

THE AGES DIGITAL LIBRARY  
**REFERENCE**

CYCLOPEDIA of BIBLICAL,  
THEOLOGICAL and  
ECCLESIASTICAL  
LITERATURE

**Prison - Provost**

*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**

## Prison

is represented in the A. V. by the following Heb. and Gr. words:

1. **rwšap** Aramaic for **rwšē**, “a chain,” is joined with **tyBē** and rendered a prison (Sept. **οἶκος δεσμῶν**; Vulg. *carcer*).
2. **al k, aWl K]** and **ayl K]** with **tyBē** (Sept. **οἶκος φυλακῆς**; Jeremiah 37:15).
3. **tkPḥḥi** from **Ēph**; “turn,” or “twist,” the stocks (<sup><2812></sup>Jeremiah 20:2).
4. **hrFmi** and **arFmi** **φυλακή**; *carcer* (Gesenius, Thesaur. p. 879).
5. **rḤṣḥi** **δεσμοτήριον**; *carcer*.
6. **rmvḥi** **φυλακή**; custodia; also intens. **trmṣḥi** A.V. “hard.”
7. **rx[** angustia; **ταπείνωσις** (Gesenius, p. 1059).
8. — **j yqAhqP]** (<sup><2601></sup>Isaiah 61:1), more properly written in one word; **ἀνάβλεψις**; *apestio* (Gesenius, p. 1121).
9. **rḥšrōḥūrwna**; *carcer*: properly a tower.
10. **tDqḥḥAtyBēoikia mύλωνος**; *domus carceris*. **tyBi** is also sometimes “prison” in the A.V. as Genesis 39:20.
11. **qhḥi** **καταρράκτης**; *carcer*; probably “the stocks” (as in the A.V.) or some such instrument of confinement; perhaps understood by the Sept. as a sewer or underground passage.
12. In the N.T. **δεσμοτήριον, οἴκημα, τήρησις**, usually **φυλακή**.

In Egypt it is plain both that special places were used as prisons, and that they were under the custody of a military officer (<sup><0412></sup>Genesis 40:3; 42:17). During the wandering in the desert we read on two occasions of confinement “in ward” (<sup><0312></sup>Leviticus 24:12; <sup><0453></sup>Numbers 15:34); but as imprisonment was not directed by the law, so we hear of none till the time of the kings, when the prison appears as an appendage to the palace, or a special part of it (<sup><1227></sup>1 Kings 22:27). Later still it is distinctly described as being in the king’s house (<sup><2812></sup>Jeremiah 32:2; 37:21; Nehemiah 3:25). This was the case also at Babylon (<sup><1227></sup>2 Kings 25:27). But private houses were

sometimes used as places of confinement (<sup>24575</sup>Jeremiah 37:15), probably much as Chardin describes Persian prisons in his day, viz. houses kept by private speculators for prisoners to be maintained there at their own cost (*Voy.* 6:100). Public prisons other than these, though in use by the Canaanitish nations (<sup>07621</sup>Judges 16:21, 25), were unknown in Judaea previous to the captivity. Under the Herods we hear again of royal prisons attached to the palace, or in royal fortresses (<sup>4183</sup>Luke 3:20; <sup>41134</sup>Acts 12:4, 10; Josephuts, *Ant.* 18:5, 2; Machzerus). By the Romans Antonia was used as a prison at Jerusalem (Acts 23:10), and at Caesarea the praetorium of Herod (ver. 35). The sacerdotal authorities also had a prison under the superintendence of special officers, **δεσφύλακες** (Acts 5:18-23; 8:3; 26:10). The royal prisons in those days were doubtless managed after the Roman fashion, and chains, fetters, and stocks were used as means of confinement (see 16:24, and <sup>18137</sup>Job 13:27). One of the readiest places for confinement was a dry, or partially dry, well or pit (see <sup>01374</sup>Genesis 37:24, and <sup>24816</sup>Jeremiah 38:6-11); but the usual place appears, in the time of Jeremiah, and in general, to have been accessible to visitors (Jeremiah 36:5; <sup>01112</sup>Matthew 11:2; 25:36, 39; <sup>41223</sup>Acts 24:23). — Smith. From the instance of the Mamertine Prison at Rome (q.v.), in which the apostle Paul (q.v.) is said to have been confined, many have rashly assumed that the Roman prisons generally were subterranean; but at Thessalonica at least, even “the inner prison” (Acts 16:24) seems to have been on the ground-floor (“doors,” ver. 26; “sprang in,” ver. 29). **SEE DUNGEON.**

### Prison, Ecclesiastical.

A bishop was required to have one or more prisons for criminous clerks in 1261. That of the bishop of Chichester remains over his palace gate; and the bishop of London’s gate-house stood at the west side of Westminster Abbey. The southwestern tower of Clugny was used as a prison. There were various names for prisons: 1, Little Ease, in which the prisoner could neither sit, lie, nor stand; 2, Bocardo, as over the gate near St. Michael’s at Oxford; 3, Hell, as at Ely; and, 4, the Lying House at Durham. At Durham, Berne, and Norwich the conventual cells adjoined the chapter-house; at Durham the term of imprisonment lasted sometimes during a year, and was often attended with chains, food being let down by a rope through a trap-door. In all cases solitary confinement was practiced, and in some cases the guilty were immured after the pronouncement of the sentence *Vade in pace*, “Go in peace.” At Thornton the skeleton of abbot De Multon (cir. 1445), with a candlestick, chair, and table, was found built up within a recess in

the wall; and a cell, with a loop-hole looking towards the high-altar, remains at the Temple, in which William le Bachelor, grand preceptor of Ireland, died. At Clugny the prison had no stair, no door, and no window. At Hirschau the prisoner could barely lie down; at St. Martin-desChamps the cell was subterranean; at St. Gabriel, Calvados, under a tower. The prisons remain at St. Gabriel, Calvados, Rebais, St. Peter-sur-Dives, and St. Benet-sur-Loire; at Caen, near the great gate; and over it at Tewkesbury, Binham, Hexham, Bridlington, and Malling. The prison was under the charge of the master of the infirmary. "Criminous priests" were imprisoned in 740 in England, and in 1351 their meager fare was prescribed. — Walcott, *Sacred Archaeology*, s.v.

## Prison Reform

Prison discipline has in recent times become a matter of so much moment that its consideration is forced upon every philanthropist, especially the believer of the new dispensation — the law of love. Under the silent influences of Christianity, torture, exposure in the pillory, and other like dedications of the offender to public vengeance have long been abandoned as barbarous practices. Death-punishment has been much narrowed in its application; and transportation, apart from any question of effectiveness, has been rendered impracticable, except within a very narrow compass.

The movement for the alleviation of the horrors of imprisonment by physical and moral improvement of the conditions of prisoners may be said to be not only Christian, but modern. We get nothing from the practice of the times anterior to Christianity, nor yet from the Middle Ages, that accounts for much in the modern systems of prison discipline. In Greece and Rome punishments were inflicted in other ways. It must be borne in mind that among the ancients the institution of slavery rendered the prison system unnecessary. It kept the functions of punishing ordinary criminals from the public administration of the affairs of a state, and placed it in private hands. Hence there was no criminal law, properly speaking. The *corpus juris*, so full of minute regulations in all matters of civic right, *SEE JUSTINIAN*, has very little criminal law, because the criminals became slaves, and ceased to be objects of the attention of the law. In the Roman empire there were houses, called *ergastula*, for the incarceration of criminal and refractory slaves. The feudal barons had towers in their castles, called *donjons* (whence our word *dungeon*), for the confinement of

their captive foes or refractory retainers. Sometimes the prison vaults were cut in the solid rock below the surface of the earth.

When imprisonment became a function of the State in the administration of justice, it was often carelessly, and hence tyrannically, exercised, because the practice of awarding it as a punishment arose more rapidly than the organization for controlling its use. In the 15th and 16th centuries the Society of the Brothers of Mercy in Italy paid much attention to the incarcerated unfortunate trespassers of society, and so greatly alleviated their forlorn condition that many of the Brothers of Mercy are reverently spoken of to this day. St. Carlo Borromeo and St. Vincent de Paul are to be especially mentioned. But the earliest instance of a prison managed on any principles of policy and humanity seems to be that of the Penitentiary at Amsterdam in 1595, an example which was soon followed by some of the German towns, especially Hamburg and Bremen. In England, on several occasions, grave abuses have been exposed by parliamentary inquiries and otherwise in the practice of prison discipline. It is well known that the real impulse to prison improvement was first communicated by the celebrated Howard (q.v.), whose sufferings, when taken by a privateer and imprisoned at Brest, during the Seven Years' War are said to have first directed his attention to this subject. The fruits of his observations in his repeated visits to most of the prisons of Europe were given to the world partly in his publications and partly on examination before Parliament. Howard's exertions, and those of Mrs. Fry and other investigators, awakened in the public mind the question whether any practice in which the public interest was so much involved should be left to something like mere chance to the negligence of local authorities and the personal disposition of jailers. As in other reform movements, so in this, our own country has been most progressive, and Europe has willingly taken lessons from America. The reports made of our prison systems by the French visitors, Messrs. Beaumont and De Tocqueville (in 1834), De Metz and Blouet (in 1837), Dr. Juliers (sent from Prussia), and Mr. Crawford (from England), have certainly contributed very largely to the present state of public opinion on the subject. In 1834, inspectors were appointed to report annually on the state of English and Scottish prisons—a measure which had been earlier adopted with reference to Ireland; and their reports may be consulted with advantage.

“The tendency lately has been to regulate prison discipline with extreme care. The public sometimes complain that too much pains is bestowed on it

— that criminals are not worthy of having clean, well-ventilated apartments, wholesome food, skilful medical attendance, industrial training, and education, as they now have in this country. There are many arguments in favor of criminals being so treated, and the objections urged against such treatment are held by those who are best acquainted with the subject to be invalid; for it has never been maintained by any one that a course of crime has been commenced and pursued for the purpose of enjoying the advantages of imprisonment. Perhaps those who chiefly promoted the several prominent systems expected from them greater results, in the shape of the reformation of criminals, than have been obtained. If they have been disappointed in this, it can, at all events, be said that any prison in the now recognised system is no longer like the older prisons, an institution in which the young criminals advance into the rank of proficients, and the old improve each other's skill by mutual communication. The system now received is that of separation, so far as it is practicable. Two other systems were tried — the silent system and the solitary system. The former imposed entire silence among the prisoners even when assembled together; the latter endeavored to accomplish their complete isolation from sight of or communication with their race. By the separate system, the criminals are prohibited from communicating with each other; but they are visited by persons whose intercourse is more likely to elevate than to debase — as chaplains, teachers, Scripture readers, the superior officers of the prison, and those who have the external control over it.” *SEE PENITENTIARY.*

The Prison Association in the State of New York is regarded as the most perfect organization of the kind in the world. According to the annual report, the objects of this society are threefold:

1. Humane attention to persons arrested, protecting them from legal sharpers, and securing their impartial trial.
2. Encouragement and aid of discharged convicts.
3. Careful study of prison discipline, observation of the causes of crime, and inquiry as to the proper means of its prevention.

The last is considered the most important of its objects. The statistics of the work of the society during the quarter of a century just ended show the following figures under the first object named above: 93,560 friendless persons visited in the detention prisons of New York and Brooklyn, all of them counselled, and many of them assisted; 25,290 complaints carefully

examined; 6148 complaints withdrawn at the instance of the society as trivial, or founded on mistake or passion; 7922 persons discharged by the courts on recommendation of the society, who were young, innocent, committed their offences under mitigating circumstances, or were evidently penitent; a total of 133,922 cases in which relief of some kind has been offered by the association. During the last twenty-five years the assistance given to discharged convicts is summed up as follows: 18,309 persons of this class aided with board, clothing, tools, railroad tickets, or money; 4139 provided with permanent situations; a total of 22,448. Aid has also been extended to thousands of persons connected with the families of the prisoners. For some years a few hundred dollars have been annually distributed on New-year's-day among indigent families. By its act of incorporation it is made the duty of the Prison Association to "visit, inspect, and examine all the prisons of the State of New York, and annually report to the Legislature their condition." In 1876 the fourth National Prison Reform Congress was held in New York City, and very advanced ground was taken. Those especially interested in this subject will do well to consult the minutes of these proceedings, and the annual reports of the New York State Prison Association; also those of the *Boston Prison Discipline Society*, an organization to which is due the introduction of religious exercises into American prisons, as well as the appointment of chaplains. Prison congresses have been held in Europe since 1845. In 1872 an international congress was held in London, likewise in 1877.

While the principle of prison reform is universally recognised, it is found in practice to work with different results in different cases. This comes from the impossibility of having uniformity in the actual management of the prisons, personal tact and influence having much to do in the case. The prison at Columbus, O., has the reputation of being one of the best in the country for this reason; it enjoys superior supervision, and is wholly free from political interference. The movers in reform hope to achieve still better results in all the institutions. Their principal business is with the criminal after he is caught — to reform him, restore his manhood, and return him to society a new individual. The question how to prevent crime in the first instance is another and more important question. See the excellent article on *Prisons and Prison Discipline* in the *Amer. Cyclop.* 14:6, 17, and the literature there quoted. See also *Revue Chretienne*, Aug. 1873, art. 1; Robin, *La Question Penitentiaire* (Paris, 1873); *Edinb. Rev.*

54, 159 sq.; *Meth. Quar. Rev.* July, 1873, art. v; *New-Engl.* Jan. 1873, art. 4; *Christian Union*, May 31, 1876; *New York Evening Post*, 1878.

## Prisoner

(*rySaj* *assir*, *δέσμιος*). Imprisonment does not appear to have been imposed by Moses as a punishment among the Hebrews, though he describes it as in use among the Egyptians (<sup><133D></sup>Genesis 39:20, 21; 40:1-4). He seems to have used it merely for the purpose of keeping the culprit safe until judgment was given (<sup><134D></sup>Leviticus 24:12). As execution immediately followed the sentence, there was little occasion for incarceration. The great variety in the names of prisons in the Hebrew would lead us to imagine that they were more frequently used in the latter than in the earlier periods of the Hebrew nation; and that they were not only used in the detention of criminals, but as a means of punishment and correction (<sup><146D></sup>2 Chronicles 16:10; <sup><127D></sup>1 Kings 22:27; <sup><125D></sup>2 Kings 25:29; <sup><247D></sup>Jeremiah 37:15, 21; 52:31; <sup><232D></sup>Isaiah 24:22; 42:7; <sup><104D></sup>Matthew 4:12; <sup><413D></sup>Acts 12:4). Prisoners were often confined in stocks, or with chains (<sup><81D></sup>Job 12:27; 33:11; <sup><241D></sup>Jeremiah 40:4); and the keepers of the prisons often had a discretionary power to treat their prisoners as they pleased. The torture was often applied to extort a confession from the accused. In later periods the Jews confined those in prison who failed in the payment of their debts. They had the liberty to punish the debtor with stripes (*Wisdom of Solomon* 2:19; <sup><115D></sup>Matthew 5:26; 18:28-34). The Romans, in some instances, fastened their criminals by one or both hands to a soldier: such appear to have remained in their own houses (<sup><423D></sup>Acts 28:16). It was not unfrequently the case that the keepers of prisons, when those who were committed to their charge had escaped, were subjected to the same punishment which had been intended for the prisoners (12:19; 16:27). *SEE PRISON.*

## Pritchard, Martin

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church of some standing, was born in Ohio April 23, 1827; was converted and joined the Church at the age of seventeen. He obtained a good elementary education, and for a number of years was engaged as a school-teacher. He was licensed as an exhorter when about twenty-three, and as a local preacher at the age of twenty-five. He joined the Nebraska Conference in 1857, and at once entered upon his duties as an itinerant with that energy and devotion to his work which so signally characterized his whole career as a minister, and the fruits of his



labor gave abundant proof that he was indeed called of God. He preached successively at Mount Pleasant, Peru, Belleview, Platte Valley, Pawnee City, Falls City, and a second time at Peru. In 1870 he was appointed presiding elder of the Lincoln district, and at the next annual conference he was appointed presiding elder of the Nebraska district. At the Conference of 1875 he was appointed presiding elder of the Lincoln district, where he continued his earnest and faithful labors until about ten days before his death, which occurred on March 24, 1877. He was a member of the Book Committee four years, and was twice elected reserve delegate to the General Conference. See *Minutes of the Annual Conferences, 1877*, p. 142; *N. Y. Christian Advocate*, April 19, 1877.

### Pritchard, Samuel

a Wesleyan missionary, was born in the first quarter of our century. He was converted in 1843, and feeling called of God to preach the glad tidings, he entered the itinerant ranks in 1852, and was sent to Biabou Circuit, in the island of St. Vincent. He was there only two years when he was seized with malignant yellow fever, and died Feb. 28, 1853. During the brief period of his ministerial labors he gained the affectionate regard of the community in which he resided. See *Wesleyan Mag.* 1853, p. 872.

### Prithu

is the name of several legendary kings of ancient India. It is, however, especially one king of this name who is the favorite hero of the *Puranas*. His father was Vena, an embodiment of the Hindu divinity Vishnu (q.v.). Vishnu perished through his wickedness; for when he was inaugurated monarch of the earth, he caused it to be everywhere proclaimed that no worship should be performed, no oblations offered, and no gifts bestowed upon the Brahmins. The Rishis, or Saints, hearing of this proclamation, entreated the king to revoke it, but in vain; hence they fell upon him and slew him. But the kingdom now being without a king, as Vena had left no offspring, and the people being without protection, the sages assembled, and consulted how to produce a son from the body of the dead king. First, then, they rubbed his thigh; from it, thus rubbed, came forth a being called Nishada; and by this means the wickedness of Vena having been expelled, they proceeded to rub the right arm of the dead king, and by this friction engendered Prithu, who came forth resplendent in person, and in his right hand appeared the mark of the discus of Vishnu, which proved him to be a

universal emperor, one whose power would be invincible even by the gods. The mighty Prithu soon removed the grievances of the people; he protected the earth, performed many sacrifices, and gave liberal gifts to the Brahmins. On being informed that in the interval in which the earth was without a king all vegetable products had been withheld, and that consequently the people had perished, he in great wrath marched forward to assail the earth. The earth, assuming the figure of a cow, fled before him, but seeing no escape from the power of the king, at last submitted to him, and promised to renew her fertility, provided he made all places level. Prithu therefore uprooted mountains, levelled the surface of the earth, established boundaries of towns and villages, and induced his subjects to take up their abode where the ground was made level. Then Prithu caused the earth to appear before his throne in the shape she had assumed, and commanded that any one who should apply to her with a wish, and bring a calf with him to milk her, should be granted his wish. This is the celebrated wonder-cow, about which the Brahmins and the Kshatrias fought such tremendous battles that the gods found it necessary to intervene. Now the earth resumed her former liberality, the people were relieved of their want, and the young god, presented by Vishnu and Shiva with never-missing weapons, by the sun-god with an all-illuminating crown, by the sea-god with a parasol trimmed with pearls, walked through the world a conqueror in every battle, bestowing rain or sunshine at his will. He now prepared for invading the empire of India, and for that purpose offered ninety-nine great sacrifices of horses; but when he was going to offer the hundredth, Indra managed to steal the horse, as the last performance would have secured victory. Prithu's son pursued the robber, who could not otherwise escape him than by changing himself into the form of a penitent strewed with ashes and hung all round with bones. Indra succeeded in stealing the horse a second time, and only escaped the unerring weapons of his foe by the intervention of Brahma. Prithu resigned power in favor of his son, and retired to a solitude, where he was absorbed by the divinity. The legend of Prithu evidently records some historical fact regarding the civilizing influences exerted by a great king of Hindu antiquity.

### **Pritz, Johann Georg,**

a German theologian, was born at Leipsic in 1662. After having been an evangelical minister at Leipsic and at Zerbst, he became superintendent at Schleitz. He was made professor of theology at Greifswalde, and in 1711 was called to Frankfort-on-the-Main as senior minister. He died in the year

1732. Among his numerous writings we cite the following: *De contemptu divitiarum apud antiquos philosophos* (Leipsic, 1693, 4to): — *De prcerogativa sexus masculini prce femineo* (4to): — *De immortalitate hominis, contora Asgillum* (ibid. 1702, 4to): — *Proben der Beredtsamkeit* (noted for eloquence) (ibid. 1702, 8vo): — *Introductio in Novum Testamentum* (ibid. 1709, 8vo). He also edited a work of opuscles of St. Macaire, and translated some of the writings of Burnet and other English authors. — Hoefer. *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, s.v.

### Private Baptism

The Church, even in her most ritualistic periods, has always held that, in case of danger or sickness, baptism might be administered at any time or in any place. In Thessaly, when baptism was restricted to Easter, many died without it, and in consequence the old prohibitions were mitigated, the font being hallowed at Easter and Pentecost for occasional use. Children, if in danger, might be baptized on the day of their birth, by a decree of the councils of Gerona, 517, and Winchester, 1071; and the Constitutions of Othobon, 1268. According to Roman Catholic teachings, the vessels in which any have been baptized are to be carried to church and there applied to some necessary use, and not to any common purpose, out of reverence to the sacrament (Langton's *Constitutions*, 1223); and the water with which baptism was ministered was to be thrown into the fire, or carried to the church to be put into the font. The vessel, Lyndwood says, was to be large enough to permit immersion, and was to be burned or deputed to the use of the Church, by Edmund's Constitutions of 1236; that is, as Lyndwood explains, "for washing the church linen." Wooden vessels were burned. In England, in the Anglo-Saxon period, children, if sick, were brought to the priest, by Elfric's Canons, 957, who was to baptize them, from whose district soever they were brought, without delay.

### Private Confession

SEE CONFESSION.

### Private Judgment

is the right the Protestants claimed in the Reformatory movement of the 16th century, and has since become the corner-stone of Protestantism (q.v.). The term signifies the right of man to read the Bible for himself and form his own judgment of its meaning under the enlightenment of the Holy

Spirit. In the view of Protestantism, man does not only enjoy this privilege, but is bound to exercise it. But, on the other hand, the Romish Church steadfastly denies this right to any man, and holds the Church alone authority and guide in Scripture interpretation. On this point the Council of Trent thus decrees: “In order to restrain petulant minds, the council further decrees that in matters of faith and morals, and whatever relates to the maintenance of Christian doctrine, no one, confiding in his own judgment, shall dare to wrest the Sacred Scriptures to his own sense of them, contrary to that which hath been held, and still is held, by holy mother Church, whose right it is to judge of the true meaning and interpretation of Sacred Writ, or contrary to the unanimous consent of the fathers, even though such interpretation should never be published. If any disobey, let them be denounced by the ordinaries, and punished according to law.” From the terms of this decree, it is plain that Romanists hold that their Church alone is entitled to judge of the true meaning and interpretation of Sacred Scripture. To the same effect the creed of pope Pius IV declares: “I also admit the Holy Scriptures according to that sense which our holy mother the Church has held, and does hold, to which it belongs to judge of the true sense and interpretation of the Scriptures. Neither will I ever take and interpret them otherwise than according to the unanimous consent of the fathers.” In opposition to such doctrines as these, the Word of God explicitly teaches that every man is bound to judge for himself of the true meaning of Scripture. Thus <sup><317></sup>1 Thessalonians 5:21, “Prove all things; hold fast that which is good.” <sup><4171></sup>Acts 17:11, “These were more noble than those in Thessalonica, in that they received the Word with all readiness of mind, and searched the Scriptures daily, whether those things were so.” <sup><4124></sup>Mark 12:24, “And Jesus answering said unto them, Do ye not therefore err, because ye know not the Scriptures, neither the power of God?” <sup><2169></sup>Luke 16:29, “Abraham saith unto him, “they have Moses and the prophets; let them hear them.” <sup><2180></sup>Isaiah 8:20, “To the law and to the testimony: if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them.”

The popish theory goes to destroy individual responsibility; but in alleging herself to be the appointed interpreter of Scripture the Church of Rome is obliged to concede the right of private judgment so far as to enable us to determine for ourselves from the Divine Word that we are bound to submit our understandings to her guidance in spiritual things. But by any concession of the exercise of private judgment to any extent whatever, her

theory falls to the ground. Dr. Whately shows this in a very striking manner in a passage which we extract from his *Cautions for the Times*: “A man who resolves to place himself under a certain guide to be implicitly followed, and decides that such and such a Church is the appointed infallible guide, does decide, on his own private judgment, that one most important point which includes in it all other decisions relative to religion. Thus, by his own showing, he is unfit to judge at all, and can have no ground for confidence that he has decided rightly in that. If, accordingly, he will not trust himself to judge even on this point, but resolves to consult his priest, or some other friends, and be led entirely by their judgment thereupon, still he does in thus resolving exercise his own judgment as to the counsellors he so relies on. The responsibility of forming some judgment is one which, however unfit we may deem ourselves to bear it, we cannot possibly get rid of, in any matter about which we really feel an anxious care. It is laid upon us by God, and we cannot shake it off. Before a man can rationally judge that he should submit his judgment in other things to the Church of Rome, he must first have judged,

- 1, that there is a God;
- 2, that Christianity comes from God;
- 3, that Christ has promised to give an infallible authority in the Church;
- 4, that such authority resides in the Church of Rome.

Now, to say that men who are competent to form sound judgments upon these points are quite incompetent to form sound judgments about any other matters in religion is very like saying that men may have sound judgments of their own before they enter the Church of Rome, but that they lose all sound judgment entirely from the moment they enter it.” See Elliott, *Delineation of Romanism*; *North Brit. Rev.* 34:260; Daubigne, *Hist. of the Ref.* i, 281; *Congre., Quar.* 8:2, 66; Lee, *Right and Responsibility of Private Judgment* (N. Y. 1855); Rogers, *Reason and Faith*.

### Privatio Communio

(*deprivation of the Communion*), one of the punishments inflicted on offending members of the clerical body during the earlier centuries. Those punishments included suspension, degradation, *privatio communionis*, or deprivation, corporal chastisement, and excommunication. *Privatio* was of two kinds, namely, a restriction to *communio peregrina*, or to

*communio laica*. The former had reference to the mode in which strangers were treated who did not bring with them letters testimonial, by which they might be ascertained to be members of some Christian Church: they were looked upon with suspicion, and till they could clear themselves were not allowed to come to the Lord's table, nor to receive any temporal support from the Church funds. In this way delinquent clergymen were treated even in their own Church: they were deprived of means of support, and prevented from officiating or being present at the Lord's Supper. *Communio laica* was a punishment which required a clergyman to communicate as a layman, and among the lay members of the Church. **SEE COMMUNIO LAICA AND COMMUNIO PEREGRINA.**

### Privation

is a philosophical term which, according to Plato, is limitation, imperfection, the inherent condition of all finite existence, and the necessary cause of evil. Leibnitz (*Causa Dei*, § 69, 72; *Essai sur la bonte de Dieu*, 1iere partie, § 29, 31; 3ieme partie, § 378), after Augustine, Aquinas, and others, held similar views.

### Privation, Ecclesiastical,

is one of the vindictive, i.e. positive, penalties (in opposition to the censures) which the ecclesiastical laws inflict in the Church of Rome on prebendaries for grave and repeated offences against the discipline of the Church. It is the suspension of an ecclesiastic from his office and prebend. It differs from the disciplinary transfer by which the delinquent receives, in place of the prebend which is taken from him, another, though inferior one; it also differs from absolute deposition, by which an ecclesiastic is deprived forever of his office and official income, and declared unfit for any further employment, while the privation does not forbid him the hope of getting some time another prebend. The privation, as long as it lasts, deprives its object of the power of performing the ecclesiastical functions of consecration or jurisdiction, without unfitting him for life for any further employment. This penalty — even because it is a positive penalty — cannot be inflicted for merely administrative reasons, like the transfer, for instance; or for delinquencies which remained secret, and are only known to the bishop, like the suspension; but only in consequence of canonic examination and by judiciary sentence. The canons name among the transgressions which, if proved, are punished with privation: continued

negligence in the performance of the official duties (c. 4, Dist. 91), addiction to lucre (c. 8, 10 *Ne clen. vel monach.* 3, 50), repeated infrinements of the law of residence (*Conc. Tid.* sess. 24 c. 12, *De ref.*), immoral and scandalous conduct, etc.; if admonitions and gradual corrections have proved unavailing (*id.* sess. 21 c. 6, *De ref.*; c. 13, 10 *De vit. et hon. cler.* 3, 1). There are, of course, other transgressions and vices, which can be visited with indefinite suspension; drunkenness, for instance. Wetzler u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lexikon*, s.v. **SEE PRIVATIO COMMUNIONIS.**

## Privilege

(Lat. *privilegium*, from *privata lex*, a private law), in general, is a special ordinance or regulation in virtue of which an individual or a class enjoys certain immunities or rights from or beyond the common provisions of the general law of the community. In ancient and medieval legislation, the law of privilege formed an important branch; and, in truth, the condition of the so-called “privileged classes” was in all respects different, socially, civilly, and even religiously, from that of the non-privileged.

In canon law, there were two privileges enjoyed by the clergy, which deserve especial notice, from the frequency of the historical reference to them — the “privilege of the canon” (*privilegium canonis*) and the “privilege of the forum” (*privilegium fori*). By the former, the person of the clergyman, of whatever degree, was protected from violence by the penalty of excommunication against the offender; by the latter — in England called “benefit of clergy” (q.v.) — the clergyman was exempted from the ordinary civil tribunals, and could only be tried in the ecclesiastical court. — Chambers, s.v. This privilege from the civil power is now generally abrogated, or at least modified. It comprehended the independent jurisdiction of the clergy (*privilegium fori*), according to which not only all litigious concerns among the clergy themselves, but all personal, and most of the real complaints of laymen against clerks, were brought before, and decided by, ecclesiastical courts; likewise. not only their official transgressions, as functionaries of the Church, but also their civil crimes, were tried and punished by clerical tribunals. To the same class of privileges belongs *the benefit of competence*, in consequence of which, in matters of debts and substation, the clerical person must be left the means of living according to his station. Finally, the clergy obtained at an early period a number of immunities. which were gradually increased. They were, in consideration of the spiritual pursuits to which they have to

devote themselves, exempted from the administration of governmental or communal functions, from tutorships and guardianships, from military and other services to which all other citizens of the State are bound (*ismunitras personalis*). With these was connected the immunity from extraordinary taxes (*immunitas realis*); from presentations for the building of roads, bridges, channels; from lodging soldiers; from surveyances in times of war (*immunitas mixta*). Many of these immunities were granted to the clergy by the emperors Theodosius (*Cod. Theodos.* 2, 3, 11, 14-17, 24, 36, *De episc. eccl. et cler.* 16:2) and Justinian (1, 1, 2, 6, 52, *Cod. De episc. et cler.* 1, 3) in the times of the Roman empire; afterwards by the Frankish kings (*Cupp. Reg. From cc. lib. 7:c. 185, 290, 467*); consolidated by the ecclesiastical legislation (c. 69, c. 12 qu. 2; c. 40, c. 16:qu. I; c. 4, 7, 10 *De immun. eccl.* 3, 49; Sextus, c. 1, 3, cod. 3, 23; Sextus, c. 4, *De censibus*, 3, 20; Clem. c. 3, cod. 3, 13, etc.), and urgently recommended by the Council of Trent to the worldly rulers (*Conc. Trid. sess. 25:c. 20, De ref.*). In our times most of the civil legislations impose the same regular taxes on all citizens, without exception, and regardless of former immunities. But in many European states the clergy are unconditionally exempted from communal functions, guardianships, and personal prestations, and are also exempted from military service. — Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lexikon*.

### Privileged Days

those signaled by peculiar ceremonies or commemorating particular events: the first, fourth, and fifth Saturdays in Lent, and Easter Eve, Ash-Wednesday, first and fourth Sundays in Lent, Palm-Sunday, Good-Friday, and Holy Week. — Walcott, *Sacred Archaeology*, s.v.

### Privileged Sundays

those on which, in some churches of mediaeval times, “histories” (lessons from Holy Writ) were read.

### Privilegium Altaris

is a privilege granted by the pope that masses for the dead said before a certain altar may procure an indulgence to the deceased. Forever and for all days (*privilegium perpetuum et quotidi (anum)*) this privilege has been granted by Benedict XIII (de dat. 20 Julii, 1724, “omnium saluti”) to all patriarchal, metropolitan, and cathedral churches for the high altar. Generally it is granted for seven years only (*septennium*), running from the



day of the grant. The indulgence can be obtained for the dead if a mass of requiem (called sometimes a black mass) be said before the privileged altar; but if the rite do not allow of a votive mass, nor, in consequence, of a requiem (i.e. *in fest. displici, coram exposito*, etc.), the *application* or *intention* “pro defuncto” is sufficient, as in such a case no mass of requiem can be said even at the privileged altar. On the Day of All-Souls all priests before altars can use this privilege (*Decret. Congreg. Sacr. Indulg.* 19 Maii, 1761). — Aschbach, *Kirchen-Lex.* s.v. *SEE ASYLUM*.

### Privilegium Canonis

(1.) Certain exemptions of the clergy from the State. *SEE PRIVILEGE*.

(2.) That privilege of ecclesiastics which makes a *real* injury to a member of the clergy punishable by excommunication, this taking place *de ipso facto*. After several former canons had established the principle that such real injuries must, after examination, be punished with excommunication (for instance, can. *Si quis deinceps*, 22; *De presbyterorum*, 23, c. 17, qu. 4), the heresy of Arnold di Brescia gave occasion to the Council of Rheims, in 1131, to sanction that extreme penalty. The canon then decreed, commencing with “*Si quis suadente diabolo*,” was made by Innocent II, in 1139, a general law of the Church; and this is the reason why the privilege mentioned above is called *Privilegium canonis*. In Gratian’s decree this ecclesiastical law is given as can. 29, c. 17, qu. 4. It contains some further dispositions, for it states that it is applicable also to *real* injuries perpetrated against monks, and that absolution, except in the dying hour, can only be obtained if the excommunicated person applies for it personally in Rome. This canon has received in the course of time an enlarged interpretation for some cases and a restricted one for others. As a matter of course, the term “ecclesiastic” includes all those who received the tonsure; but the term “monk” has also a very extensive signification, as it includes every member of an order approved by the Church, even the novice. The law is, moreover, applicable to cases where the dead body of a clergyman has been the object of some wanton outrage. On the other side, there are cases where a person, though belonging to the clergy, has no share in the privilege; for instance, the ecclesiastic who is degraded *acti*, especially when he is sentenced to hard labor; the clergyman who dresses in worldly clothes, or persists in a sinful way of life. The canon *Si quis suadente* speaks only of that kind of *real* injury which consists in “assault upon an ecclesiastic,” but we have, of course, to take a more extensive view of the

case: not only he who strikes, etc., the clergyman is to be punished by excommunication, but also the intellectual originator of such an outrage, or he in whose name it is committed, and who approves of it, or he who, being a witness to it, fails to do what is in his power to prevent it. It is necessary that the delinquent should have acted with the intention of injuring a clergyman; he who, *animo injuriandi*, strikes another person, ignorant that he is a member of the clergy, is not excommunicated; but he is who strikes a layman whom he mistakes for a member of the clergy. If the quarrel originated with the ecclesiastic, the law cannot be applied to the person who is in the case of legitimate defence against him; this is also admitted in favor of a woman who defends her chastity against the assaults of a clergyman. An exception is also admitted in favor of the husband, son, father, or brother of a woman found in criminal conversation with an ecclesiastic. The rule that absolution must be personally applied for in Rome has been restricted in some cases: it is not applicable to women, to monks, and other clerks living in community, when they have assaulted each other, or to sick and ailing persons. A report sent to Rome is sufficient in such cases. Sometimes, when the injury is a trifling one (*levis percussio*), the bishop may grant a dispensation. In general the modern practice has become milder: it imposes the voyage to Rome as a penance only for injuries against the offender's own curate or bishop; absolution is bestowed on his return by the bishop. — Wetzler u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lexikon*, s.v.

## Prize

(βραβεῖον, <sup><4024></sup>1 Corinthians 9:24) signifies the honorary reward bestowed on victors in the public games of the Greeks, such as a wreath, chaplet, garland, etc., and is metaphorically used of the rewards of a future life: "I press," says the apostle, "towards the mark, for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus" (<sup><1084></sup>Philippians 3:14). *SEE GAME*.

## Proast, Jonas

an English divine, flourished in the closing half of the 17th and the early part of the 18th century. He is noted as a controversialist, and wrote, among other things, *Letters on Toleration* (1690/91, and since). There is nothing accessible regarding his personal history. Leckey (*Hist. of Rationalism*, 2, 87) is the only writer of note who has considered Proast;

neither Leslie Stephen (*Hist. of English Thought in the 18th Century*) nor Tulloch (*Rational Theology in the 18th Century*) mentions him.

## Probabilionists

are those who oppose the doctrine of Probabilism and assert that man is obliged, on pain of sinning, always to take the more probable side. The Jansenists and the Port-Royalists are of this class. *SEE PROBABILISM*.

## Probabilism

The Roman Catholic Church recognises no standard of ethics except that of her own construction. Protestants look to the Bible as the source of all doctrines of morality. The Church of Rome accords authority also to tradition, and to the writers of her own communion who have kept within the list of the faithful ones. *SEE MORAL THEOLOGY*. The expressed opinion of a Church doctor forms a sufficient basis for a legitimate moral decision. ‘The eternal and objective foundations of the moral law are thus exchanged for the subjective view of individual persons of eminence (see Wuttke, *Christian Ethics*, 1, 261-263). Not only is the deciding element the individual, instead of the Church, but that individual whose decision best suits the inquirer (see Sanchez, *Op. Mor.* i, 9, n. 12 sq., n. 24; Laymann, *Theol. Mor.* [1625] i, 11). Probabilism is a term used in philosophic parlance, as we may *SEE IN THE ARTICLE PROBABLE*, but in Christian theology it has become synonymous with Roman Catholic ethics. Though its principal source and advocacy are in the Order of the Jesuits, the whole Church of Rome has by its tacit acceptance of this doctrine become identified with it.

*Definition.* — Probabilism designates, in the domain of morals, an object so comprehensive, and including so many different branches, that we shall scarcely be able to delineate it here, even in its fundamental features. In order to define it we must depart from that moral idea which is the centre of the domain in which it moves: this centre is the *certitude* and firm conviction of the moral subject about the legitimacy of his acts. It is the opposite of this subjective consciousness which forms the object of all probabilistic questions. As the ground of the doctrine, it is assumed, then, that in human actions absolute certainty is not always attainable as to their lawfulness or unlawfulness. Short of this certainty, the intellect passes through the stages of “doubt” and of “probability.” Probability is a state of consciousness intermediate between certitude and incertitude, but

approaching more or less to certitude, without reaching it entirely. Consciousness, in the state of probability, has risen above incertitude. Doubt is a wavering state between two judgments, between negation and affirmation of the goodness or permissibility of an action; it excludes every positive approbation, every positive consent, every permanent decision in favor of either term of the moral antithesis. Probability has passed this uncertain wavering; it does not move hesitatingly to and fro; it has found a point of support, though the latter may not be absolutely trustworthy. In consequence, a more or less positive decision in favor of one or the other term of the question is possible. Such a decision must not originate in any subjective whim; it must be founded on sufficient objective reasons. This gives us the true idea of the *probable conscience*: “Probabile est id quod probari potest, hoc est, quod rationibus nititur.” We may, then, define probability in matters of conscience thus: it is the decision or consent of conscience in regard to the moral permissibility of an action, a decision founded on sufficient reasons, but not excluding all misgivings to the contrary. To the *probaeble conscience*, then, corresponds, as its foundation, the *probable opinion* (*opinio probubilis*). An opinion as to the legitimacy or illegitimacy of an action is the more probable the stronger the reasons on which it rests. These reasons are either *intrinsic*, a part of the thing itself and its objective nature, or *extrinsic*, owing their weight to human authorities. The extrinsic probability of an opinion contents itself with the repute and confidence enjoyed by the authorities which support it, while the intrinsic probability endeavors to conceive the rational foundation of the opinion in question. But whichever of these forms probability may assume, it can never be at variance with the decisions and doctrines of the Church. Absence of intrinsic and extrinsic contradictions is the negative condition of probability. To establish true and real probability (*probabilitas vera*), a positive element is required, to wit, a more or less evident accord with the objective law, either with its spirit or with its more or less clearly expressed dispositions. It results from the nature of opinion that a variety and diversity of opinions be conceived, which, in regard to their legitimacy, are of equal or unequal value. Moreover, in the conflict of views another element will arise as to their comparative “safety;” that is, the greater or less danger of moral culpability which they involve; and this greater or less moral “safety” of a view may or may not coincide with its greater or less “probability.” Hence the gradual scale of probable opinions, the highest degree being the *opinio probabilissima*, but the *opinio tenuiter probabilis* being entirely excluded. The ascending degrees of the concurrent probable

opinions are marked by the *opinio mere probabilis*, *ceque probabilis*, and *probabilior*.

The doctrine of probabilism is founded upon these distinctions. It is taught, with some variations, by four different schools, all of which agree in professing that it is lawful, in certain cases, to act upon opinions which are merely probable. These four schools of probabilism are called: *Probabilism Simple*, *Equiprobabilism*, *Probabiliorism* (from *probabilior*, more probable), and *Tutorism* (from *tutor*, more safe). The first holds that it is lawful to act upon any probable opinion, no matter how slight its probability. The second requires that the opinion shall be “solidly probable,” but holds that, provided it be really probable, it is lawful to act upon it, even though the conflicting opinion should be equally probable. The third narrows much more the limits of what is allowed in the conflict of probable opinions, and only permits action on the more probable of the two; but permits this even when the less probable adverse opinion is the “more safe.” The fourth requires that in all cases the more safe opinion shall be followed, even when the less safe opinion is much the more probable. The extreme rigorism which the last class requires has caused its division into *absolute* and *mollified* tutorism. “By the *certainty* of an opinion,” says Fuchs, “we are to understand the more or less considerable remoteness of the danger of sin, or of error, or of encroachment on other persons’ rights. The more an opinion removes him who chooses it for his guide from the danger of actual sin, the more certain it is. The *opinio tutor* is that which declares that an action is not allowed; the *opinio minus tuta* is that which asserts the legitimacy of the action in question. As the being allowed and the not being allowed of an action stand together in the same relation as liberty and law, it may be said that in the first case liberty, in the second law, is favored (*libertati favet, legi favet*).”

To these probabilistic systems is opposed a system espoused by the more consistent of Romish theologians of the Old Catholic type. It is called *Antiprobabilism*, and in its austere severity does not allow any influence on man’s actions, even to the most probable opinion. It requires that an opinion shall be absolutely morally certain, in order that it may be lawful for a man to act upon it in the light of Christian truth. But this system has been rejected by papal authority, declaring erroneous the assertion “*Non licet sequi opinionem vel inter probabiles probabilissimam.*”

*History of Probabilism.* — It is commonly said that the system of probabilism is modern; but this is only true of the discussions regarding it, for the doctrine itself, in some of its forms, is as old as the study of ethics, even considered as a moral science. The disputes regarding it arose with the science of casuistry, when men, in the 16th and 17th centuries, began to reduce morals to a system. It formed a leading subject of the controversy between the Jesuits and the Jansenists; but even in its modern form probabilism dates back to the close of the scholastic period. At the Council of Constance, in A.D. 1415, a debate had arisen on the subject of the murder of the duke of Orleans, assassinated in Paris Nov. 23, 1407, at the instigation of his political rival, the duke of Burgundy. The Franciscan Jean Petit had endeavored to justify this crime in an assembly of French noblemen held at Paris March 8, 1408; but his proposition had been condemned, at the request of chancellor Gerson, by the university and the bishop of Paris. When the matter was brought before the council, Martin Porree, bishop of Arras, speaking in behalf of the duke of Burgundy, tried to prevent any conclusions unfavorable to Jean Petit, asserting that several authorities were in favor of Petit, and that, in consequence, his opinion was at least probable, and ought not to be peremptorily disposed of by way of rejection and condemnation. Gerson defended a contrary view of the matter, and the council condemned as heretical the doctrine of the legitimacy of murder committed on the persons of tyrants, and stamped with the name of heretic all those who should pertinaciously maintain it (comp. Mansi, *Coll. Conc.* 27:705, and 28:868). This resolution left probabilism untouched, and condemned only a false application of its principles in a particular case.

The Dominican Bartolomeo de Medina is considered as the founder of probabilism in its usual signification. Through his commentary on the theological *Summa* of St. Thomas de Aquinas it entered the schools: “Si est opinio probabilis,” he says (quaest. 19, art. 6, concl. 3), “licitum est eam sequi. licet opposita probabilior.” Many Thomist theologians adopted this proposition; among them, Bannez, Alvarez, Ledesma, Martinez, and Lopez. Among the Jesuits, the celebrated Vasquez was the first who (1598) positively took sides with the probabilists, and a number of members of his order followed in his footsteps. From this time forth the Jesuits did much for the expansion of the probabilistic doctrines, and the aberrations to which they led. Probabilism came to be synonymous with Jesuitism, so largely were the Jesuits identified with the advocacy of this

pernicious dogma. This is, however, easily accounted for. The Jesuits had come on the stage at a time when the Church of Rome was in danger of being broken up, if not of being entirely dismembered. The Reformation had struck her heavy blows, and in some countries she was felled to the ground. Loyola's order aimed at her recovery and restoration. The bride of Christ they saw endangered, and their mission was the salvation of the Romish Church at any price. In a struggle of life and death, as has been aptly said, one is not very careful in the use of measures; and in all warfare the sentiment holds good, though involving manifold violations of ordinary right, that the end sanctifies the means. The Jesuits were well aware that they were an essentially new phenomenon of the churchly life that they stood upon purely human invention and power; it need not surprise us, therefore, that they felt called by their fundamental principles to the development of a special system of morality — a system the highest end of which is the glory of God through the exaltation of the visible Church, which, of course, is to them the Romish Church. The purpose — zealously pursued by the Jesuits in the interest of Romish domination — of becoming soul-guarding fathers and conscience-counsellors, especially for men and women of eminence, required, on the other hand, that the Jesuits should acquire for themselves the highest possible repute in ethics — and hence it was requisite that they should become the literary representatives thereof; and, on the other, that this ethics should be moulded in adaptation to this end — should make itself not disagreeable and burdensome, but should become as elastic as possible in view of different wants — should be a “golden net for catching souls,” as the Jesuits themselves were wont to call their own pliability. The more ramified and complex the network of casuistic ethics became, so much the more indispensable were the practiced conscience-counsellors, or, more properly, conscience-advocates; the more stairways and back doors they were able to turn attention to in conscience affairs, so much the more prized and influential they became. This explains the great compass and the peculiar character of Jesuitic ethics. They were but too well aware that it did not harmonize with the moral consciousness of the ancient Church, and they hesitated not to admit that they did not recognise earlier Church tradition as a criterion for morality, but wished rather to lay the foundations for a new tradition. The sophisticated artifices in the doctrine of right and morality were not then first thought out and invented by Jesuitism; but it learned them by listening to weak, corrupt human nature, as others had here and there done before it. Jesuitism, moreover, was *the first* to set up these sophisms as rules; first brought

them into an organized system of doctrine, and formed them as methods of the Christian doctrine of morals; first scientifically constituted, authorized, and sanctioned them as leading principles of Catholic morality; and — what is not to be overlooked — has first applied them to the allotment of the moral life to the natural weaknesses of the different ranks and classes, in order that “the kingdom of heaven henceforth may suffer no violence.”

We will not forget, however, that after the Theatines, in a general assembly of their order, in 1598, had formally renounced probabilism, several members of the Society of Jesus likewise raised their voice against the abuses of the system: we mention among them the Portuguese Ferdinand Rebelle and the Italian Comitulus. A short time afterwards the general of the order. Mutius Vileteschi, expressed similar opinions in a series of writings. We read in one of them: “Nonnullorum ex societate sententise, in rebus praesertim ad mores spectantibus, plus nimio liberae non modo periculum est ne ipsam evertant, sed ne ecclesiae etiam Dei universae insignia afferant detrimenta. Omni itaque studio perficiant ut qui docent scribuntne minime hac regula et norma in delectu sententiarum utantur: *Tueri quis potest, probabilis est, auctore non caret. Verum ad eas sententias accedant quae tutiores, quae graviore majorisque nominis doctorum suffragiis sunt frequentatae; quae bonis moribus conducunt magis; quae denique pietatem alere et prodesse queunt, non vastare, non perdere.*” The Sorboluie, too, opened fire upon the probabilistic aberrations with the condemnation of the *Magntos director curatorun, vicariorum, et confessoriorum* of P. Milhard, and the clergy of France continued the battle with praiseworthy zeal. The University of Louvain made similar declarations. In 1653 the Dominicans, in a general chapter held at Rome, joined their voice to these authorities. Again, some Jesuits, among others Candidus Philalethes (Andre Leblanc), censured those of their order who were advocates of probabilism. Yet these antagonistic elements within Jesuitism were the exceptions, not the rule. The rank and file of the Society of Jesus were wedded to their new idols; and as the Jesuits were the chief representatives of Romish ethics in the 16th and 17th centuries, those who chose to attack Romanism levelled their guns directly at probabilism; while those who favored Romanism, or were themselves its supporters, but desired the downfall of Jesuitism, directly charged on this particular body of probabilists. Thus, e.g., Jansenism lifted up its voice against probabilism in order to destroy by this detour their enemies the Jesuits. Pascal, the great, if not immortal, advocate of the Port-Royalists, adopted this method.



In his *Lettres Provinciales* he puts together these aberrations of members of the Jesuitic Order; and as he represents the doctrine of probability, it is a curious perversion of the principle of authority the application of it to legitimize doubt and license. He stigmatized probabilism as the “morals of the Jesuits.” The great publicity which the *Provincial Letters* owed to the splendid talent of their author became, especially among the educated classes, an inflexible opinion against Jesuits, which continues to this day. A number of refutations of the *Provincial Letters* appeared, some of them very awkward. The Jesuit Pirot, in his *Apologie pour les Casuistes* (Paris, 1657), made the following assertion: If an opinion is probable, it is sure, and can be followed; surety has no degrees, but is indivisible, so far as the moral action connected with a probable opinion is concerned; in consequence, a less probable opinion is as sure as a more probable (*Apol.* p. 46). Similar opinions were sustained by the Jesuits Matthew de Mova, Honord Lefevre, and Etienne des Champs (*Quaestio Facti de Sententia Theologorum Societatis circa Opiniones probabiles*, Paris, 1659). The ablest refutation, *Riponse aux Lettres provinciales de L. de Montalte; ou Entretiens de Cleandre et Eudoxe*, is due to the Jesuit Daniel, the well-known French historian, who gives a very elaborate account of probabilism. He observes that, according to the doctrine of the Jesuits, two conditions are required for the probability of an opinion: first, it can contradict neither the dogmas and truths taught by the Church, nor any evident reason; secondly, it must be founded on sound judgment, and not set up wantonly against the prevailing doctrine of the competent teachers.

Among these tumultuous contests in the domain of Catholic morals, the Apostolic See could not remain silent. The pope condemned the *Provincial Letters* (Sept. 6. 1657) on one side, and Pirot’s *Apology* on the other (August, 1659). Pope Alexander VII declared against the dangerous excrescences of probabilism in a decree of Sept. 24, 1665; and his successor, Innocent XI, strictly defined its limits by his bull of 1679. The first-mentioned decree commences with these memorable words: “Our most holy father has heard, not without great sorrow, that several opinions, which weaken Christian discipline and prepare destruction to the souls, have been partly revived and partly started for the first time, and that the unbridled license of some extravagant minds increases every day, whereby a way of thinking has crept into the Church which is altogether at variance with Christian simplicity and the doctrine of the holy fathers, and which, should the believers make it the rule of their life, would produce a great

moral corruption.” Among the moral propositions censured by these two papal decrees, the following concern probabilism: from the first decree, *Prop. 27* — “Si liber sit alicujus junioris et moderni, debet opinio censeri probabilis, dum non constet rejectam esse a Sede apostolica tanquam improbabilem;” from the latter, *Prop. 1* — “Non est illicitum in sacramentis conferendis sequi opinionem probabilem de valore sacramenti, relicta tutiore, nisi id vetet lex, conventio aut periculum gravis damni incurrendi. Hinc seenertia probabili tantum utendum non est in collatione baptismi, ordinis sacerdotalis aut episcopalis.” *Prop. 2* — “Probabiliter existimo judicem posse judicare juxta opinionem etiam minus probabilem.” *Prop. 3* — “Generatim, dum probabilitate sive intrinseca sive extrinseca, quantumvis tenui, modo a probabilitatis finibus non exeatur, confisi aliquid agimus, semper prudenter agimus.” *Prop. 4* — “Ab infidelitate excusabitur infidelis non credens, ductus opinione minus probabili.” The antiprobabilistic extreme, represented by the rigorism of the Jansenists, was met by pope Alexander VIII with the condemnation of the proposition referred to above, a condemnation which is contained in the decree of 1690.

The first consequence of the papal declarations was a sharper separation of the parties. Probabilism found its most redoubtable adversaries in the Carmelite Henry of St. Ignatius, the two Dominicans Daniel Concina (*Delia Storia del Probabilismo*) and Vincent Patuzzi, and in Franzoza and Pet. Ballerini. But all these efforts did not annihilate probabilism whether inside or outside the Order of the Jesuits. though it had to submit to many restrictions. In their fifth general assembly the Jesuits only protested against making probabilism the doctrine of their order. Oliva, the general of the order (in a letter of Feb. 3, 1669), speaks plainly enough in favor of probabilism; and while he declares *certainly and truly probable* opinions fit to engender a *certain conscience* (*conscientia certa*), he asserts, on the other side, that the requirement “sequendi semper in omnibus probabiliorem partem” would be too heavy a burden upon mankind. It was shown, however, much more clearly how deeply probabilism was rooted in the Jesuitic Order when the Spaniard Gonzalez, the general of the order, took with great decision, in 1694, the defence of the opposite system. In his work he dissents from the principle that man, in moral matters, must suffer himself to be guided by a sincere love of truth. Hence he draws the inference that we must always choose what we think to be nearest to truth; if objective truth cannot be obtained, we must at least

cling to that which, according to our subjective conviction, is highest to it. For that reason we can follow even the less sure opinion, if we are convinced of its greater probability. The work written from this standpoint, and which the author meant to dedicate to the general of the order, Oliva, found its way into publicity only after many years. Perhaps Gonzalez would not have ventured, even while general of the order, to publish it if the same work which the casuists of the order wished to suppress had not been greatly approved of by pope Innocent XI. Many of the Jesuits claimed that Gonzalez had, by his disapproval of probabilism, made himself unworthy of his place, and pronounced him self-deposed. Only the protection of the pope saved him (see Wolf, *Gesch. der Jesuiten*, 1, 173). In his *Fundamentum Theologiae Moralis* (Rome, 1684) Gonzalez put in the background the authority system hitherto so predominant by giving the preference to the ethical province as the more appropriate judgment-seat of the appellate court. Two other theologians followed in his footsteps, Gilbert and Camarillo, representing the probabilistic tendency. Gilbert, professor at Toulouse, did not in his work attack the principle of probabilism, only its vulgar form. He asserts that we are certain not to sin if we stick to the absolute probability either of law or of liberty; if we judge sensibly that something is allowed, after examining it sufficiently, taking the circumstances into account, and satisfying ourselves of the soundness of our judgment. While Gilbert treated the subject in a more speculative way, Camarillo, professor at Salamanca, in his treatise *De Regula Honestatis Moralis* (Naples, 1702), takes a more historical view of the matter, and shows that modern probabilism has not the testimony of antiquity in its favor, and that since its first appearance the most considerable authorities were against it.

While the probabilists continued in their attempts to again turn the scales — we shall only mention the *Tractatus Probabilitatis* by Gabriel Gualdus (under the assumed name of Nicolaus Peginletus, Louvain, 1708) and the “Criticisms” of Cardenas (*Opp. Carden.* Ven. 1710) — and while the party of the probabilists grew in strength every day, mediating tendencies appeared. Among the works written in this spirit, the *Sententia Medio* of Alfonso de Liguori is the best. This distinguished Romanist developed a system of morals which may be described as a kind of *practical* probabilism, in which, by the use of what are called reflex principles, an opinion which *objectively* is but probable is made *subjectively* the basis of a certain and safe practical judgment. Liguori teaches that we are bound to

keep our actions, as much as possible, in accordance with truth; or at least, as in the case of a more probable opinion, as near to truth as possible. If it should appear that of two opinions one is more favorable to liberty, the other to law, the latter being at the same time more probable, it must be admitted without hesitation. Liguori, in the case where equally strong reasons speak for law and liberty, professes a somewhat different opinion from Gilbert and the rigid probabiliorists — he decides for liberty. Liguori starts in his demonstration from the proposition that a doubtful law is not binding (“*lex dubia non obligat*”). A dubious law, he further says, is an uncertain law, and a law of this description cannot engender any obligation (“*lex incerta non potest certam inducere obligationem*”); for in this case of doubt, of uncertainty, liberty is in possession, and in consequence has the right on its side, according to the axiom “*In dubio melior est conditio possidentis.*” This is the strongest point of Liguori’s argumentation, but also the point with which it stands and falls; here it has to fight a decisive battle against probabiliorism, or against refined tutorism. Rassler, in his *Norma Recti* (Ingold. 1713), takes a similar stand-point between the contending parties, while Charles Emanuel Pallavicini, in his letters on the administration of the sacrament of penitence, claims for the confessors the right to choose between probabilism or probabiliorism, both with proper restrictions.

The maxims of the Jesuits disseminated themselves, like an infectious disease, far beyond the circle of their own order, as is shown by the comprehensive works of the Sicilian Antony Diana (*Resolutiones Morales*, Antv. 1629-37, 4 vols. fol.; Lugd. 1667; Venet. 1728), who taught, under the express approval of his ecclesiastical superiors, and also of the Jesuits, the doctrine of probabilism in its worst forms. One may act according to a probable opinion, and disregard the more probable one; man is not under obligation to follow the more perfect and the more certain, but it suffices to follow the simply certain and perfect; it would be an unendurable burden were one required to hunt out the more probable opinions (*Res. Mo.* [Antv. 1637] vol. ii, tract. 13; vol. 4, tract. 3; *Summanz* [1652], p. 214). The most of the Jesuits taught the same thing. In relation to murder, Diana teaches like Escobar: I am at liberty to kill even him who assails my honor if my honor cannot otherwise be rescued (*Res. Mor.* 3, 5, 90; *Summa*, p. 210, 212). When some one has resolved upon a great sin, then one is at liberty to recommend to him a lesser one, because such advice does not relate absolutely to an evil, but to a good, namely, the avoiding of the

worse; for example, if I cannot otherwise dissuade a person from an intended adultery than by recommending to him fornication instead thereof, then it is allowable to recommend this to him; not, however, in so far as it is a sin, but in so far as it prevents the sin of adultery. Diana appeals in this connection to many like-judging Jesuit doctors (*Res. Mol.* [Antv. 1637] vol. 3, tract. 5, 37). If a priest commissions Peter to kill Caius, who is weaker than Peter, but nevertheless Peter comes out second best and gets killed himself, still the priest incurs no guilt, and may continue in the administration of his office (*ibid.* vol. 3, tract. 15,17). He who resolves upon committing all possible venial sins does not thereby involve himself in any mortal sin (*ibid.* vol. 3, tract. 6, 24). He who, *ex aliqua justa cause*, rents a house to another for purposes of prostitution commits no sin (*ibid.* vol. 3, tract. 6, 45). To eat human flesh, in case of necessity, he holds, with the majority of the Jesuits, as allowable (*ibid.* tract. 6, 48). He who, in virtue of a promise of marriage, induces a maiden to yield to him is not bound by his promise in case he is of higher rank or richer than she, or in case he can persuade himself that she will not take his promise in serious earnest (*ibid.* [Antv.] vol. 3, tract. 6, 81; in the spirit of Sanchez and Less). Marriage between brother and sister can be made legitimate by papal dispensation (*ibid.* vol. 4, tract. 4, 94; sanctioned by several Jesuits). In such moral perversity of view Diana seems only to have been surpassed by the Spanish Netherlander Cistercian Lobkowitz (*Theol. Mor.* 1645, 1652; comp. Perrault, i, 331 sq.), who, in his scepticism, entirely breaks down the moral consciousness, and declares that nothing is evil *per se*, but only because it is positively forbidden; hence God can dispense even with all the commandments (comp. the views of Duns Scotus, p. 34) (*ibid.* 1626); can e.g., allow whoredom and other like sins, for none of these are evils *per se*. Monks and priests are at liberty to kill the female misused by them when they fear, on her account, for their honor. This writer declares himself expressly and decidedly in favor of the views of the Jesuits. Also the Franciscan Order became infected with the maxims of the Jesuits, as is proved by the very voluminous work of Barthol. Mastrius de Mandula (*ibid.* 1626), which was published under the express sanction of the officers of the order, and who justifies *restrictiones mentales* even in oaths (*Disp.* 11:52, 171, 172, 183, ed. Ven. 1723), and also the murder of tyrants (*ibid.* 8:27), the murder of the slanderers by an important person, castration, and similar things (*ibid.* 8:25, 28; 11:110 sq.), as well as probabilism.

The moral system of the Jesuits is, we grant, not, strictly speaking, that of the Romish Church; many of their more extreme maxims the Church has condemned, and the more recent Jesuits themselves find it advisable no longer fully to avow their former principles. Nevertheless Jesuitism, together with its system of morals, is, as has been well said by Wuttke (1, 271, 272), “the ultimate consequential goal of the Church in its turning aside from the Gospel, just as (though in other respects widely different therefrom) Talmudism was the necessary goal of Judaism in its rejection of the Saviour. The error consists in the placing of human discretion and authority in the stead of the unconditionally valid, revealed will of God. Even as earlier Catholicism had intensified the divine command by self-invented, ascetic work-holiness into a seemingly greater severity-had aimed at a higher moral perfection than that required by God — so Jesuitism, with like presumption, lowered the moral law, out of consideration to temporal relations, to a merest minimum requirement; contented itself with a much lower moral perfection than the divine law calls for, and sought out cunning means for lightening even this minimum.”

Probabilism, moreover, is not a merely fortuitously discovered expedient, but it is in fact an almost inevitable consequence of the historical essence of Jesuitism. The order itself arose neither on the basis of Scripture nor of ancient Church tradition, but sprang absolutely from the daring inventive power of a single man breaking through the limits of ecclesiastical actuality. It is not therefore at all unnatural that it should make the authority of a single spiritually pre-eminent man its highest determining power, and subordinate to this the historical objective form of the moral consciousness. This, then, is the distinguishing characteristic of Jesuitical ethics—that in the place of the eternal objective ground( and criterion of the moral it substitutes subjective opinion, and in the place of an unconditional eternal end a merely conditionally valid one, viz. the defending of the actual, visible Church against all forms of opposition that in the place of the moral conscience it substitutes the human calculating of circumstantial and fortuitous adaptation to the promotion of this its highest end; that it attempts to realize what is *per se* and absolutely valid by a wide-reaching isolating of the means, and by so doing subordinates morality to the discretion of the single subject. “Though the ethics of the Jesuits are lax and quite too indulgent towards worldly, sinful proclivities and fashions, yet this is only one phase of the matter. A merely worldly-lax moral system, in the usual sense, seems but little applicable to the members of a

brotherhood the first rule of which is a perfect renunciation of personal will and personal opinion and self-determination, in a word, unconditional obedience to every command of superiors. and which has actually accomplished in the missionary field the grandest of deeds, and numbers among its members multitudes of heroic martyrs. This lack of strictness in one direction rests by no means on mere worldliness, on pleasure in the delights of this life, but follows, on the one hand, of necessity (as well as does also the rigor of obedience), from the subjectively arbitrary presupposition of the entire order, from the lack of an objective, unshaken foundation, and rests, on the other hand, strictly on calculation; is itself a cunningly devised means to the end; is intended to awaken, especially in the great and mighty of the earth (and the masses of the people are such under some circumstances), a love to the Church, to the mild, friendly, indulgent mother.”

Jesuitical ethics is the opposite pole of monastic ethics; where the latter requires too much, the former exacts too little. Monastic morality strives to win God for the sinful world, Jesuitical morality seeks to win the sinful world, not indeed for God, but at least for the Church. Monasticism says to God, though not in an evangelical sense, “If I have only thee, then I ask for nothing else in heaven or earth.” Jesuitism says about the same thing, but says it to the world, and particularly to the distinguished and powerful. The former turns away in indignant contempt from the worldly life because the world is immersed in sin; the latter generously receives the same into itself, and turns attention away from guilt by denying it. It is true the Jesuits represent also a monastic order, but this order is also a means to an end, and resembles the other nobler orders about as much as wily Reynard resembles the pious pilgrim; and the well-known hostility of the older orders to this brilliantly rising new one was not mere jealousy, but a very natural, and, for the most part, moral protest against the spirit of the same. See Wuttke, *Christian Ethics* (transl. by Prof. J. P. Lacroix, N. Y. 1874, 2 vols. 12mo), i, 255-272; Staudlin, *Gesch. der Sittenlehre Jesu* (Gdting. 1799), i, 441; Schrockh, *Kirchengesch.* 9:343 sq.; Cotta, *De Prob. Morali* (Jena, 1728); Rachel, *Examen Prob. Jes.* (Helmst. 1664, 4to); De Wette, *Christl. Sittenlehre*, II, ii, 334 sq.; Perrault, *Morale des Jesuites* (1667, 3 vols.); Ellendorf, *Die Moral u. Politik der Jesuiten* (1840); *Pragmatische Gesch. der Minchsorden* (1770), vols. 9 and 10; *Deutsches Kirchenblatt*, 1875 (review of Gury’s *Compendium Theologiae Moralis*, new ed. Ratisbon, 1874; one of the worst probabilistic advocates); Mosheim,

*Eccles. Hist.* 4:230; v, 190; *Christian Remembrancer*, July, 1852, p. 191 sq.; *Amer. Quar. Rev.* 11:473; *Edinb. Rev.* 23:320; 92, art. i.

## Probable

(Lat. *probabilis*), a barbarous technical word which serves to designate the philosophic dogma that anything which does not admit of demonstration may admit the *probable* as proof, if such a course does not involve absurdity or contradiction. "As demonstration," says Locke, "is the showing the agreement or disagreement of two ideas, by the intervention of one or more proofs, which have a constant, immutable, and visible connection one with another; so *probability* is nothing but the appearance of such an agreement or disagreement by the intervention of proofs whose connection is not constant and immutable, or at least is not perceived to be so, but is, or appears for the most part to be so, and is enough to induce the mind to judge the proposition to be true or false, rather than the contrary ... The entertainment the mind gives this sort of propositions is called belief, assent, or opinion, which is admitting or receiving any proposition as true upon arguments or proofs that are found to persuade us to receive it as true, without certain knowledge that it is so. And herein lies the difference between *probability* and *certainty*, faith and knowledge, that in all the parts of knowledge there is intuition; each immediate idea, each step, has its visible and certain connection; in belief not so. That which makes us believe is something extraneous to the thing we believe; something not evidently joined on both sides to, and so not manifestly showing the agreement or disagreement of, those ideas that are under consideration" (*Essay on the Human Understanding*, bk. 4, ch. 15; comp. Reid, *Intel. Powers*, essay 7, ch. 3). "The word *probable*," — says Mr. Stewart, "does not imply any deficiency in the proof, but only marks the particular nature of that proof, as contradistinguished from another species of evidence. It is opposed not to what is certain, but to what admits of being demonstrated after the manner of the mathematicians. This differs widely from the meaning annexed to the same word in popular discourse; according to which, whatever event is said to be probable is understood to be expected with some degree of doubt... But although, in philosophical language, the epithet probable be applied to events which are acknowledged to be certain, it is also applied to events which are called probable by the vulgar. The philosophical meaning of the word, therefore, is more comprehensive than the popular; the former denoting that particular *species* of evidence of which contingent truths admit; the latter



being confined to such degrees of this evidence as fall short of the highest. These different degrees of probability the philosopher considers as a series, beginning with bare possibility, and terminating in that apprehended infallibility with which the phrase moral certainty is synonymous. To this last term of the series the word probable is, in its ordinary acceptation, plainly inapplicable” (*Elements*, pt. 2, ch. 2, § 4).

Archbishop Butler, in his treatment of the evidences of Christianity, has had frequent recourse to this theory of the probable, and in consequence has at times laid himself open to severe attacks from the deistical and infidel schools of philosophy. By dwelling exclusively upon the absence of direct contradiction, and sinking the absence of confirmation, the learned author of the *Analogy* not unfrequently converts absolute ignorance into the likeness of some degree of positive knowledge. So Campbell, who borrowed from Butler, constructed most ingenious arguments on this paradox. Both these English thinkers seem to have had a confused notion that the improbability is an actual thing which still exists. Thus Campbell, after Butler, says, e.g., “The chances that a comet will not appear at a given instant in a given place are infinite. The presumption against the statement is therefore as strong as experience can afford; and yet when an astronomer announces the appearance of the comet you unhesitatingly believe him.” The object in this statement is to prove that we must depend largely upon testimony built up from experience, and that therefore knowledge is built upon the *parobable*. The result is, of course, a *delusive* appearance of independent scientific grounds for what is really a purely *a priori* deduction. Like methods are now adopted in scientific circles, and what Hume and consorts once condemned the theologians for, the latter now have to contend with in the application of scientific queryings to the positive in divine laws, and institutions. See Ueberweg, *Hist. of Philos.* (Index in vol. 2); *The (Lond.) Quatr. Rev.* Jan. 1875, p. 31 sq.; *London Academy*, Nov. 15, 1873, p. 435, col. 1; Stephen, *Religious Thought in England in the 18th Century*, vol. 1.

### Probation, Ecclesiastical,

in the Methodist Episcopal Church and other Methodist bodies, is the period, usually six months, for the candidate for Church membership to determine whether the organization is such as is likely to aid him in his Christian life, and for the Church to determine whether he is a proper person to be received.

### Probation, Ministerial,

signifies among some English dissenters the state of a student or minister while supplying a vacant church, with a view, on their approval of his character and talents, to his taking the pastoral oversight of them.

### Probation, Monastic,

is the year of a novitiate, which a *religieux* must pass in a convent to prove his virtue and vocation, and whether he can bear the severities of the rule.

### Probation, Moral,

is a term used in Christian morals to denote that state of man in which his character is formed and developed in action preparatory to judgment (q.v.). It is the state antecedent to a state of *retribution* (q.v.). “More strictly speaking, moral probation is that experimental trial which lays the foundation for approbation or disapprobation, praise or blame, reward or punishment. It involves obligations to obedience, exposure to temptations, commands and prohibitions; promises, on the one hand, to encourage to duty; threatenings, on the other, to deter from sin; with a certainty of final retributions according to the character produced under these various means, and visibly proved by the course of action pursued by the individual. This is the state which is denominated moral probation; and in such a state is mankind under the law of God and the mediatorial reign of Christ; or, in the customary language of the New Test., under the kingdom of heaven (~~4130~~ Matthew 13:10-52).” It is the principal or rather essential doctrine in the independent system of those Christian moralists who wish to prove metaphysically the truth of Christian ethics. It is the favorite basis of Butler in his *Analog*. See Butler, *Works*, 1, 109. 128 sq., 382; *Christian Rev.* 16:541; Harlan, *Ethics* (see Index). The question whether there be a period of probation after death is more properly a part of the articles **SEE FUTURE PUNISHMENT; SEE PURGATORY**. Comp. the *Meth. Quart. Rev.* April, 1876, p. 355 sq., 357 sq.

### Probationer

is, in the Church of Scotland, a student in divinity, who, bringing a certificate from a professor in a university of his good morals, and his having performed his exercises to approbation, is admitted to undergo

several trials before the presbytery, and upon his acquitting himself properly in these, receives a license to preach. *SEE PROBATION.*

## Probity

honesty, sincerity, or veracity. “It consists in the habit of actions useful to society, and in the constant observance of the laws which justice and conscience impose upon us. The man who obeys all the laws of society with an exact punctuality is not, therefore, a man of probity; laws can only respect the external and definite parts of human conduct; but probity respects our more private actions. and such as it is impossible in all cases to define; and it appears to be in morals what charity is in religion. Probity teaches us to perform in society those actions which no external power can oblige us to perform, and is that quality in the human mind from which we claim the performance of the rights commonly called imperfect.”

## Probst

*SEE SPRENG.*

## Probus

a Christian martyr under Diocletian and Maximian, in the beginning of the 4th century, was born at Sida, in Pamphylia. He was repeatedly called up before Maximus, the governor of Cilicia, and commanded to sacrifice to the heathen deities. But he invariably refused, and his conduct was marked by the strongest decision. He was on one occasion scourged, both on his back and belly, which only called forth from the intrepid man the remark, ‘The more my body suffers and loses blood, the more my soul will grow vigorous and be a gainer.’ After an ineffectual attempt to destroy him by means of wild beasts, he was finally slain by a sword, rejoicing to suffer persecution for righteousness’ sake. See Fox, *Book of Martyrs*, p. 43.

## Probus Lector

an Irish monastic, flourished in the Monastery of Slane, Ireland, A.D. 949. His original name was *Ceanchair*, but, like many Irish scholars and missionaries of that period, he Latinized it. He wrote the first *Life* of St. Patrick about 600 years after the saint’s death. Piacre had previously written some verses on the saint, and Muirchu had alluded to him in another work, but the first *Life* of St. Patrick was from the pen of Probus. He gives no authorities for his statements in this *Life*, and we know of

none then extant that he could have given. He wrote in a dark period, the midnight of the Dark Ages. He seems to have written from his own fancy, viewing the ecclesiastical affairs of the infant Church of Ireland in the 5th century through the medium of his own times. Bishop Lanigan, the Roman Catholic historian, admits that his facts cannot be distinguished from his fancies. He became a devotee and a high ritualist, and was esteemed in his day a very holy and learned man. When the pagan Danes set fire to the Monastery of Slane, he refused to be separated from the precious MSS. and relics in it, and rushed into the flames and perished with them. His *Life* of St. Patrick, and still more that of Jocelin, who wrote about 150 years after him, have ever since been the store-house from which the material of every Roman Catholic *Life* of the Irish saint has been drawn. Jocelin lived in an age of fiction in regard to Ireland, and seems to have written according to the liveliness of his fancy or to the supposed credulity of his readers. He asserted many things about St. Patrick which had never been heard of before and for which he gives no authority, and which intelligent Catholics now indignantly reject. Dr. Colgan, the Irish antiquarian, says that the fable of the expulsion of the venomous serpents from Ireland was for the first time put forth by Jocelin. This and similar fabrications being thus boldly and dogmatically asserted in a dark age, and remaining for centuries uncontradicted, thousands afterwards received them as historical facts. Dr. Johnson says somewhere, "One may tell a bona-fide lie, and if he shall tell it over ten times, and no one shall contradict him, he will begin to believe it himself." This has been really true in regard to Ireland. Fables and monstrosities remaining thus uncontradicted have been credited by thousands, while others who could not receive them have foolishly and sceptically thrown aside well-attested truths and regarded nearly all Irish history as fabulous. Perhaps the real life and character of no one, so long and so thoroughly incorporated in history, are so little known as those of St. Patrick. See Moore, *Hist. of Ireland*; Usher, *Religion of the Early Irish*. (D. D.)

### Procaccini, Camillo

an Italian painter who contributed to sacred art, was born in 1546. He received his first instruction in the school of his father, and afterwards visited Rome, where some biographers say that he studied the works of Michael Angelo and Raphael. Procaccini wrought uninterruptedly, and produced paintings at such a rate that his works, though they charm the eye by the simplicity and spirit which characterize them, are greatly

deficient in the higher power of impressing the mind and moving the affections. His *St. Roch Administering to the Sick of the Plague*, which is at Dresden, is one of his best works. He died in 1626.

### Procaccini, Ercole

*the elder*, was the head of the celebrated family of artists of that name. He was born in 1520 at Bologna, where the greater number of his works still exist. He died about 1591. Authors are divided in opinion respecting his merit: Baldinucci and Malvasia call him a painter of moderate talent, while Lontazzo esteems him to be a happy imitator of the coloring and grace of Correggio. His design is too minute and his coloring too languid, but he possessed far more taste than most of his contemporaries, and precision free from mannerism, which eminently qualified him for an instructor of youth. Several eminent artists, among whom were Sammacchini, Sabbatini, Bertoja, and his own three sons, were his disciples. — *English Cyclop.* s.v. Those interested in his works may consult Spooner, *Biog. Hist. of the Fine Arts*, vol. 2.

### Procaccini, Giulio Cesare

the best artist of the family, was born in 1548. He renounced sculpture, in which he had made considerable progress, for painting, which he studied in the school of the Caracci. 'The works of Correggio were the principal object of his studies, and many judges are of opinion that no painter ever approached nearer to the style of that great artist. In some of his easel pictures and works of confined composition he has been mistaken for Correggio. A *Madonna* of his at San Luigi de' Francesi has been engraved as the work of that master; and some paintings still more closely approximating to this style are in the palace of Sanvitali at Rome and in that of Carrega at Genoa. Of his altar-pieces, that in the church of Santa Afra in Brescia is perhaps most like the style of Correggio: it represents the *Virgin and Child amid a smiling group of saints and angels*, in which dignity seems as much sacrificed to grace as in the mutual smile of the *Virgin and the Angel* in the Nunziata at San Antonio of Milan. He is sometimes blamable for extravagance of attitude, as in the *Executioner* of San Nazario, which is otherwise a picture full of beauties. Notwithstanding the number and extent of his works, his design is correct, his forms and draperies select, his invention varied, and the whole together has a certain grandeur and breadth which he either acquired from the Caracci, or, like

them, derived from Correggio. He died in 1626. There are many of his works in Milan.

### Procedure, Ecclesiastical

or the rules to be followed in the Church of Rome in disciplinary actions. They owe their regulation to pope Innocent III. Previous to his time, it is true, the official vindication had assumed a more definite form in the synodal jurisdiction of the archdeacon. But he perfected them, and there are now in the Romish Church five kinds of penal procedures in use: the trial may be instituted in consequence of accusation, inquisition, denunciation, exception, and on account of notoriety. The first and last had existed at a much earlier period. There was no need of a formal accusation in the case of notorious transgressions, and the bishop punished them in virtue of his office; of course, after the matter had been sufficiently proved and avowed. The proceedings were of a more formal kind when there was an accusation. Here the proceedings of the Roman law were taken for models. The inquisition or official examination took place when an ecclesiastic was accused of a transgression by a public and plausible rumor, which acted, as it were, as accuser. To complete the official examination, the judge could, if he thought fit, exact the oath of purgation (*purgatio canonica*). The former custom of purgation by ordeals now came into disuse. If a plausible denunciation was made, an official examination must take place. If the fault was avowed, the penalty was only the imposition of a penance. Cases of exception were those where a man who was on the point of appearing as a witness or accuser, or a person who applied for ordination or for an ecclesiastical office, was stopped by an accusation, which, if proved, unfitted him for bearing witness or office. This was also an occasion for canonical purgation. In these cases punishment was out of the question, and there could only follow an exclusion from the witness-stand, from the right to accuse, from the orders or the function in question. In those parts where the Church is still possessed of a penal jurisdiction, she has to conform to the laws and customs which regulate the penal procedure of the country. See Biener, *Beit. zur Gesch. des Inquisitions-processes* (Leips. 1827); Hildenbrand, *Die Purgatio Canonica und Civilis* (Munich, 1841); Walter, *Kirchelnrecht*, § 200; Richter, *Kirchenrecht*, § 211. — Aschbach, *Kirchen-Lex* . s.v

## Process

the formal act, instrument, bull, or enict of *canonization* (q.v.) in the Romish Church.

## Procession

the Hebrew term **hky** **h** *htlikka/h*, rendered “going” in <sup><1972></sup>Psalm 78:25, means a religious procession, as described in the context, headed by the phylarchs, who preceded the sacred ark, while the instrumental musicians followed it, and a line of females with timbrels accompanied it on either side. On the general subject see the monographs in Volbeding, *Index Programmatum*, p. 159. **SEE PROCESSIONS.**

## Procession of the Holy Ghost

that doctrine regarding the Third Person of the Blessed Trinity which teaches that as the Son proceeds (or is born) from the Father, so the Holy Ghost proceeds (or emanates) from the Father and from the Son, but as from one principle. The subject has been fully discussed in its historical relations in the art. **FILIOQUE CONTROVESY** **SEE FILIOQUE CONTROVESY**, and as a theological question in the art. **HOLY GHOST** **SEE HOLY GHOST**. But since the writing of those articles the subject has been revived and taken a new historical form—the formation of a new religious body from the ranks of the Romish Church, now known as the *Old Catholics* (q.v.). At their second annual conference or synod held in Bonn, Germany, in 1875, preparations were made for a “Union Conference” of the Old Catholic, Oriental, and Anglican churches, and such a conference accordingly convened at Bonn on Aug. 12 of that year and lasted five days. (Those interested in the character and nationality of its distinguished attendants will do well to consult the *Methodist Quar.* Oct. 1875, p. 673-675.) In the last session of that conference a common formula was adopted respecting the doctrine of the Procession, which Westerns and Orientals alike agreed to; and though it did not finally settle the question, and the controversy is still alive as we write, it is yet a very hopeful sign of an early union of different branches of the Church of Christ which have so little at variance and so much in common. The discussions regarding the subject were long and animated, and for some time the Orientals held out against the adoption of ¶ 3, but by their final adoption of it an enormous

step towards complete understanding has been made. The following are the resolutions:

### “PRELIMINARY RESOLUTIONS.

- “1. We agree together in receiving the ecumenical symbols and the doctrinal decisions of the ancient undivided Church.
- “2. We agree together in acknowledging that the addition of the *Filioque* to the Creed did not take place in an ecclesiastically regular manner.
- “3. We acknowledge on all sides the representation of the doctrine of the Holy Ghost, as it is set forth by the Fathers of the undivided Church.
- “4. We reject every proposition and every method of expression in which in any way the acknowledgment of two principles or ἀρχαί or αἰτίαι in the Trinity may be contained.

### “ON THE PROCESSION OF THE HOLY GHOST.

“We accept the teaching of St. John of Damascus respecting the Holy Ghost, as the same is expressed in the following paragraphs, in the sense of the teaching of the ancient undivided Church:

- “1. The Holy Ghost goes forth out of the Father (ἐκ τοῦ πατρός) as the Beginning (ἀρχή), the Cause (αἰτία), the Source (πηγή) of the Godhead (*De recta Sententia*, n.1; *Contra Manich.* n. 4).
- “2. The Holy Ghost goes not forth out of the Son (ἐκ τοῦ υἱοῦ), because there is in the Godhead but one Beginning (ἀρχή), one Cause (αἰτία), through which all that is in the Godhead is produced (*De Fide orthodox.* i, 8: ἐκ τοῦ υἱοῦ δὲ τὸ πνεῦμα οὐ λέγομεν, πνεῦμα δὲ υἱοῦ ὀνομάζομεν).
- “3. The Holy Ghost goes forth out of the Father through the Son (*De Fide orthodox.* i, 12: τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἐκφαντορικῆ τοῦ κρυφίου τῆς θεότητος δύναμις τοῦ πατρός, ἐκ πατρός μὲν δι’ υἱοῦ ἐκπορευομένη. *Ibid.*: υἱοῦ δὲ πνεῦμα, οὐχ ὡς ἐξ αὐτοῦ, ἀλλ’ ὡς δι’ αὐτοῦ ἐκ τοῦ πατρός ἐκπορευόμενον. *C. Manich.* n. 5: διὰ τοῦ λόγου αὐτοῦ ἐξ αὐτοῦ τὸ πνεῦμα αὐτοῦ



ἐκπορευόμενον. *De Hymno Trisag.* 1. 28: πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς διὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ καὶ λόγου προϊόν. *Hom. in Sabb.* s. n. 4: τοῦτ' ἡμῖν ἔστι τὸ λατρευόμενον...πνεῦμα ἅγιον τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ πατρός ὡς ἐξ αὐτοῦ ἐκπορευόμενον, ὅπερ καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ λέγεται, ὡς δὲ αὐτοῦ φανερούμενον καὶ τῇ κτίσει μεταδιδόμενον, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐξ αὐτοῦ ἔχον τὴν ὑπαρξιν).

“4. The Holy Ghost is the Image of the Son, who is the Image of the Father (*De Fide orthodox.* i, 13: εἰκὼν τοῦ πατρὸς ὁ υἱός. καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ τὸ πνεῦμα), going forth out of the Father and resting in the Son as the force beaming forth from Him (τοῦ πατρὸς προερχομένην καὶ ἐν τῷ λόγῳ ἀναπανομένην καὶ αὐτοῦ οὔσαν ἐκφαντικὴν δόναμιν. *Ibid.* i, 12: πατήρ...διὰ λόγου προβολεὺς ἐκφαντορικοῦ πνεύματος).

“5. The Holy Ghost is the personal Production out of the Father, belonging to the Son, but not out of the Son, because he is the Spirit of the Mouth of the Godhead, which speaks forth the Word (*De Hymno Trisag.* n. 2S: τὸ πνεῦμα ἐνυπόστατον ἐκπόρευμα καὶ πρόβλημα ἐκ πατρὸς μὲν, υἱοῦ δέ, καὶ μὴ ἐξ υἱοῦ, ὡς πνεῦμα στόματος θεοῦ, λόγον ἐξαγγελτικόν).

“6. The Holy Ghost forms the mediation between the Father and the Son, and is bound together to the Father through the Son (*De Fide orthodox.* i, 13: μέσον τοῦ ἀγεννήτου καὶ γεννητοῦ καὶ δι' υἱοῦ τῷ πατρὶ συναπτόμενον).

“N. B. — It is to be noted here that the German preposition aus (out of) equals ἐκ or *ex.* as denoting out of a cause or origin: whereas the word *von* (from) is equivalent to ἀπό or *ab;* while *drwch* (through) denotes *Stin* or *per,* through the instrumentality of.”

Since that conference the *Filioque* question has been much agitated in England, and it has been asserted, by High-Churchmen especially, that the exclusion of the *Filioque* from the Creed was granted by Dr. Dollinger and canon Liddon at Bonn. What the conference did may be stated as follows: It declared, as bishop Pearson had already admitted, that the *Filioque* was inserted in an ecumenical creed by an inadequate authority, and therefore irregularly. It formulated certain propositions which might serve to show that when the Latins accept and the Easterns reject the *Filioque* they do

not differ, as has been too generally supposed; since the Latins reject any assertion of two principles or causes in the Godhead, and the Easterns admit a **μειντεία** of the Son, in the eternal procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father. Whatever may have been the hopes and fears of individual members of the conference, no proposition was brought forward respecting the exclusion of the *Filioque* from the Creed of the Western Church. See Schaff, *Creeds* (Index in vol. 3); Forbes, *Nicene Creed*; Neale, *Eastern Church* (Introd.), 1095-1168; Stanley, *Eastern Church*; Mag, *Hist. des Dogmes* (Index in vol. 2); Martensen, *Dogmatics* (see Index); *Meth. Quar.* Jan. and April, 1876; *New-Englander*, July, 1870. See also Pusey's Letter to Liddon *On the Clause "And the Son"* (Lond. 1876, 8vo).

## Processional

(Lat. *processionale*), the servicebook which contains the prayers, hymns, and general ceremonial of the different processions. Many ancient books of this class have been preserved. The processional approved for common use is that of Rome, of which many editions have been published.

## Processional Cross

### Picture for Processional Cross

or CROSS OF THE STATION (*crux gestatoria*, or *stationaria*), is the cross carried in the ecclesiastical processions spoken of under PROCESSIONS. It was carried as early as the 4th century and in the 5th century both in the East and in the West. It is mentioned by Socrates, Nicephorus, Cassiodorus, in the *Life* of St. Porphyry by Durand, and by Baronius under the year 401, and in the *Canons* of Cleveshoe in 747, when regulating the rogations. A cross made of ash, silver-plated, engraved or enamelled, without a crucifix, was at an early date, after the introduction of the labarum of Constantine, carried in processions by the staurophoros. The evangelistic symbols were usually set at the ends of the arms, which terminated in fleurs-de-lys. In the 4th century it had short handles, and candles were attached to the arms. Charlemagne gave such a cross, of pure gold, to the church of Constantine at Rome. In the 12th century at Rome a subdeacon (*regionarius*) carried down the cross, inclined so that the faithful might kiss it, from the altar to the porch, where he held it upright in his hands during the processions. In England, at Durham, the chief cross was of gold, with a silver staff, and the cross used on ordinary days was of crystal. A novice followed it, carrying a benitier. A cross of the 15th

century is still preserved in St. John's Lateran; another, of the time of St. Louis, is at St. Denis; a third, of silver and beautiful designs, with statues and evangelistic symbols, at Conques; and another at Burgos. In England, no doubt, many were destroyed during the War of the Roses and at the Reformation. At Chichester the ambry for the cross remains. In England, from Easter to Ascension, the cross was of crystal or beryl, but in Lent of wood, painted blood-red. No parish could carry its cross into a monastic church; and in funerals, in a collegiate church, the cross of the latter only is set before the bier. We append an illustration of the cross now usually carried by Romanists in their processions.

### Processional Path

(*spatium vel via processionum a retro altaris; latus pone chorum; Fr. partour de chaeur, i.e. behind a choir*). The transverse aisle in square-ended churches is commonly doubled, as at Lichfield, or even tripled, as at Winchester and at St. Mary Overge, in order to provide room for chapels as well as a passage for processions. At Hereford this aisle resembles a low transept. The eastern screens at Fountains, the Lady chapel of Hexham, and the Nine Altars of Durham seem to have been further developments of the same idea, which appears also in the longitudinal new walk of Peterborough. At Canterbury, pilgrims to the martyrdom passed up the south aisle of the nave, and through the passage under the platform of the crossing.

### Processions

These, as solemn and religious rites, are of very great antiquity, but evidently of pagan origin. With the Greeks and Romans, they took place chiefly on the festivals of Diana, Bacchus, Ceres, and other deities; also before the beginning of the games in the Circus; and in spring, when the fields were sprinkled with holy water to increase their fertility. The priests used to head them, carrying images of the gods and goddesses to be propitiated, and either started from certain temples or from the Capitol. The Romans, when the empire was distressed, or after some victory, used constantly to order processions, for several days together, to be made to the temples, to beg the assistance of the gods or to return them thanks. Among the Jews, processions were introduced for public prayers when the faithful people went in order to implore the divine help (<sup><0615></sup>Joshua 6:15; <sup><0615></sup>2 Samuel 6:15; <sup><1522></sup>Ezra 2:12-30; <sup><1085></sup>1 Kings 8:45; <sup><0403></sup>Numbers 10:33-

36), with a form at setting out and when halting; or when rendering thanks to God (<sup><407></sup>2 Chronicles 20:21, 27, 28; <sup><410></sup>Matthew 21:9). Certain processions around the altar were (and still are to a certain extent) usual on the Feast of Tabernacles; and from them the Mohammedans have adopted their mode of encompassing the sanctuary seven times at Mecca (q.v.). Processions form a prominent part of the Buddhist worship. *SEE PROCESSION.*

In the Christian Church the practice was early introduced and has maintained itself to this day among the Romanists. In the earliest ecclesiastical phraseology the word *processio* denotes merely *the act of requesting a religious assembly, and taking part in public worship*. It is distinguished from private offices of devotion, and includes the idea of *social* worship, but without any additional idea of public ceremony, pomp, or the like. *Procedere* then meant *to go to church*, and is, in short, synonymous with *sacris interesse, sacra. frequentare*. This was the meaning given to the word by Tertullian (*Ad Uxor.* lib. ii, c. 4) and Jerome (*Commentar. in Ep. 1 ad Cot.* c. 11). In many canons and other ecclesiastical writings we also find the word *procession*, without any explanation or addition, used in the sense of a *religious assembly* (*conventus et coetus populi in ecclesia*). The Greek word *σύναξις* (as well as *συναγωγή, σύλλογος*, conf. Suiceri *Thesauru.*) is translated sometimes by *collecta*, sometimes by *conventus*, and sometimes by *processio*. When Christian worship began to be conducted openly, and churches were publicly frequented, the meaning of the word *processio* was exactly equivalent to our term *church-going*. After the 4th century, especially in later mediaeval times, the word was applied to processions usual at funerals, marriages, baptisms, as well as to the line of communicants at the Lord's Supper. Processions at festivals and on other occasions were, in course of time, quite common. Laws to protect such processions from interruption were passed, and any persons found guilty of disturbing them were subject to severe punishment. The first processions mentioned in ecclesiastical history are those set on foot at Constantinople, in the time of Chrysostom. The Arians of that city being forced to hold their meetings without the town, went thither night and morning, singing anthems. Chrysostom, to prevent their perverting the Catholics, adopted counter-processions, in which the clergy and people marched by night, singing hymns, and carrying crosses and torches. From this period the custom of processions was introduced both into the Eastern and Western churches

(Chrysost. *Or. contr. lud. et theatr.* ; Basil, *Ep.* 207, al. 63; Ambrose, *Ep.* 40 *ad Theodos.* n. 14; Augustine, *De Civ. Dei*, i, 22, c. 8; Rufin. *Hist. Eccl.* i, 2, c. 33). Even during the persecutions of the emperors there were at least some funeral processions (*Act. S. Cypr.* ap. *Rom. Act. S. Bonifac.*).

Various ceremonies were observed, according to the objects for which these processions were instituted, the spirit of the times in which they were celebrated, and the countries wherein they took place. The clergy usually attended: if the occasion was one of joy or thanksgiving, they were attired in the most splendid vestments. The laity put on their best attire, and were adorned with garlands and other ornaments; and the sound of bells and music was heard through the whole line. On occasions of mourning or penitence, the procession was distinguished by plain vestments, bare feet, deep silence, or sounds of lamentation and prayer, and sometimes by the exercise of flagellation. Men and women walked apart; and the line of procession was ranged with reference to the various ranks and classes of the persons who composed it. Lighted wax tapers were often carried in procession, especially on the festival of the Purification of the Virgin Mary, which was hence called *festum* or *missa candelarum* **SEE CANDLEMAS**. Litanies composed for the occasion were sung in Latin as the procession moved. The penitential psalms and the psalms of degrees were employed on the occasion, as well as many Latin hymns.

These processions have always been more common in the Western than in the Eastern Church. The Reformation greatly lessened them even in the Roman Catholic Church, and, especially in mixed countries, processions are less frequent or popular nowadays. They are there either supplicatory processions or cross processions, and are either directed to a certain distant place, to some miraculous image or object, or they are confined to the streets of the cities and the churches. Banners, crosses, and images are generally carried in front; the clergy follow; and the people make up the rear, singing hymns or reciting prayers. In some Protestant states they are still permitted, under certain restrictions. The Protestants themselves rarely practice them, excepting the Ritualists (q.v.).

In the mediaeval Church the name procession was given to the ritual march, at the time of the celebration of the host, of the celebrant, and especially the bishop and his assistants, from the church door or the sacristy to the altar. In a narrower sense, the procession is now a ritual walk, the purpose of which is thanksgiving or supplication, or an honor

paid to a person either living or dead. For the walks of the first kind alone, the purpose of which is thanksgiving, the term “procession” is employed without any more special determination; those of the second kind are usually called by Romanists “litaniae,” “rogationes,” “supplicationes,” and also “exomologeses,” “stationes,” which were their former names. Among the walks of the third kind we mention the solemn entrance, attended with ecclesiastical ceremonies, of a bishop, pope, or sovereign into a place; the funeral, and even the bridal procession. Another distinction between different processions is this, that in some of them the host is carried about, in others it is not; the former are called *theophoric* processions (θεός and φορέω). All these processions are either prescribed on certain days of the year and on certain occasions, or simply allowed in certain circumstances. Among the prescribed processions, the most important are the Corpus-Christi procession. Candlemas-day, the procession on Palm-Sunday, the litany of St. Mark’s Day, the litany on the three days of the Week of Prayer, and, finally, the funeral procession. Curates or ecclesiastics of a higher rank may organize processions on the harvest festival, in great distresses, etc.

Each procession has (and here we depend on Roman Catholic writers) a leader, who is either a priest or a bishop. The priestly leader wears the chasuble and stole, and often the pluvial besides; his head is covered with a barret. The episcopal leader wears chasuble, stole, and pluvial; his head is covered with the mitre; he holds the pastoral staff in his left hand, with his right hand he blesses the people before whom the procession passes. The color of the stole, pluvial, and mitre is suited to the purpose of the procession. If (as is the case in the theophoric processions and when a particle of the cross is carried about for public veneration) the head must be uncovered, the bishop has the staff carried in front of him and the mitre behind him. In theophoric processions the blessing with the right hand is also omitted. In this case the leader carries the venerable thus: he holds the ostensorium with both hands before his face, while his hands are covered with the vellum hanging down from both his shoulders. The organization of the Catholic Church, as a community presided over by the clergy, requires this leadership by ecclesiastics. If the leader wears the chasuble and stole, he declares by his dress that unceasing efforts to attain purity of heart (*alba*) and a childlike trust in the merits of Jesus Christ (*stola*) are the festive robes which every Christian, but more especially every priest, should wear in and outside of the house of God. If, besides, the bishop

carries the staff and wears the mitre, it is for the purpose of reminding the Christians that he is their highest pastor, whose care surrounds and whose benediction follows them everywhere. If the leader (unless prevented by his veneration of the body of Christ or his reverence for the beam of the cross) have his head covered, this is a hint given to the faithful that it is their duty to revere the priest as their father in Christ. If the priest cover with a vellum the hands that hold the ostensorium, he confesses therewith his unworthiness of carrying, under the form of the bread, the body of him who created heaven and earth. The leader of the procession has generally *assistants* and a suite of honor. If the leader be a priest, he is assisted, if possible, by two levites, one walking to his right, the other to the left, and dressed, according to the color of the leader, as deacon and subdeacon, or at least by two acolytes. If the leader be a bishop, a few canons of his cathedral, at least, should walk before him, dressed in the pluvial. If the procession be theophoric, two acolytes, walking immediately before the leader, incense the venerable uninterruptedly with their censers; in this case, also, a baldachin is generally extended over the leader, and borne by four, six, or eight laymen of distinction. It seldom happens that the leader of a non-theophoric procession walks beneath the baldachin: it is then a personal honor, only bestowed on bishops on extraordinary occasions, as on their solemn entrance into a church. In countries where the custom has hitherto existed, it is allowable to spread the baldachin over particles of the cross or other instruments of Christ's passion. The faithful who participate in the procession walk two by two. This may find an analogy in Christ's sending out his disciples two by two to preach the Gospel. Gregory the Great (*Horn. 17 in Evang.*) declares this to be a symbol of the two commandments of love—the love of God and the love of our fellow-man. Though the non-observance of this prescription is attended with much inconvenience, it is neglected in many processions in the cities and country. Mabillon saw even in Rome a procession where the faithful walked partly two by two, partly three by three, and even in larger numbers (*Iter Ital. v. 152*). The faithful who participate in the procession (monks who are not bound by their rule to entire seclusion can be compelled by the bishops to attendance) are disposed with respect to the class and sex they belong to. This is a requirement of good order. We find this arrangement mentioned by the oldest writers. St. Augustine speaks of a procession which took place near Hippo, where the bishop walked in the middle, the people before and after him (*De Civ. Dei, i, 22, c. 8, n. 11*). Porphyry of Gaza made the people precede, and followed himself with his clergy (*Sur. 26 Feb.*). The

great procession held by Gregory the Great indicated seven different churches, as starting-points for seven different classes of people (clerks, monks, female servants of God, married women, widows, poor, and children).

In our times the procession is generally (the custom is not the same everywhere) opened by the children: they are put, as it were, in the first line of battle, in order that God may be moved by their innocence to listen favorably to the prayers of the community. The children are followed by the clergy, with the chanters and musicians; among the clergy the leader of the procession walks the last, behind him the men, the prominent citizens taking the lead, followed by the women. The promiscuous walking of persons of both sexes is nowhere allowed. The order, as described, places the leader, as pastor of the community, in the middle of the procession: he is the shepherd of the children as well as of the adults, of the innocent as well as of the penitent, of the married people as well as of the unmarried: he must always in life be near to all of them. If brotherhoods, societies of mechanics, and members of religious orders are present, the two first mentioned open the cortege, the latter walk before the chanters and musicians. In front of the procession and between its different divisions, crosses or crucifixes, flags, and, if the procession is a very solemn one, images, relics, statues, etc., are carried. The bearer of the principal crucifix has two acolytes — one to his right, the other to his left — each with a lighted taper in his hand. The carrying of the images, statues, etc., is committed to the care of the brotherhoods, associations, and partly to the young men and girls of the community; the relics are carried by the clergymen, or, if the procession is held in honor of the relics, by the leader of the procession. The principal crucifix *SEE PROCESSIONAL CROSS* is generally carried (if possible) by a subdeacon; subdeacons also carry the crucifixes before the chapters, the archbishops, and the pope. The crosses are carried before the pope and archbishops in such a way that the image of the crucified one is turned towards those dignitaries. The principal crucifix opens the procession, unless a flag has been preferred, in which case the crucifix follows at some distance. Brotherhoods and corporations are in the habit of having flags carried before them. The most important of these customs are very old. Sozomen (*Hist. Eccl.* i, 8, c. 8) and the biographer of St. Caesarius of Arles (*Sur.* 27 Aug.) knew already of the carrying of crosses or crucifixes (during many centuries naked crosses were alone in use) and of lighted tapers. In former times the book of the Gospels was



sometimes carried along with the cross (*Vit. S. Porphyr. Ep. Sur.* 26 Feb.). Flags, which, it must be observed, are not prescribed, but only allowed, are mentioned by Gregory of Tours (*Hist. Franc.* i, 5, c. 4). Gregory the Great ordered an image of Mary to be carried about as early as 590 (Baron. *Annal.* ad a. 590). In the 4th century, we find processions held for the purpose of transferring relics solemnly to the churches (Socrat. *Hist. Eccl.* i, 3, c. 16; Augustine, *Confess.* i, 9, c. 7). The Synod of Braga in 572 (*ibid.* c. 6) calls this a solemn custom (see *Conc. Clovesh.* a. 747, c. 16). The faithful walk (*ibid.* c. 6) quietly and devoutly. Idle talk, forward looking around, laughing, showy suits, luxury of dress, etc., shock the pious mind. The men walk bareheaded; the clergy and magistrates alone are, with some restrictions, allowed to cover their heads. The clerks wear the chasuble; only on most sacred occasions, as at the procession of the Corpus Christi, we find the custom that at least some of the subdeacons wear the tunica, some of the deacons the dalmatica, several priests the planeta, and the ecclesiastics of higher rank the pluvial. The subdeacons who carry the crosses wear the tunica, besides the amictus, alba, and cingulum. For the laymen there are no longer any rules in this respect. Sozomen (*Hist. Eccl.* i, 8, c. 8) speaks of all the faithful bearing burning tapers; we hear of them in other places appearing barefooted, in sack and ashes (*Conc. Mogunt.* a. 813, c. 33); Charlemagne himself, according to the narrative of a monk of St. Gall, set the example of walking barefooted in procession at Ratisbon (Mart. *De Ant. Ecclesiastes Rit.* i, 4, c. 27, a. 7); but these are things of the past. The purport of the prayers is in accordance with the purpose of the procession. Yet the Church has given some rules. At theophoric processions, especially that of the Corpus Christi, the hymns in honor of the Eucharist must be sung in preference (*Pange lingua, Sacris solemnibus, Verbum supernum prodiens*); special songs are also prescribed for the procession at Candlemas and on Palm-Sunday; for the litanies of St. Mark's Day and of the Week of Prayer, the litany of All-saints' and the versicles and orations which follow it in the breviary are prescribed. At the funeral procession of full-grown persons, prayers of intercession; at the funerals of children, thanksgiving prayers are in use.

As extraordinary processions are generally undertaken for a purpose that must be submitted to God in special prayers, regulations have been made for these cases too. The Roman ritual mentions expressly the *processio ad petendam pluviam*, the *processio ad postulandam serenitatem*, the procession in time of famine, in time of epidemic and plague, in time of

war, in any other great distress, the thanksgiving procession, and, finally, that for the translation of relics. Originally the people sang psalms on such occasions (Jerome, *Ep.* 108, al. 27; Gregor. Nazianz. *Or.* 10; *Vit. S. Potphyr. Ep. Sur.* 26 Feb.); only when the purpose of the procession was to obtain some favor from God, it was an early custom to exclaim quite frequently, “Kyrie eleison,” or recite other prayers of penitence (Chrysost. *Orat. contr. lud. et theatr.*). This is the way the litany of All-saints’ has been little by little composed. The common Roman Ordo says: “Omnes in commune ‘Kyrie eleison’ decantent, et cum contritione cordis Dei misericordiar exorent pro peccatis, pro pace, pro peste, pro conservatione frugum et pro caeteris necessitatibus.” Mabillon (*Comment. in Ord. Rom.* p. 34) saw an old Roman ritual according to which a hundred “Kyrie eleison.” a hundred “Christe eleison,” and again a hundred “Kyrie eleison” were to be said kneeling, in such a propitiatory procession. As the psalms ceased little by little to be known by heart, rosary-praying, which has become of so general use in our day, took their place. The procession comes out of a place of worship, and, its walk performed, returns to it. If (as at funerals) not all the participants, the clergy, at least, with the chanters and the bearer of the principal cross, always return. Even if a bishop or pope is received outside of the doors of the city, it is customary for the clergy to start from the church and return thither with that high personage. The procession on Candlemas-day and Palm-Sunday starts at the call of the leader, “Procedamus in pace” (the choir answering, “In nomine Christi, amen”). In theophoric processions the leader or the chanters give the signal by commencing the hymn *Pcngē lingua*; if it is a supplication, the assembly kneel down a few minutes praying, the chanters commence to sing the litany of All-saints’, and the procession starts, singing the hymn *Sancta Maria*, which is a part of that litany. If in supplications (which is often the case in rural communities) the litany of All-saints’ is not recited in Latin, the procession commences thus: the ecclesiastic leader kneels on the lowest step of the high-altar, begins to say the rosary aloud, rises at the first Ave of the first decade, and therewith gives the signal for starting. The litany procession stops frequently at one, or two, or even more places of worship. The clergy (or at least the superiors) of the church where it stops receive it in chasuble and stole, with two acolytes, at the gate of the churchyard, or at the portal of the church, and offer holy water to the clerks and distinguished laymen of the procession. In such places of worship it is customary to sing an antiphony, and a versicle and oration in honor of the patron of the church; sometimes

a high-mass, with or without sermon, is held in one of them. The laymen like at such occasions to sing three times the song of triumph and the little doxology. This stopping, which, especially in Milan, is so extensively in use (luring the rogations celebrated there in the week that follows Ascension that the procession stops on the first day at twelve, on the second at nine, and on the third at eleven churches (comp. Mabill. *Lit. Gallic.* p. 153), is a custom of great antiquity. The Gallican liturgy mentions it as a well-known matter (*Missale Gothic.*; *Missale Gallic. Vet.*; *Cod.* 306). Gregory of Tours speaks of it as an established custom (*Hist. Franc.* i, 9, c. 6). The seven bodied procession of Gregory the Great started from seven churches and stopped at the Church of Our Lady (Greg. Tur. *Hist. Franc.* i, 10, c. 1). The reception by the clergy of the church where the procession stops is also a very old custom (Leo III in *Libr. Pontif.*); it was called "Occurrere." As processions in such cases, especially in the country, have often to walk an hour or more before they reach another place of worship, the Church has found it necessary, from time to time, to warn the faithful not to make of these intervals an occasion for feasting and tipping (*Rit. Rom.*; comp. *Conc. Clovesh.* a. 747, c. 16). When the procession walks inside of the places of worship, or in their immediate neighborhood, the bells of the steeple are rung. This reminds one of the procession which followed the body of St. Anastasius, and at which a noise was produced by striking on consecrated woods (*Conc. Nicoen.* a. 787, act. 4). Processions of less importance move only inside the walls of the house of worship. Such is the case with all processions in countries where the Catholic religion does not enjoy complete freedom of worship. According to the rules, processions should precede the high-mass, but this is practically the case with very few (comp. the *Rit. Romn.*, the *Coerem. epp.*, and the Rubricists). — Aschbach, *Kirchen-Lex.* s.v.

The origin of processions may have been an imitation of the motion of the heavenly spheres, the courses of the stars, and the revolutions of seasons, and more immediately of ancient religious dances. They were always accompanied by singers, and generally by musicians. Procession is progression, says Durand, when a multitude, headed by the clergy, goes forth in regular order and ranks to implore the divine grace. It represents the pilgrimage of man upon earth on his way to the better land, from the cradle to the grave, as St. Paul says that we are pilgrims and sojourners in this world. Processions round cloisters and cemeteries still more vividly brought before the mind the thought of the last home to which man must

come at length, as waters, after the most devious course, are lost in the great sea. In a procession to the altar, in reverse order to that of the recession, first went the verger, the crossbearer, attended on either side by acolytes carrying candlesticks and lighted tapers; then came the censers, or thurifers, the chanters in copes and carrying batons, the subdeacon, deacon, and celebrant; then choir boys, clerks of the second grade, and the more honorable following. In the cathedral the precentor, the sub-chanter of canons (*prechcantré*), and the succentor of vicars (*souschantré*), each with his chanter's baton, preceded the bishop, carrying his cross, or staff. In the middle of the 15th century the capitular tenants went in procession on St. Peter's Eve at Exeter, preceded by the choristers carrying painted shields of arms.

In England processions were made with litanies and prayers,

- (1) for the prosperity of the king;
- (2) for the wealth of the realm;
- (3) for pureness of the air;
- (4) for the increase of the fruits of the earth.

Two processions for the good success of a king were made on Sundays about the church and churchyard, by English canons, in 1359 and 1398. On Ash-Wednesday, after confession in church, there was a solemn procession for ejecting the penitents, who were not readmitted until Maundy Thursday. On Easter-day was a grand procession in memory of the disciples going to meet our Lord in Galilee, and in imitation of it there was a humbler procession on every Sunday. The other great procession was annual, on Palm-Sunday. Bishops were also met with processions of the chapter and vicars, or a convent, at the west door of the church and the cemetery gate, by decree of Honorius 3, 1221. In 1471 all curates of the diocese were required to visit the high-altar of Lincoln Cathedral in procession, and make their offerings. In the nave the great processions were arranged. At Canterbury two parallel lines, and at Fountains, Lincoln, Chichester, and York two rows of circular processional stones were arranged at proper intervals, and specifically allotted. At Exeter the antiphon was sung daily at the screen, and the procession passed through the north gate of the choir to the vestibule of the Lady Chapel, and then by the south gate of the choir near the throne to the high-altar. It afterwards traversed the nave and cloisters, concluding before the rood-loft; and if there was no sermon, the procession returned to the altar. Carpets were

strewn along the way on great festivals. Bishop Edyngdon desired to be buried at Winchester, where the monks stood in procession on Sundays and holydays. These monks, being aggrieved by a bishop, on one occasion went round their cloisters from west to east, out of their usual manner, in order to show that all things were out of order. At Chichester at Epiphany an image "of the Spirit" was carried round the church by the dean or senior canon and two vicars. On Whitsun-Monday the parishioners in the diocese often came to blows about right of precedence, so that bishop Storey made injunctions (1478) for order on this occasion, when the shrine of St. Richard was visited annually. Crosses and banners were permitted, but the long painted rods with which the contending parties had hitherto belabored each other were proscribed, as well as laughing, crowding, and noise. The pilgrims entered by the great south porch and assembled in the choir at 10 A. M. and left the building by it, having duly visited "the chancel and church." In 1364 the primate forbade such dangerous contentions throughout England. As late as 1551 the city companies of London went in procession — the Fishmongers to St. Michael's, Cornhill, with three crosses, a hundred priests, and the parishioners and members of the guild carrying white rods; and the parish of St. Clement Danes displayed eighty banners and streamers, and was preceded by the city waits. On Easter-Monday at Kinnorsley and Wellington the parishioners, adult and children, joined hand-in-hand, surrounded the church and touched it with a general simultaneous embrace, called "clipping the church." They afterwards attended divine service. The procession at Wolverhampton on Monday and Tuesday in Rogation week. in which the children bore poles dressed with flowers and the clergy chanted the Benedicite, only ceased in 1765. Some of the Gospel trees or holy oaks where the stations were formed still remain. — Walcott, *Sacred Archceol.* s.v. See Middleton, *Letters from Rome*; Willet, *Synops. Pap.*; Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lexikon*, 8:803-809; Martigny, *Dict. des Antiquites Chet.* s.v.; Siegel, *Christliche Alierthümer*; Riddle, *Christian Antiquities*, p. 757, 758, 771-774, 833; Barnum, *Romanism*, p. 468.

### Prochazka, Francis Faustin

a Bohemian monastic, noted as a writer, was born at Neupaka, Bohemia, Jan. 13, 1749. He studied with the Jesuits of Gischin and at the University of Prague. In 1767 he entered the Order of Barnabites, where he had for his master the celebrated Durich, who taught him Hebrew and encouraged him in his predilections for the Slavonic literature. When the Barnabites

were suppressed in Bohemia (1788), he became successively theological censor, professor and director of the Gymnasium at Prague, and librarian of the university of that city. He published the New Testament in Bohemian with commentaries, an edition of the Bible in that dialect, a reprint of the *Chronique de Bunzlau: — Commentarius de Secularibus Artium Liberalium in Moravia Favis* (1782): — *Melanges de Litterature Boheme* (Prague, 1784, 8vo). This religious man also assisted on the Barnabite Bible, and at the moment of his death was occupied on the valuable *Bibliotheca Slavica* of Durich. Prochazka died at Prague in 1809. — Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, s.v.

### Prochet, Matteo

a noted modern Italian Protestant theologian, was born in Piedmont in 1836. He was afforded by his Waldensian parents all the educational and religious advantages that might properly fit him for Church service, but on the outbreak of the Franco-Italian-Austrian war in 1859 he took up arms for his country's freedom and greatly distinguished himself by his bravery. After his return from the field of battle he continued his theological studies, and in 1862 was ordained minister in the Church of the Vaudois. He soon rose to positions of distinction, and was repeatedly honored by his ecclesiastical associates in missions to the sister churches of the Continent and of England, Scotland, and Ireland. He finally became the president of the Waldensian missions in Italy, and in 1873 was sent to represent his Church in the Evangelical World Alliance at New York. While in this country he spoke frequently and greatly impressed that distinguished body by his learning and wisdom. He was at the time pastor in Geneva and also professor of theology. On his return voyage from this country he was accompanied by the much-lamented Carrasco, the Spanish convert to Protestantism, who was one of his most intimate friends, and with whom he had planned several important polemical treatises against Romanism and her relations to the State. Prochet has a fine, commanding presence—tall in figure, broad-chested, quick in movement and speech, like most of the sons of the South; keen in perception, and accurate in his scholarship. His influence is great not only in Italian Protestantism, but in evangelical Christianity. See *Report of the Alliance*, (1873). (J. H. W.)

## Proch'orus

(Πρόχορος), one of the seven deacons, being the third on the list, and named next after Stephen and Philip (<sup><416></sup>Acts 6:5), A.D. 30. No further mention of him is made in the N.T. There is a tradition that he was consecrated by St. Peter bishop of Nicomedia (Baron. 1, 292). In the *Magna Bibliotheca Patrum* (Colon. Agripp. 1618, 1, 49-69) will be found a fabulous "Historia Prochori, Christi Discipuli, de Vita B. Joannis Apostoli."

## Proclamation

(*l wq, hnræ* etc., or some form of [*miv*]; as in <sup><1152></sup>1 Kings 15:22; Jeremiah 1, 29), the edict of any governing power, published in a solemn manner. The laws of Moses, as well as the temporary edicts of Joshua, were communicated to the people by means of the genealogists, or "officers," as in the English version; but the laws and edicts of those who subsequently held the office of kings were proclaimed publicly by criers (<sup><244></sup>Jeremiah 34:8, 9; Jonah 3, 5-7), a class of persons mentioned by Daniel (3, 4; 5:29), under the word *azwokj keroza*, which our translators have rendered "herald" (q.v.).

## Proclamations, Royal.

These documents in former times were almost equal in authority to an act of the constitutional legislature. They often interfered with religion, and dealt largely in reformation of manners. In 1529 king Henry VII issued a proclamation "for resisting and withstanding of most damnable heresyen sown within the realme by the discyples of Luther and other heretykes, perverters of Christes relygyon." In June, 1530, this was followed by the proclamation "for dampning (or condemnyng) of erroneous bokes and heresies, and prohibytinge the havinge of holy scripture translated into the vulgar tonges of englishe, frenche, or dutche." "And that having respect to the malignity of this present tyme, with the inclination of people to erronious opinions, the translation of the newe testament and the old into the vulgar tonge of englysshe, shulde rather be the occasion of conltynuance or increase of errours amonge the said people, than any benefit or commodite towards the weale of their soules." It was therefore determined that the Scriptures should only be expounded to the people as heretofore, and that these books "be clerely extermynate and exiled out of

this realme of Englande for ever.” Under Edward VI there is a proclamation against such “as innovate any ceremony,” and who are described as “certain private preachers and other laimen, who rashly attempt of their own and singular wit and mind, not only to persuade the people from the old and accustomed rites and ceremonies, but also themselves bring in new and strange orders according to their phantasies. The which, as it is an evident token of pride and arrogancy, so it tendeth both to confusion and disorder.” There is a proclamation also to abstain from flesh on Fridays and Saturdays; enforced on the principle, not only that “men should abstain on those days, and forbear the pleasures and the meats wherein they have more delight, to the intent to subdue their bodies to the soul and spirit, but also for worldly policy.” Charles II issued a proclamation against “vicious, debauched, and profane persons,” i.e. “a sort of men of whom we have heard much, and are sufficiently ashamed; who spend their time in taverns, tippling-houses, and debauchery; giving no other evidence of their affection to us but in drinking our health, and inveighing against all others who are not of their own dissolute temper; and who, in truth, have more discredited our cause, by the license of their manners and lives, than they could ever advance it by their affection or courage. We hope all persons of honor, or in place and authority, will so far assist us in discountenancing such men, that their discretion and shame will persuade them to reform what their conscience would not; and that the displeasure of good men towards them may supply what the laws have not, and, it may be, cannot well provide against; there being by the license and corruption of the times, and the depraved nature of man, many enormities, scandals, and impieties in practice and manners, which laws cannot well describe, and consequently not enough provide against, which may, by the example and severity of virtuous men, be easily discountenanced, and by degrees suppressed.” Some parties in Scotland who had no objection to national fasts, or even to the royal recommendation of them, yet objected to royal command and dictation as worded in the usual form, they being charged to keep the fast “as they tender the favor of Almighty God, and would avoid his wrath and indignation.” According to counsel learned in the law, obedience to such mandate is not imperative, for it is affirmed —

“1. That in England, where by statute the sovereign is head of the Church as well as of the State, that headship applies only to the clergy and members of the National Church, and does not include those who are not of her communion.



2. That in Scotland-where seceding or dissenting churches (except it be the nonjurors) stand not upon any statute of toleration, but upon the free basis and constitution of the country-no such relation exists, but is excluded by the act of 1690 (c. 5), ratifying the Confession of Faith; whereby an antagonistic principle is established, it being declared that ‘there is no other Head of the Church but the Lord Jesus Christ,’ and that he, ‘as King and Head of the Church, hath therein appointed a government in the hand of church-officers distinct from the civil magistrate,’ who ‘may not assume to himself the administration of the Word and sacrament, or the keys of the kingdom of heaven.’

3. That, in point of fact, proclamations for the observance of national fasts and thanksgivings in Scotland were, for a considerable period after the date of that act, and until the union between England and Scotland, passed by the three estates of the Scottish Parliament, and not by the sovereign alone. And,

4. That no statute can be found authorizing such proclamations in Scotland; and the phraseology used in them seems to have grown out of the practice in England, or to be founded on what appears to be an unwarranted extension of the two statutes cited in the proclamation of June, 1857, which refer exclusively to prayers for royal personages, and apply at most to ministers and preachers of two denominations.”

### Proclianites (Or Proclianists)

is the name of the followers of Proclus (q.v.). They were extreme Montanists (q.v.), and were spread more especially in Phrygia, where, about the close of the 4th century, they formed a most dangerous sect, and greatly disturbed the peace of the churches.

### Proclus

surnamed *Διάδοχος*, i.e. *the Successor*, because he replaced Syrianus (q.v.) as the head of that Athenian school of philosophers who were Neo-Platonists, has been called “the Scholastic among the Greek philosophers.” Indeed, according to M. Cousin, Proclus is *the* Greek philosopher; the flower and crown of all its schools; in whom, says the learned Frenchman, “are combined, and from whom shine forth, in no irregular or uncertain rays, Orpheus, Pythagoras, Plato, Aristotle, Zeno, Plotinus, Porphyry, and Jamblichus,” and who “had so comprehended all religions in his mind, and

paid them such equal reverence, that he was, as it were, the priest of the whole universe!" This is a compliment, but a compliment ill warranted and bestowed only because M. Cousin perceived in this Neo-Platonist more of kinship with that extravagant class of philosophizers, of whom Cousin himself is one, whose method consists in putting forth strings of brilliant propositions, careless about either their consistency or coherence. Indeed, Cousin's adoration for Proclus shows, if we may use the words of one of their own class, "what things men will worship in their extreme need!" (Thomas Carlyle).

With the beginning of Christianity in its aggressive movements, the heathen world saw itself faced with immediate danger of a prostration that could only end in death. Philo the Jew, anxious to revive the power of the old dispensation, rallied all extraneous forces, determined to build, by the aid of what antiquity had shaped, a structure that should rival, if not outshine, the simple edifice the Son of the Carpenter of Nazareth and the fishermen of Galilee had reared. What Philo failed to accomplish, Ammonius Saccas, also of Alexandria (near the beginning of the 3d century), and aided by Plotinus his pupil, attempted to effect. *SEE PLOTINUS*. But both master and pupil left their work ere it was fairly begun, and though Porphyry (q.v.) zealously applied himself to bring out the mystical rationalism of Plotinus, the six *Enneades* in which these teachings were set forth failed to show even a marked *progress* in the work so long attempted, and it remained for Jamblichus (q.v.) in the 4th and Proclus in the 5th century to give any appearance whatsoever to the edifice the Neo-Platonists had been so long in constructing. If we wish to see Neo-Platonism in its incipiency, we must go to Philo the Jew. But if we wish to see it in its ripest growth, we must study it in the writings of Proclus the Athenian. The Neo-Platonism he presents to us is no longer the outgrowth of Judaism intermixed with Hellenism, but paganism illumined by the spirit and light of the Gospel of Christ — that very religion with which it was struggling for the empire of the world (see Ullmann, *Der Einfluss des Christenthums*, in *Studien u. Kritiken*, 1832, No. 2).

The bewildering conflict of philosophical theories which these five centuries had been fostering had resulted in the growth of scepticism, and left no resting place for minds of a religious turn. The Neo-Platonists of the 4th and 5th centuries most naturally took their refuge in mysticism, where feeling and intuition supersede the slow and doubtful process of the intellect (comp. Fisher, *Beginnings of Christianity*, p. 178, 179). Plotinus

was the first to take this refuge. So did from this time forth all the successors of the Platonists, of whom Gibbon sneeringly says that “Plato would have blushed to acknowledge them.” They discarded philosophy, though they claimed to be philosophers. They played upon the superstitious tendencies of their age rather than upon the intellectual strength that still remained. They sought to persuade by the aid of magic rather than by the clear force of logic. They turned prophets and seers. Though they took part in the higher discussions and conclusions of philosophy, they nevertheless stood opposed to all philosophy, since they did not even profess to rest upon careful inquiries into eternal laws of the Spirit, but claimed to have a revelation from God. Thus exalted above all such investigations, Neo-Platonism became the poetry as well as the religion of philosophy. It was attached more especially to the system of Plato, and was professed to be an explanation and a development of his views, but it was aimed to bring together the fundamental principles of all philosophical schools, and the ideas which constitute the basis of all popular religions. It was the work of man, and, however ambitious the scheme, it failed absolutely in its mission. Superstition was the centre and support; magic and sorcery the basis and top-stone of the new structure. It had both philosophy and religion in its composition, and yet it was neither the one nor the other. “The divinity which it presents is exalted above all human apprehension, and was called simply the Self-sufficient One (τὸ ἕν). From his overflowing fulness proceeded the Divine Intelligence, and from this the World-soul, by which the material universe is pervaded with divine life. Evil is only that which is imperfect, and is the most distant reflection of Deity upon matter. The human soul which had been produced by the Divine Intelligence fell, in consequence of its longing after earthly things, from its original divine life to its present temporal existence. It therefore belongs to the sensual as well as to the intellectual world. But the souls of the good and wise, even in this world, are in their happiest moments reunited with the Deity, and death is to such a complete restoration to their home. From a pious veneration for an ancestry far back in antiquity, the Grecian gods especially were regarded as the personal manifestations of the divine life in nature. Some of them were celestial beings, and some ruled here on earth. These earthly powers were the national gods (μερικοί, ἔθνάρκται), subordinate to the Deity, and exalted above all passion. The myths were therefore, of course, to be explained allegorically. The arts of divination and magic were justified on the ground of the necessary connection of all phenomena by virtue of the unity of the world-

principle” (Hase, *Church Hist.* § 50). While, then, Neo-Platonism was a new power, it was nevertheless a reformation of the old faith. Though it extended itself over the whole Roman empire, it embraced within itself contradictory elements, and could maintain its existence only long enough to witness and embellish the downfall of heathenism. The last school to minister to Neo-Platonism in these her last hours was that founded by Proclus.

*Life.* — Proclus was of Lycian origin, and was born in Constantinople in 412. He received his first instruction at Xanthus, in Lycia (whence his surname “Lycius”). His philosophic training he enjoyed at Alexandria, where he studied under Arion, Leonaras, Hero, and especially under Olympiodorus, with whom he applied himself chiefly to Aristotelian and Platonic philosophy. Thence he went to Athens, where a certain Plutarch, a philosopher, and his daughter, and later Syrianus, became his instructors. Asclepiogeneia, a priestess of Eleusis, instructed him chiefly in theurgic mysteries. The vivid imagination and enthusiastic temperament which in his childhood had led him to believe in apparitions of Minerva and Apollo, naturally convinced him, when all the influences of the Mysteries (q.v.) were brought to bear upon him, still more of his immediate and direct intercommunication with the gods; and he distinctly believed himself to be one of those through whom divine revelation reaches mankind. His soul, he thought, had once lived in Nicomachus the Pythagorean, and, like him, he had the power to command the elements to a certain extent, to produce rain, to temper the sun’s heat, etc. The Orphic poems, the writings of Hermes, and all that strangely mystical literature with which the age abounded, were to him the only source of true philosophy, and he considered them all more or less in the light of divine revelations. That same cosmopolitan spirit in religious matters which pervaded Rome towards her end had spread throughout all the civilized “pagan” world of those days, and Proclus distinctly laid it down as an axiom that a true philosopher must also be a hierophant of the whole world. Acquainted with all the creeds and rites of the ancient Pantheons of the different nations, he not only philosophized upon them in an allegorizing and symbolizing spirit, as many of his contemporaries did, but practiced all the ceremonies, however hard and painful. More especially the practice of fasting in honor of Egyptian deities, while on the one hand it fitted him more and more for his hallucinations and dreams of divine intercourse, on the other hand more than once endangered his life. Of an impulsive piety, and eager to win

disciples from Christianity itself, he made himself obnoxious to the Christian authorities at Athens, who, in accordance with the spirit of religious intolerance and fanaticism which then began to animate the new and successful religion against which Proclus waged constant war, banished him from that city. On being permitted to return, he acted with somewhat more prudence and circumspection, and only allowed his most approved disciples to take part in the nightly assemblies in which he propounded his doctrines. He died in 485, in his full vigor, and in the entire possession of all his mental powers, for which he was no less remarkable than for his personal beauty and strength. As a philosopher he enjoyed the highest celebrity among his contemporaries and successors. Marinus does not scruple to call Proclus absolutely inspired, and to affirm that when he uttered his profound dogmas his countenance shone with a preternatural light. Besides his other philosophical attainments, he was a distinguished mathematician, astronomer, and grammarian. In style Proclus is much more perspicuous and intelligible than his predecessor Plotinus; indeed, he is on the whole a good writer, and occasionally is almost eloquent. But the matter of his works has not much to recommend it: his propensity to allegorize everything, even the plainest and simplest expressions in the authors on whom he comments, must deduct largely from his merits as an expounder of other men's thoughts; and but for the interest which attaches to him as the last of a school of philosophy, it is not much to be regretted that his works have slumbered so long in the dust of libraries, and have been either wholly neglected or imperfectly edited.

*His Philosophical System.* — In the writings of Proclus there is collated, arranged, and dialectically elaborated the whole body of transmitted philosophy, augmented by large additions, and the whole combined into a sort of system, to which he succeeded in giving the appearance of strict logical connection. He professed that his design was not to bring forward views of his own, but simply to expound Plato, in doing which he proceeded on the idea that everything in Plato must be brought into accordance with the mystical theology of Orpheus. He looked upon the Orphic poems and Chaldaean oracles, which he had diligently studied, as divine revelations, and capable of becoming instrumental to philosophy by means of an allegorical exposition. He therefore wrote a separate work on the coincidence of the doctrines of Orpheus, Pythagoras, and Plato. It was in much the same spirit that he attempted to blend together the logical method of Aristotle and the fanciful speculations of Neo-Platonic

mysticism. He called himself, as we have already had occasion to say, the last link of the Hermaic chain, that is, the last of men consecrated by Hermes, in whom, by perpetual tradition, was preserved the occult knowledge of the Mysteries. Where reasoning fails him, he takes refuge in the *πίστις* of Plotinus, which is superior to knowledge. He conducts us to the operations of theurgy, which transcends all human wisdom, and comprises within itself all the advantages of divinations, purifications, initiations, and all the activities of divine inspiration. Through it we are united with the primeval unity, in which every motion and energy of our souls comes to rest. It is this principle which unites not only men with gods, but the gods with each other, and with the one — the good, which is of all things the most credible.

Proclus “held, in all its leading. features the doctrine of emanations from one ultimate, primeval principle of all things, the absolute unity, towards union with which again all things strive. This union he did not, like Plotinus, conceive to be effected by means of pure reason, as even things destitute of reason and energy participate in it, purely as the result of their subsistence (*ὑπαρξις*, *Theol. Plat.* i, 25; ii, 1, 4). In some unaccountable way, therefore, he must have conceived the *πίστις*, by which he represents this union as being effected, as something which did not involve rational or thinking activity. All inferior existences are connected with the highest only through the intermediate ones, and can return to the higher only through that which is intermediate. Every multitude, in a certain way, partakes of unity, and everything which becomes *one*, becomes so by partaking of the one (*Inst. Theol.c.* 3). Every object is a union of the one and the many: that which unites the one and the many is nothing else than the pure, absolute one — the essential *one*, which makes everything else partake of unity. Proclus argued that there is either one principium, or many principia. If the latter, the principia must be either finite or infinite in number. If infinite, what is derived from them must be infinite, so that we should have a double infinite, or else finite. But the finite can be derived only from the finite, so that the principia must be finite in number. There would then be a definite number of them. But number presupposes unity. Unity (*ἐνότης*) is consequently the principium of principia, and the cause of the finite multiplicity and of the being of all things (*Theol. Plat.* ii, 1). There is therefore *one* principium which is incorporeal, for the corporeal consists of parts. It is immovable and unchangeable, for everything that moves, moves towards some object or end, which it seeks after. If the principium were

movable it must be in want of the good, and there must be something desirable outside of it. But this is impossible, for the principium has need of nothing, and is itself the end towards which everything else strives. The principium, or first cause of all things, is superior to all actual being (οὐσία), and separated from it, and cannot even have it as an attribute (*l.c.*). The absolutely one is not an object of cognition to any existing thing, nor can it be named (*l.c.* p. 95). But in contemplating the emanation of things from the one and their return into it we arrive at two words, the *good*, and the *one*, of which the first is analogical and positive, the latter negative only (*l.c.* p. 96). The absolutely one has produced not only earth and heaven, but all the gods which are above the world and in the world: it is the god of all gods, the unity of all unities (*l.c.* ii, 110). Everything which is perfect strives to produce something else; the full seeks to impart its fulness. Still more must this be the case with the absolute good, though in connection with that we must not conceive of any creative power or energy, for that would be to make the one imperfect and not simple, not fruitful through its very perfection (*l.c.* p. 101). Every emanation is less perfect than that from which it emanates (*Inst. Theol. c. 7*), but has a certain similarity with it, and, so far as this similarity goes, remains in it, departing from it so far as it is unlike, but as far as possible being one with it, and remaining in it (*ibid.* 31). What is produced from the absolutely one is produced as unity, or of the nature of unity. Thus the first produced things are independent unities (αὐτοτελεῖς ἐνάδες). Of these independent unities some are simple, others more composite. The nearer the unities are to the absolute unity the simpler they are, but the greater is the sphere of their operation and their productive power. Thus out of unity there arise a multitude of things which depart further and further from the simplicity of the absolute one; and as the producing power diminishes, it introduces more and more conditions into things, while it diminishes their universality and simplicity. His whole system of emanations seems, in fact, to be a *realization* of the logical subordination of ideas. The simplest ideas which are contained in those which are composite being regarded by him as the principles of *things*.”

The emanations proceeded in a curious triadic manner. That which precedes all power, and emanates immediately from the primal cause of all things, is limit. Unity, duality, he considered as identical with limitation (πέρας) and boundlessness (ἄπειρία), and from the mixed compound of these two principia arises a third, a compound of the two — *substance* (as

a sort of genus of all substances), that which in itself is absolutely an existing thing and nothing more (*Theol. Plat.* 3, 133 sq.). Everything, according to Proclus, contains in itself being (οὐσία), life (ζωή), and intelligence (νοῦς). The life is the centre of the thing, for it is both an object of thought and exists. The intelligence is the limit of the thing, for the intellect (νοῦς) is in that which is the object of intellect (νοητόν), and the latter in the former; but the intellect or thought exists in the thing thought of objectively, and the thing thought of exists in the intellect productively (νοερώς). This accordingly is the first triad-limit, infinitude, and the compound of the two. Proclus distinguished the divinities (making these also descend from unity and give birth to triads) into intelligible and intelligent, supernatural and natural; attributed a supernatural efficacy to the *name* of the Supreme Being, and, like his predecessors, exalted theurgy above philosophy. The first triad — viz. the limit — Proclus taught, is the deity who advances to the extreme verge of the conceivable from the inconceivable, primal deity, measuring and defining all things, and establishes the paternal, concatenating, and immaculate race of gods. The infinite is the inexhaustible power of this deity. The “mixed” is the first and highest world of gods, which in a concealed manner comprehends everything within itself. Out of this first triad springs the second. As the first of the unities produces the highest existing thing, the intermediate unity produces the intermediate existent thing, in which there is something first — unity, divinity, reality; something intermediate — power; and something last — the existence in the second grade, conceivable life (νοητὴ ζωή); for there is in everything which is the object of thought being (τὸ εἶναι), life (τὸ ζῆν), and thought (τὸ νοεῖν). The third of the unities. the “mixed,” produces the third triad, in which the intelligence or thinking power (νοῦς) attains to its subsistence. This thinking power is the limit and completion of everything which can be the object of thought. The first triad contains the principle of union; the second of multiplicity and increase by means of continuous motion or life, for motion is a species of life; the third, the principle of the separation of the manifold, and of formation by means of limit.

In his treatise on *Providence and Fate*, Proclus seeks to explain the difference between the two, and to show that the second is subordinate to the first in such a manner that freedom is consistent with it. Both providence and fate are causes — the first the cause of all good, the second the cause of all connection (and connection as cause and effect). There are



three sorts of things — some whose operation is as eternal as their substance, others whose substance does not exist, but is perpetually coming into existence, and, between these, things whose substance is eternal, but whose operation takes place in time. Proclus names these three kinds *intellectual*, *animal*, and *corporeal*. The last alone are subjected to fate, which is identical with nature, and is itself subject to providence, which is nothing else than the deity himself. The corporeal part of man is entirely subject to fate. The soul, as regards its substance, is superior to fate; as regards its operation, sometimes (referring to those operations which require corporeal organs and motions) beneath, sometimes superior to fate, and so forms the bond of connection between intellectual and corporeal existence. The freedom of the soul consists in its living according to virtue, for this alone does not involve servitude. Wickedness, on the other hand, is want of power, and by it the soul is subjected to fate, and is compelled to serve all that ministers to or hinders the gratification of the desires. Proclus strongly distinguished the soul from that which is material, pointing out its reflective power as a mark of difference; the corporeal not being able to turn back in that way upon itself, owing to its consisting of separable parts. He founded on this also an argument for the immortality of the soul (*Inst. Theol. c. 15*). The human soul he considered wrapped up in various more or less dense veils, according to the degree of perfection attained; and he further assumed a certain sort of solidarity between the souls of those who naturally, or by certain immutable circumstances, were linked together, such as children and parents, rulers and subjects; and he carried this doctrine so far as to assert that the children must naturally participate in their parents' faults. Faith alone, he further held, was essential to the attainment of theurgy, which, comprising mantic and supernatural inspiration, is preferable to all human wisdom; and in this he chiefly differs from Plotinus (q.v.). Some of the topics touched upon in this treatise are carried out still further in the essay on *Ten Questions about Providence*. In the treatise on the *Origin of Evil* (Περὶ τῆς τῶν κακῶν ὑποστάσεως), Proclus endeavors to show that evil does not originate with God, or with the daemons, or with matter. Evil is the consequence of a weakness, the absence of some power. As with the total absence of all power activity would be annihilated, there cannot be any total, unmixed evil. The good has one definite, eternal, universally operating cause — namely, God. The causes of evil are manifold, indefinite, and not subject to rule. Evil has not an original, but only a derivative existence.

*His Works.* — The following of Proclus's writings are still extant:

- (1.) *Εἰς τὴν Πλάτωνος θεολογίαν*, in six books.
- (2.) *Στοιχείωσις θεολογική* (*Institutio Theologica*). This treatise was first published in the Latin translation of Franciscus Patricius. The Greek text, with the translation of AEm. Portus, is appended to the edition of the last-mentioned work (Hamb. 1618).
- (3.) A commentary on the *First Alcibiades* of Plato.
- (4.) A commentary on the *Timaeus* of Plato. Of this commentary on the *Timaeus* five books remain, but they only treat of about a third of the dialogue. It is appended to the first Basle edition of Plato.
- (5.) Various notes on the *Πολιτεία* of Plato, printed in the same edition of Plato as the last-mentioned work.
- (6.) A commentary on the *Πολιτεία* of Plato, published in Stallbaum's edition of that dialogue.
- (7.) Portions of a commentary on the *Cratylus* of Plato, edited by Boissonade (Leips. 1820).
- (8.) A paraphrase of various difficult passages in the *Τετράβιβλος σύνταξις* of Ptolemaeus: first published, with a preface, by Melancthon (Basle. 1554).
- (9.) A treatise on motion (*Περὶ κινήσεως*), a sort of compendium of the last five books of Aristotle's treatise *Περὶ φυσικῆς ἀκροάσεως*.
- (10.) *ὑποτύπωσις τῶν ἀστρονομικῶν ὑποθέσεων* (ibid. 1520).
- (11.) *Σφαῖρα*, frequently appended to the works of the ancient astronomers. There are also several separate editions of it.
- (12.) A commentary on the first book of Euclid's *Elements* (attached to various editions of the text of Euclid).
- (13.) A commentary on the *Ἔργα καὶ ἡμέραι* of Hesiod, in a somewhat mutilated form (*ὑπόμνημα εἰς τὰ Ἡσιόδου ἔργα καὶ ἡμέρας*) (first published at Venice in 1537). A better edition is that by Heinsius (Leyden, 1603).

(14.) *Χρηστομάθεια γραμματική*, or, rather, some portions of it preserved by Photius (cod. 239), treating of poetry and the lives of various celebrated poets. The short life of Homer which passes under the name of Proclus was probably taken from this work.

(15.) *Ἐπιχειρήματα ἢ κατὰ Χριστιανῶν*. The object of this work was to maintain the eternity of the universe against the Christian doctrine on the subject. The work of Proclus has not come down to us in a separate form, but we still possess his arguments in the refutation of them by Joannes Philoponus (*De Eternitate Mundi*).

(16.) *De Providentia et Fato*, addressed to Theodorus, a mechanician.

(17.) *Decem Dubitationes circa Providentiam* (Περὶ τῶν δέκα πρὸς τὴν Πρόνοιαν ἀπορημάτων).

(18.) *De Malorum Subsistentia* (Περὶ τῆς τῶν κακῶν ὑποστάσεως). This and the two preceding treatises only exist in the Latin translation of Gulielmus de Morbeka. They are printed entire by Fabricius in his *Bibliotheca Graeca*, 9:373, etc.

(19.) A little astrological treatise on the effect of eclipses, in a Latin translation.

(20.) A treatise on poetry, also in a Latin translation, printed together with a treatise by Choeroboscus (Paris, 1615).

(21.) Five hymns.

(22.) Some scholia on Homer.

The following works have perished:

(1.) A commentary on the *Philebus* of Plato (Procl. *in Tim.* p. 53,222).

(2.) A commentary on the *Phaedrus* of Plato (Procl. *l.c.* p. 329).

(3.) A defence of the *Timaeus* of Plato against the *Ἀντιρρήσεις* of Aristotle (ibid. p. 226: Βιβλίον ἰδιᾶ ἐκδεδωκῶς οἶδα τῶν πρὸς τὸν Τίμαιον Ἀριστοτέλους ἀντιρρήσεων ἐπισκέψεις ποιουμένων).

(4.) *Καθαρτικὸς τῶν δογμάτων τοῦ Πλάτωνος*, against Dominus (Suid. s.v. *Δομνῖνος*).

- (5.) A commentary on the *Thecetus* of Plato (Marinus, *l.c.* cap. ult.).
- (6.) **Νόμοι**, a commentary apparently on the *Laws* of Plato (Procl. *in Tim.* p. 178).
- (7.) Notes on the **Ἐννεάδες** of Plotinus.
- (8.) **Μητρωακὴ βίβλος**, on the mother of the gods (Suid. s.v. ΗροςX.).
- (9.) **Εἰς τὴν Ὀρφέως θεολογίαν** (Suid. *l.c.*; Marin. c. 27).
- (10.) **περὶ τὰ λόγια**, in ten books (Suid. Marin. c. 26).
- (11.) A commentary on Homer (Suid.).
- (12.) **Περὶ τῶν παρ' Ὀμήρω θεῶν** (*ibid.*).
- (13.) **Συμφωνία Ὀρφέως, Πυθαγόρου καὶ Πλάτωνος** (Suid. Marin. c. 22).
- (14.) On the three **ἐνάδες νοηταί** — namely, **ἀλήθεια, καλλονή,** and **συμμετρία** (Procl. *in Polit.* p. 433).
- (15.) **Εἰς τὸν λόγον τῆς Διοτίμας περὶ τῆς τῶν κακῶν ὑποστάσεως.**
- (16.) **Περὶ ἀγωγῆς**, on the theurgic discipline, in two books (Suid.).
- (17.) Various hymns and epigrams.

There is no complete edition of the extant works of Proclus. The edition of Cousin (Paris, 1820-27, 6 vols. 8vo) contains the treatises on *Providence and Fate*, on the *Ten Doubts about Providence*, and on the *Nature of Evil*, the commentary on the *Alcibiades*, and the commentary on the *Parmenides*. This learned Frenchman has since brought out *Procli Philos. Platonici opera inedita* (Paris, 1864). There are English translations of the commentaries on the *Tiinceus*, the six books on the *Theology of Plato*, the commentaries on the first book of Euclid, and the *Theological Elements*, and the five *Hymns*, by Thomas Taylor. See Fabricius, *Bibl. Graec.* 9:363-445; Brucker, *Historia Critica Philosophice*, ii, 319-336; Tennemann, *Geschichte der Philosophie*, vol. 6; Ritter, *Geschichte der Philosophie*, bk. 13, c. 3, vol. 4:699, etc.; Dr. Burigny, *Life of Proclus*, in *Memoirs of the Academy of Inscriptions*, vol. 31; Marinus, *Vita Procli* (Gr. and Lat. ed. by

Fabricius [Hamb. 1740, 4to]; ed. by Boissonade [Leips. 1814, 8vo)]; Baur, *Christl. Jahrbücher* (Tubing. 1846, p. 29-72); Cudworth, *Intell. Universe* (see Index); Hunt, *Pantheism*, p. 117 sq.; Lewes, *Hist. of Philos.* vol. ii; Simon, *Ecole Alex.* vol. ii; Tennemann, *Man. of Philos.* p. 190 sq.; Gibbon, *Decline and Fall*, c. 20:§ 12; Hase, *Ch. Hist.* p. 48 etc.; Ueberweg, *Hist. of Philos.* i, 255-258; Smith, *Dict. of Greek and Roman Biog. and Mythol.* s.v. (from which a part of the above has been taken); Kingsley, *Alexandria*, p. 116-124, 128; Alzog, *Patrol.* § 57; Nourisson, *Pensees Humaines*, p. 161 sq.

## Proclus

ST., an Eastern ecclesiastic of the 5th century. He was at a very early age appointed reader in the church at Constantinople. He was also engaged as secretary or amanuensis to St. Chrysostom, and was employed in a similar capacity by Atticus (who succeeded Arsacius as patriarch of Constantinople), by whom he was invested successively with the orders of deacon and presbyter. He was raised to the rank of bishop of Cyzicus by Sisinnius, the successor of Atticus, but did not exercise the functions of his office, the people of Cyzicus choosing another in his place. On the death of Sisinnius (A.D. 427) there was a general expression of feeling in favor of Proclus as his successor, but Nestorius was appointed. Proclus contended zealously against the heresies which the latter strove to introduce into the Church, combating them even in a sermon preached before Nestorius himself. On the deposition of Nestorius, Proclus was again proposed as his successor; but his elevation was again opposed, though on what grounds does not appear very clearly ascertained. But on the death of Maximianus, who was appointed instead, Proclus was at last created patriarch. In A.D. 438 Proclus gained a great deal of honor by having the body of St. Chrysostom brought to Constantinople. There is still extant a fragment of a Latin translation of a eulogy on St. Chrysostom, by Proclus, delivered probably about this time. It was in the time of Proclus that the custom of chanting the *Trisayion* was introduced into the Church. While in office, Proclus conducted himself with great prudence and mildness. For further details respecting his ecclesiastical career, the reader is referred to Tillemont's *Melmoies Ecclesiastiques* (14, 704-718). His extant writings are enumerated by Fabricius (*B. G.* ix. 505-512). One of the most celebrated of his letters (**Περὶ πίστεως**) was written in A.D. 435, when the bishops of Armenia applied to him for his opinion on certain propositions which had been disseminated in their dioceses, and were

attributed to Theodorus of Mopsuestia. The discussion that ensued with respect to these propositions made a considerable stir in the East. Proclus bestowed a great deal of pains upon his style, which is terse and sententious, but is crowded with antitheses and rhetorical points, and betrays a labored endeavor to reiterate the same sentiment in every possible variety of form. From the quotations of subsequent authors, it appears that several of the writings of Proclus are lost. The *Platonic Theology* of Proclus Diadochus has sometimes been erroneously described as a theological work of St. Proclus. The 24th of October is the day consecrated to the memory of St. Proclus by the Greek Church. See Smith, *Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog. and Mythol.* s.v.; Neander, *Ch. Hist.* ii, 496 sq.; Riddle, *Hist. of the Papacy*, i, 160 sq., 170 sq.

### Proconsul

The Greek word ἀνθύπατος, for which this is the true equivalent, is rendered uniformly “deputy” in the A.V. of <sup><4437></sup>Acts 13:7, 8, 12; 19:38, and the derived verb ἀνθυπατεύω in <sup><44812></sup>Acts 18:12 is translated “to be deputy.” At the division of the Roman provinces by Augustus, in the year B.C. 27, into senatorial and imperial, the emperor assigned to the senate such portions of territory as were peaceable and could be held without force of arms (Sueton. *Oct.* 47; Strabo, 17:840; Dio Cass. 53:12), an arrangement which remained with frequent alterations till the 3d century. Over these senatorial provinces the senate appointed by lot yearly an officer who was called “proconsul” (ibid. 13), who exercised purely civil functions, had no power over life and death, and was attended by one or more legates (ibid. 14). He was neither girt with the sword nor wore the military dress (ibid. 13). He was chosen out of the body of the senate; and it was customary, when any one’s consulate expired, to send him as a proconsul into some province. He enjoyed the same honor with the consuls, but was allowed only six lictors with the fasces before him. Such provinces were in consequence called “proconsular.” With the exception of Africa and Asia, which were assigned to men who had passed the office of consul, the senatorial provinces were given to those who had been praetors, and were divided by lot each year among those who had held this office five years previously. Their term of office was one year. The proconsuls decided cases of equity and justice, either privately in their palaces, where they received petitions, heard complaints, and granted writs under their seals; or publicly in the common hall, with the formalities generally observed in the courts at Rome. These duties were, however,

more frequently delegated to their assessors, or other judges of their own appointment. As the proconsuls had also the direction of justice, of war, and of the revenues, these departments were administered by their lieutenants, or *legati*, who were usually nominated by the senate. The expense of their journeys to and from their provinces was defrayed by the public. Livy (8 and 26) mentions two other classes of proconsuls — those who, being consuls, had their office continued beyond the time appointed by law; and those who, being previously in a private station, were invested with this honor, either for the government of provinces or to command in war. Some were created proconsuls by the senate without being appointed to any province, merely to command in the army, and to take charge of the military discipline; others were allowed to enter upon their proconsular office before being admitted to the consulship, but having that honor in reserve.

Among the senatorial provinces in the first arrangement by Augustus were Cyprus, Achaia, and Asia within the Halys and Taurus (Strabo, 17:840). The first and last of these are alluded to in ~~4437~~ Acts 13:7, 8, 12; 19:38, as under the government of proconsuls. Achaia became an imperial province in the second year of Tiberius, A.D. 16, and was governed by a procurator (Tacit. *Ann.* i, 76), but was restored to the senate by Claudius (Sueton. *Claud.* 25), and therefore Gallio, before whom St. Paul was brought, is rightly termed “proconsul” in ~~4482~~ Acts 18:12. **SEE GALLIO**. Cyprus also, after the battle of Actium, was first made an imperial province (Dio Cass. 53:12), but five years afterwards (B.C. 22) it was given to the senate, and is reckoned by Strabo (17:840) ninth among the provinces of the people governed by **στρατηγοί**, as Achaia is the seventh. These **στρατηγοί**, or propraetors, had the title of proconsul. Cyprus and Narbonese Gaul were given to the senate in exchange for Dalmatia, and thus, says Dio Cassius (54:4), proconsuls (**ἀνθύπατοι**) began to be sent to those nations. In Bockh’s *Compus Inscriptionum*, No. 2631, is the following relating to Cyprus: **ἡ πόλις Κοῖντον Ἰούλιον Κόρδον ἀνθύπατον ἀγνεΐας** This Quintus Julius Cordus appears to have been proconsul of Cyprus before the twelfth year of Claudius. He is mentioned in the next inscription (No. 2632) as the predecessor of another proconsul, Lucius Annius Bassus. The date of this last inscription is the twelfth year of Claudius, A.D. 52. The name of another proconsul of Cyprus in the time of Claudius occurs on a copper coin, of which an engraving is given under CYPRUS **SEE**

**CYPRUS.** A coin of Ephesus (q.v.) illustrates the usage of the word **ἀνθύπατος** in <sup>448B</sup>Acts 19:38.

## Procopm, Andrew

(also known as *Procop the greater, the elder, or the holy, or the shaven*, in allusion to his having received the tonsure in early life), was one of the greatest of the Hussite leaders, and ranks only second to Ziska, whose successor he was among the Taborites. Procop was born of a noble family towards the close of the 14th century. He owed his education to an uncle, a nobleman of Prague. After having travelled for some years through France and Spain, Procop returned to his native country just as the religious wars were breaking out. He had taken holy orders, but instead of entering the ministry he joined the ranks of the insurgent Hussites, and, by his military genius, rapidly rose to the first rank. In 1424 Ziska died, and the Taborites elected Procop as their leader. Palacky, in comparing the two great Hussites, says of Procop that if he did not equal Ziska in warlike ability, he surpassed his predecessor in mind and political farsightedness. Procop's history from this time till 1427 presents an almost unbroken series of daring attacks upon the Austrians. At the same time, a larger body of Taborites, who called themselves Orphans, and had been overrunning Lausitz and had burned Lauban, under the leadership of a man subsequently known as Procop the lesser (or younger), now, in concert with the more distinguished Procop, attacked Silesia, and took part in those internal feuds of the Hussite factions by which Bohemia was almost wholly ruined. The threatened approach of three German armies, which had been levied by the neighboring states to carry on an exterminating crusade against the heretics, was alone able to restore unanimity to the divided Hussites, who, under the leadership of the two Procop, offered a desperate and successful resistance to the larger numbers of the Germans, subsequently pursuing their enemies with fire and sword through Silesia, Moravia, and Hungary as far as Presburg. In 1429 Procop made inroads into the German states as far as Magdeburg, and returned to Bohemia laden with spoil, and followed by a numerous band of captive nobles and knights; and in the following year, at the head of 50,000 men-at-arms, and half as many horsemen, he again broke into Misnia, Franconia, and Bavaria, and after having burned 100 castles and towns, destroyed 1400 villages and hamlets, and carried off a vast amount of treasure, turned his arms against Moravia and Silesia. The emperor Sigismund at this crisis offered to treat with him, but the imperial demand, that the Hussites should



submit to the decision of a council, afforded Procop a pretext for breaking off all negotiations with the imperial court. A second German crusading army now advanced in 1431, but was thoroughly defeated at Riesenburg. These successes, which were followed by others of nearly equal importance in Silesia, Hungary, and Saxony, where the princes had to purchase peace at the hands of the two Procop on humiliating terms, induced the Council of Basle to propose a meeting between the Hussite leaders and ten learned Catholic doctors. The meeting lasted fifty days, but was productive of no good result. Procop himself went before that learned body, and defended, with much spirit, the creed of his party. But failing to receive such treatment as he felt himself entitled to, he finally refused further to attend the council, and returned to Bohemia, where, combining his forces with those of Procop the lesser, he laid siege to Pilsen. The Calixtines, who came here in force, had offended Procop by the peace treaty they had made with a delegation of the Council of Basle. The council, on this, passed an act known as the Basle Compact, by which the Hussites were allowed the use of the cup in the Lord's Supper, and the Bohemians were designated by the title of the *First Sons of the Catholic Church*. The Taborites and Orphans, under the leadership of the two Procop, refused, however, to have anything to do with the pope, and hence dissensions arose between them and the more moderate of the Hussites. After many lesser encounters between these factions, a decisive battle was fought near Lipaum in 1434, in which Procop was induced, by a feint of the enemy, to leave his intrenchments. His followers at first fought desperately against the troops of the Bohemian nobles, who were commanded by Meinhard of Neuhaus; but at length, under the influence of a sudden panic, they gave way, and took to flight. Procop, after vainly striving to re-form their broken lines, threw himself into the midst of the enemy, and was killed. Procop the lesser, following in his steps, was also slain, and with these two brave Hussite leaders the cause of the Taborites perished. Milman says, "with Procop fell the military glory, the religious inflexibility, of Bohemia." See Gillett. *Life and Times of John Huss*, vol. 2, ch. 17 sq.; *Leben des Procop* (Prague, 1789); Milman, *Hist. of Latin Christianity*, 7:545-568; Palacky, *Gesch. von EBomen*, 3, 91 sq.

### Procop The Younger.

SEE PROCOP, ANDREW.

## Procopius Of Caesarea,

a noted character in the history of the East in the 6th century, is especially distinguished as the writer of a history in which he dwells at large on the ecclesiastical condition of the periods of which he treats. He was born at Cesarea, in Palestine, about the end of the 5th or beginning of the 6th century. After studying rhetoric in his native country, he went to Constantinople, where he gave lessons in rhetoric, and appears to have been also a lawyer. His reputation for learning and ability reached the court; and the emperor Justin the elder, in the last year of his reign, appointed him assessor (*συγκάθεδρος*) to Belisarius, who was about that time sent as governor to Dara, on the frontiers of Armenia. Procopius afterwards accompanied that commander in his first war against the Persians (530), afterwards in that against the Vandals in Africa (533-535), and lastly against the Goths in Italy (536-539). During these campaigns he appears to have rendered himself very useful by his ability and activity, and to have been intrusted by Belisarius with important commissions connected with the service of the army. In his capacity of assessor, he was the general's legal adviser, and he was also his private secretary. In 538 he assisted Antonina, the wife of Belisarius, in raising troops in Campania, and in sending some by sea to Rome, which was then besieged. On his return to Constantinople, about 540, the emperor Justinian made him a senator, as a reward for his services. In 562 he was made prefect of Constantinople, unless perhaps it was another of the name who obtained this dignity in that year. He died in that city at an advanced age, but the precise year of his death is not ascertained. It was during his extensive travels that he gathered the materials for the *History of his Own Times* (in eight books), translated into Latin by Claude Mattret, a Jesuit, under the title *Procopii Caesariensis Historiarum sui Temporis Libri Octo* (Paris, 1662, fol.; with the Greek text in English, Lond. 1653, fol.). His descriptions of the manners of the various barbarous nations which invaded the Roman empire are vivid and interesting. The first two books of his history concern the Persian wars. He begins his narrative with the death of Arcadius, and briefly relates the wars between the Romans and Persians under Theodosius the younger, Anastasius, and Justinus, and lastly Justinian. As he comes down to contemporary times, his history is more diffuse. He closes with the twenty-third year of Justinian's reign (A.D. 550). Books 3 and 4 treat of the wars of the Vandals in Africa, and the reconquest of that province by Belisarius. The 5th, 6th, and 7th books are concerned with the

history of the Gothic kingdom in Italy founded by Theodoric, and the expedition of Belisarius against Totilas. The 8th book is of a mixed character; it resumes the account of the Persian wars, then speaks of the affairs of the Roman empire in other quarters — in Africa, on the Rhine, and in Thrace — and at last resumes the narrative of the Gothic war in Italy, the expedition of Narses, the defeat and death of Teia, and the final overthrow of the Gothic kingdom. — *English Cyclop.* s.v. As a historian, Procopius took Herodotus for his pattern, and even resembles his master's fatalism in the material conception of history. Procopius assumes the *role* of a sceptic, and as such regards himself as above all positive religion and dogmatic disputes. On account of the cold, unsympathetic manner in which he writes of Christianity, some have not believed him a Christian, but a deist, Jew, or even a heathen. He was, however, at least in outward confession, a Christian, as appears from his second work, **Περὶ Κτισμάτων**, *De Edificiis*, which contains a history of all churches, convents, and other public buildings reared under Justinian at the public expense in the Roman empire. Another of his writings, entitled **Ἀνέκδοτα**, or *Secret History*, in thirty chapters, is a sort of complement to the books *De Bellis*. Justinian and Theodora are here painted in the darkest colors. Procopius says that he wrote it because in his first work he could not, through fear of torture and death, speak of living persons as they deserved. Some grossly obscene passages concerning Theodora, who was evidently a very bad woman, have been expunged in most editions. There seems little doubt that Procopius is the author of the work. The Paris edition of Procopius, already quoted, is enriched with copious historical notes, prefaces, and an index. The works of Procopius, with valuable notes, are included in the Bonn edition of the Byzantine historians (1833-38, 3 vols. 8vo), which is, of course, the best. See Fabricius, *Bibl. Graeca*, 7:555 sq.; Hanke, *De Scriptor. Byz.* p. 145 sq.; Tueffel, in Schmidt's *All geem. Zeitschrift fur Gesch.* 8:38-79; Herzog, *Real-Encyclop.* s.v.; Smith, *Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog. and Mythol.* s.v.; Piper, *Mon. Theol.* § 204; Dahn, *Procopius v. Ccesarea* (Berl. 1865).

## Procopius

OF GAZA, a very respectable Greek sophist of the 6th century, and the first who suffered martyrdom in Palestine, under the reign of Diocletian. The precise time of his birth or death is not recorded. He wrote commentaries on the Octotueuch (ed. C. Clauser, Tigur. 1555, fol.), the books of Kings, the Chronicles (ed. J. Meursius, Lugd. Bat. 1620, 4to), Isaiah (ed. J.

Curterius, Paris, 1580, fol.), etc., and opened among the Greeks the list of the Catenic writers. See Mosheim, *Eccles. Hist.* (Index in vol. 3); Alzog, *Patrologie*, § 76.

### Procopius, Friedrich P.

a Roman Catholic monastic noted especially for his valuable contributions to Christian song, was born in the year 1608, of Protestant parents, at Templin, in Brandenburg. At a very early age he joined the Roman Catholic Church, and when eighteen years old he entered the Order of the Capuchins of the Austro-Bohemian province. Having completed his studies, he visited many cities as a preacher and missionary. He soon became known as a famous pulpit orator, but more so by his poetical productions, which gave him the name of "Catholic Meistersinger." Procopius (died at Linz in 1680. He wrote, *Der Gross Wunderthtigen Mutter Gottes Marite Hulf' Lob-Gesang* (Passow, 1659): — *Iertzen-Freud unid Seelen- Trost* (ibid. 1660, 1661): — *Mariale Concizanatorium rythmo-nelodicum* (2d ed. Salzburg, 1667), a collection of sermons on St. Mary: — *Triemale Donminicale primum* (ibid. 1676), sermons for the Christian year: — *Catechismale* (ibid. 1674). Comp. Bernardus a Bononia, *Bibliotheca Script. Capucinatorum*, p. 217-219; Brihl, *Geschichte der Literatur des Kathol. Deutschlands*, p. 20 sq.; Kehrein, *Geschichte der Kathol. Kanzelberedsamkeit der Deutsche* (Regensburg, 1843), vol. i, § 36; Schletterer, *Uebersichtliche Darstellung der Geschichte der kirchliche Dichtung . geistlichen Musik* (Nordlingen, 1866), p. 217 sq.; and the notice of the latter work in Hauck's *Theolog. Jahresbericht*, ii, 1866, p. 191 sq. (B. P.)

### Procopovitsch

SEE PROKOPOVITCH.

### Procrastination

the postponement of a matter from one day to another; according to the maxim of the lazy and of the men of pleasure, "Seria in crastinum (diem or tempus)." Generally, in such cases, time wears on, and things are not done, at least not in the right time or in the right way: "Cras, eras et semper eras, et sic dilabitur setas." The system of procrastination, therefore, is to be commended in no respect; but least of all in moral, or, better, religious matters. Every day lost in our moral amendment is an irreparable loss, a

loss for eternity, as reformation becomes the more difficult the more it is delayed.

## Proctor

(formed by a contraction from the Latin *procurator*) designates an officer commissioned to take care of another person's cause in ecclesiastical courts, in the stead of the party whom he represents. It corresponds to attorney or solicitor in the other courts. In the Church of Rome there are extra-proctors, a class who settle in the name of another a legal business of no litigious character; a more accurate title is *mandatory*. The title of proctor has been preserved only in some kinds of procurations concerning ecclesiastical affairs. These proctors may act instead of,

1. *Bride and bridegroom* for the conclusion of the betrothal. For not only the acts which prepare the betrothal (*tractatus sponsaliti*), and the suit (*pactum de ineundis sponsalibus*), which, after its acceptation, takes the lawful nature of a betrothal, but the betrothal itself, or the actual contract about the future matrimony, can be performed by the parties either in person or by procuracy (*sponsalia per procuratorem*). Only the proctor must have special powers for the conclusion of a promise of marriage with a determined person (fr. 34, *Dig De Rit. Rupt.* 23:2).
2. *Either party at the marriage act itself (matrimonium per procuratorem)*. Should the powers given to the mandatory have been recalled before the copulation, the marriage-act would be void. even if the proctor at that time had no knowledge of the revocation. The mandatory must be present in person, and cannot be represented by a substitute (Sext. c. 9. *De Procur.* i, 19); and the bride and bridegroom thus united must afterwards give their consent in person. These dispositions of canon law are preserved in the Austrian and Bavarian legislation. Protestant matrimonial law rejects marriage by procuracy, but admits an exception in favor of royal persons.
3. *Godfathers and godmothers*, in baptisms or confirmation, may, if sick or otherwise prevented, choose third persons for their representatives at the holy ceremony (*procurator patrini*). As, according to the decision of the Council of Trent, the person to be baptized must have a godfather and a godmother (*unus et unca*), each of the parties .can make choice of a substitute, either male or female, but both mandataries cannot belong to the same sex. The real godfather, not his representative, contracts in this case

the *cognatio spiritualis*, and the prohibition of marriage founded on it (*Duclar. S. Conyr. Conc. Trid.* May 16, 1630, Aug. 23 and Sept. 1, 1721). 4. *Absent electors*, if they can sufficiently- justify their absence, and are prepared to swear to it (c. 42, § 1, 10, *De Elect.* i, 6), cannot declare their vote by writing, but may give their mandate to a colleague. Ecclesiastics are prohibited from being proctors in strictly secular affairs. In the English ecclesiastical constitution, proctors are those clergymen who are chosen in each diocese to represent their brethren in convocation.

In the universities the name refers to those officers who, as representatives of the whole body of masters of arts, maintain the discipline of the university. The proctors are chosen out of the several colleges by turn. The pro-proctors are the deputies of the proctors.

### Proctor, David C.,

a Presbyterian minister, was born in New Hampshire in 1792. He graduated at Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H., in 1818, studied divinity in the Andover Theological Seminary, Mass.. was licensed by a Congregational association, and in 1822 was ordained by a Congregational council, and went West under the auspices of the Connecticut Home Missionary Society. His first field of labor was Indianapolis, Ind.; subsequently he moved to Kentucky, and took charge of the Church in Springfield and Lebanon. In 1826 he was temporarily called to the presidency of Centre College, Danville, Ky., after which he was without charge for a number of years. He died Jan. 18, 1865. Mr. Proctor was an able preacher, and had considerable reputation as a scholar. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1866, p. 167. (J. L. S.)

### Procuration

Different meanings have been applied to this word. 1. An entertainment given to the archdeacon with provision for seven horses and six men. 2. An equivalent in money; according to Lyndwood, *7s. 6d.* to the archdeacon and *1s.* to each of the other six at his visitation, to commute for the provision or entertainment which was formerly expected to be provided at the time of visitation. 3. An entertainment made at a visitation for a bishop. In 1336 a money composition was permitted to be offered by pope Benedict XII, but only one procuration could be demanded if several churches were visited in one day. The amount varied in different countries.

In England an archbishop received 220 turons, a bishop 150, an archdeacon 50, and an archpriest or rural dean 10. *SEE SYNODAL.*

## Procurator

This word does not occur in the Vulgate or in the A.V., nor is its accurate Greek equivalent, ἐπίτροπος (though used by Philo, *Leg. ad Ceiium*, and by Josephus. *Ant.* 20:6, 2, 8, 5; comp. 20:5.; his office is called ἐπιτροπή [*ibid.* 20:5, 1]), found in this sense in the Greek Testament, where it is represented by the vaguer term ἡγεμών, rendered by our translators “governor” (ⲛⲓⲗⲏⲗ Luke 2:2; ⲛⲓⲗⲏⲗ Matthew 27:2; 28:14, etc.). Ἡγεμών also occurs in a perfectly general sense (ⲛⲓⲗⲏⲗ Matthew 10:18; ⲛⲓⲗⲏⲗ 1 Peter 2:14). In ⲛⲓⲗⲏⲗ Matthew 2:6 it is rendered “prince,” and corresponds to the Hebrew אֲלַי “Governor” in the A.V. is also used for ἐθνάρχης (ⲛⲓⲗⲏⲗ 2 Corinthians 11:32). Διοικητής is another Greek term for procurator. The word ἡγεμών, or procurator, is generally applied, both in the original and in our version, to the procurators of Judaea, Pontius Pilate (Matthew 27 etc.), Felix (Acts 23), and Festus (26:30); but it is also used of Cyrenius (Quirinus), who held the more responsible and distinguished office of *praeses* or *legatus Caesaris* over the province of Syria (ⲛⲓⲗⲏⲗ Luke 2:2). Procurators were chiefly despatched to the imperial, and not to the senatorial provinces. *SEE PROVINCE.* The revenues of the latter flowed into the merarium, or exchequer, while those of the former belonged to the fiscus, or privy purse. The *procuratore Caesaris* were specially intrusted with the interests of the fiscus, and therefore managed the various taxes and imposts, performing similar duties to those exercised by the quaestors in the provinces administered by the senate. Procurators were, however, sometimes sent as well as quaestors to the senatorial provinces (Tacit. *Ann.* 13:1; Dio Cass. 53:15); but these were doubtless offices of less dignity, though bearing the same title. *Procurator* is also used for steward (Plautus, *Pseud.* 2, 2, 14), attorney (Ulpian, *Dig.* 3, 3), regent (Cesar, *B. C.* 3, 112), etc. They were selected from among men who had been consuls or praetors, and sometimes from the inferior senators (Dio Cass. 53:13-15). They were attended by six lictors, used the military dress, and wore the sword (*ibid.* 13). No quaestor came into the emperor’s provinces, but the property and revenues of the imperial treasury were administered to the *rationales, procuratores, and actores* of the emperor, who were chosen from among his freedmen, or from among the knights (Tacit. *Hist.* v, 9; Dio Cass. 53:15). Sometimes the procurators were invested with the

dignity of *legati*, or *procuratores cum jure gladii* (τῆ ἐπὶ πάσιν ἔξουσίᾳ, Josephus, *War*, ii, 8, 1), and this was the case with the procurators of Judaea, which had been made a sub-province of Syria (προσθήκη τῆς Συρίας; id. *Ant.* 13:1, 1) since the deposition of the ethnarch Archelaus, A.D. 6. There is therefore no inaccuracy in the use of ἡγεμών in the New Test., since we find from inscriptions that praeses and procurator were often interchangeable (Gruter, p. 493, b). In one respect, indeed, the ἡγεμόνες were even more powerful than the proconsuls themselves (ἀνθύπατοι); for, being regarded as the immediate emissaries and representatives of the Caesar, by whom they were appointed to an indefinite tenure of office (Dio Cass. 53:13-15), they had the power of inflicting capital punishment at their own discretion (<sup>439D</sup>John 19:10; Josephus, *War*, ii, 8, 1). They also governed the province when the proconsul was dead or absent, “vice proconsilium,” as we see from many inscriptions (Murat. p. 907, 4, etc.). In a turbulent and seditious province like Judaea, their most frequent functions were of a military or judicial character. The first procurator was Coponius, who was sent out with Quirinus to take a census of the property of the Jews and to confiscate that of Archelaus (Josephus, *Ant.* 18:1, 1). His successor was Marcus Ambivitus, then Annius Rufus, in whose time the emperor Augustus died. Tiberius sent Valerius Gratus, who was procurator for eleven years, and was succeeded by Pontius Pilate (*ibid.* 2, 2), who is called by Josephus (*ibid.* 3, 1) ἡγεμών, as he is in the New Test. He was subject to the governor (*praeses*) of Syria, for the council of the Samaritans denounced Pilate to Vitellitus, who sent him to Rome and put one of his own friends, Marcellus, in his place (*ibid.* 4, 2). The headquarters of the procurator were at Cesarea (Josephus, *War*, ii, 9, 2; <sup>423B</sup>Acts 23:23), where he had a judgment-seat (25:6) in the audience-chamber (ver. 23), and was assisted by a council (ver. 12) whom he consulted in cases of difficulty, the *assessore*s (Sueton. *Gelb.* 14), or; ἡγεμόνες, who are mentioned by Josephus (*War*, ii, 16, 1) as having been consulted by Cestius, the governor of Syria, when certain charges were made against Florus, the procurator of Judaea. More important cases were laid before the emperor (<sup>425D</sup>Acts 25:12; comp. Josephus, *Ant.* 20:6, 2). The procurator, as the representative of the emperor, had the power of life and death over his subjects (Dio Cass. 53:14; <sup>417B</sup>Matthew 27:26), which was denied to the proconsul. In the New Test. we see the procurator only in his judicial capacity. Thus Christ is brought before Pontius Pilate as a political offender (<sup>417B</sup>Matthew 27:2, 11), and the accusation is heard by the procurator, who is seated on the



judgment-seat (ver. 19). Felix heard St. Paul's accusation and defence from the judgment-seat at Caesarea (Acts 24), which was in the open air in the great stadium (Josephus, *War*, 2, 9, 2), and St. Paul calls him "judge" (<sup><4241></sup>Acts 24:10), as if this term described his chief functions. The procurator (ἡγεμὼν) is again alluded to in his judicial capacity in <sup><4024></sup>1 Peter 2:14. He was attended by a cohort as body-guard (<sup><4077></sup>Matthew 27:27), and apparently went up to Jerusalem at the time of the high festivals, and there resided in the palace of Herod (Josephus, *War*. ii, 14, 3; Philo, *De Leg. ad Caiuz*, § 37, ii, 589, ed. Mang.), in which was the *pretorium*, or "judgment-hall," as it is rendered in the A.V. (<sup><4077></sup>Matthew 27:27; <sup><4156></sup>Mark 15:16; comp. <sup><4235></sup>Acts 23:35). Sometimes, it appears, Jerusalem was made his winter quarters (Josephus, *Ant*. 18:3, 1). The high-priest was appointed and removed at the will of the procurator (*ibid*. 2, 2). Of the oppression and extortion practiced by one of these officers, Gessius Florus, which resulted in open rebellion, we have an account in Josephus (*Ant*. 20:I, 1; *War*, ii, 14, 2). The same laws held both for the governors of the imperial and senatorial provinces, that they could not raise a levy or exact more than an appointed sum of money from their subjects, and that when their successors came they were to return to Rome within three months (Dio Cass. 53:15). The pomp and dignity of the procurators may be inferred from the narrative of these trials, and from the titles of "most excellent" and "most noble" (κράτιστε), applied to them by such different lips as those of Claudius Lysias, Tertullian, and St. Paul; yet they were usually chosen from no higher rank than that of the equites, or even the freedmen of the emperor; and the "most noble Felix," in particular, was a mere manumitted slave (Tacit. *Hist*. 5, 9; *Ann*. 12:54; Sueton. *Claud*. 28). It is satisfactory to find that even in the minutest details the glimpses of their position afforded to us by the New Test. are corroborated by the statements of heathen writers. The violence (<sup><4231></sup>Luke 13:1), the venality (<sup><4245></sup>Acts 24:26), the insolence (<sup><4362></sup>John 19:22), and the gross injustice (<sup><4247></sup>Acts 24:27), which we see exemplified in their conduct towards our Lord and his apostles, are amply illustrated by contemporary historians (Josephus, *Ant*. 18:3, 1; *War*, ii, 9; Cicero, *in Veterem*, passim); and they weighed so heavily on the mind of the emperor Trajan that he called the extortions of provincial governors "the spleen of the empire" (comp. Aurel. Vict. *Epist*. 42). Vespasian (*mnore suo*) took a more humorous view of the matter, and said that the procurators were like sponges (Sueton. *Vesp*. 16). The presence of the wives of Pilate (<sup><4279></sup>Matthew 27:19) and Felix (<sup><4245></sup>Acts 24:24) reminds us of the famous debate on the proposition of Caecina to

forbid the proconsuls and procurators to be accompanied by their wives (Tacit. *Ann.* 3, 33, 34). This had been the old and perhaps the wise regulation of earlier days, since the cruelty, ambition, and luxury of these ladies were often more formidable to the provincials than those of the governors themselves. But the rule had often been violated, and had of late been deliberately abandoned. We see, too, in the ready handing-over of the prisoner from one authority to another (ἀνέπεμψεν, *remisit*, <sup><227></sup>Luke 23:7; <sup><485></sup>Acts 26:32), some trace of that salutary dread of being denounced after their term of office was over, which alone acted as a check upon the lawlessness of even the most unscrupulous governors. Even the mention made of things at first sight so trivial as the tribunal (βῆμα), and the tessellated pavement (λιθόστρωτον) on which it was elevated, derives an interest and importance from the fact that they were conventional symbols of wealth and dignity, and that Julius Caesar thought it worth while to carry one about with him from place to place (Sueton. *Jul. c.* 46). See Sibranda, *De Statu Judaeae Provinc.* (Franc. 1698; also in Iken, *Theol. Nov.* ii, 529); Deyling, *Observat.* ii, 429; Grossmann, *De Procuratore* (Lips. 1823); Langen, in the *Theol. Quartalschr.* (1862) iii; *Bible Educator*, 3, 180. **SEE GOVERNOR.**

### Prodicians

a body of Antinomian Gnostic heretics, took their name from their founder, Prodicus, a heretic of the 2d century, who instituted the sect of the Adamites. Prodicus maintained that he and his followers were the sons of the most high God, a royal race (εὐγενεῖς), and therefore, in crazy self-conceit, thought themselves bound by no laws. They rejected the Sabbath; dispensed with prayer and all ordinances of external worship, which they considered to be necessary only for those who were under the power of the Demiurge. They indulged in open profligacy, calling themselves Adamites, because they professed to imitate the condition of bodily life which marked our first parents before their fall. Their maxim was that they were restored by Christ to a state of innocence equal to that which characterized Adam before his transgression; and that, therefore, whenever they appeared together, they should not be ashamed to appear as Adam did in the time of his innocence. They were in the habit of appealing to the authority of certain apocryphal books which were attributed to Zoroaster. Prodicus is placed by Baronius in A.D. 120, before Valentinus. His followers are sometimes identified with the *Adamites*, and sometimes with the *Origenists*. See Clement Alex. *Strom.* i, 304; 3, 438; 7:722; Theodoret,

*Fab. Hoeret.* i. 6; Farrar, *Ecclesiastes Dict.* s.v.; Neander, *Church Hist.* i, 451.

## Prodicus

(1), an Athenian philosopher of the school of the Sophists, was a contemporary of Socrates, and forerunner of the latter in the domain of philosophy, inasmuch as he prepared the way for the logical and ethical efforts of Socrates. Prodicus was a native of Sulis, in the island of Ceos. He went frequently to Athens for the purpose of transacting business on behalf of his native city, and even attracted admiration in the senate as an orator (Plato, *Hipp. Maj.* p. 282; comp. Philost. *Vit. Soph.* i, 12), although his voice was deep and apt to fall (Plato, *Protag.* p. 316, a; Philost. *l.c.*). Plutarch describes him as slender and weak (Plut. *an seni ger. sit Resp.* c. 15); and Plato speaks of a degree of effeminacy which resulted therefrom (*Protag.* p. 315, d). Philostratus is the first who taxes him with luxury and avarice (*l.c.*; comp. Welcker, *Kleine Schriften*, ii, 513, etc.). In the *Protagoras* of Plato, which points to the eighty-seventh Olympiad (any more exact determination is disputable) as the time at which the dialogue is supposed to take place, Prodicus is mentioned as having previously arrived in Athens. Still later, when Isocrates (born 01. 86, 1) is mentioned as his disciple (see Welcker, *Prodikos von Keos, Vorgaenger des Socrates*, published first in the *Rheinisches Museum der Philologie*, von Welcker and Nake, i, 1-39, 533-545, afterwards in Welcker's *Kleine Schriften*, ii, 392-541), and in the year of the death of Socrates, Prodicus was still living (Plato, *Apol.* p. 19, c). The dates of his birth and death cannot be determined. The statement of Suidas (s.v.; comp. Schol. on Plato *De Rep.* 10:600, c) that he was condemned to the hemlock cup as a corrupter of the youth in Athens sounds very suspicious (comp. Welcker, p. 582). According to the statement of Philostratus (p. 483 — comp. p. 496, ed. Olearius), on which little more reliance can be placed, he delivered his lecture on virtue and vice in Thebes and Sparta also. The *Apology* of Plato unites him with Gorgias and Hippias in the statement that into whatever city they might come, they were competent to instruct the youth. Lucian (*Vit. Herod.* c. 3) mentions him among those who had held lectures at Olympia. In the dialogues of Plato he is mentioned or introduced, not indeed without irony, though, as compared with the other Sophists, with a certain degree of esteem (*Hipp. Maj.* p. 282; *Thoet.* p. 151, b; *Phaedo*, 60; *Protag.* p. 341, a; *Charmid.* p. 163, d; *Meno*, p. 96; *Cratyl.* p. 384, b; *Symp.* p. 177; *Euthyd.* p. 305). Aristophanes, in the *Clouds* (1. 360), deals

more indulgently with him than with Socrates; and the Xenophonic Socrates, for the purpose of combating the voluptuousness of Aristippus, borrows from the book of the wise Prodicus (Πρόδ. ὁ σοφός) the story of the choice of Hercules (*Memor.* ii, 1, § 21, etc.). This separation of Prodicus from the other Sophists has been pointed out by Welcker in the above-quoted treatise (p. 400, etc.). Like Protagoras and others, Prodicus delivered lectures in return for the payment of contributions (ἐπιδείκνυται — *Xenoph. Meme.* ii, 1, § 21; comp. *Philost.* p. 482; *Diog. Laert.* 9:50; ἤρρανίζοντο-τιμῆ, *Plato, Prot.* 314, b) of from half a drachma to fifty drachms, probably according as the hearers limited themselves to a single lecture, or entered into an agreement for a more complete course (*Axrich.* 6; *Cratyl.* p. 384, b; *Aristot. Rhet.* 3, 14, § 9; *Suid.* s.v.; comp. *Welcker*, p. 414). Prodicus is said to have amassed a great amount of money (*Hipp. Me(j.* p. 282, d; *Xenoph. Symp.* 4:62; i, 5; on the practice of paying for instruction and lectures, comp. again *Welcker*, *l.c.* p. 412, etc.).

As Prodicus and others maintained with regard to themselves that they stood equally on the confines of philosophy and politics (*Euthyd.* p. 305, c), so Plato represents his instructions as chiefly ethical (*Meno*, p. 96, d; comp. *De Rep.* 10:p. 600, e), and gives the preference to his distinction of ideas — as of those of courage, rashness, boldness — over similar attempts of other Sophists (*Lach.* p. 197. c). What pertained to this point was probably only contained in individual show-orations (*Biog. Laert.*, *Philost.* 11. cc.), which he usually declined (*Philost.* p. 482). Though known to Callimachus, they do not appear to have been much longer preserved (*Welcker*, p. 465, etc.). In contrast with Gorgias and others, who boasted of possessing the art of making the small appear great, the great small, and of expatiating in long or short speeches, Prodicus required that the speech should be neither long nor short, but of the proper measure (*Plato, Phaed.* p. 267, a; comp. *Gorg.* p. 449, c; *Prot.* p. 334, e, 335, b, 338, d; *Aristot. Rhet.* 3, 17), and it is only as associated with other Sophists that he is charged with endeavoring to make the weaker cause strong by means of his rhetoric (*Cicero, Brut.* c. 8). He paid especial attention to the correct use of words (*Plato, Euthyd.* p. 187, e; *Cratyl.* p. 384, b; comp. *Galen, In Hippocr. de Articul.* 4:p. 461, 1), and the distinction of expressions related in sense (*Lach.* p. 197, d; *Prot.* p. 340, a, 341, a; *Charmid.* p. 163, d; *Meno*, p. 75, c; comp. *Themist. Orat.* 4:p. 113). But he deserves greater remembrance for his parenetical discourses on moral subjects, among

which one of the best known is *Hercules at the Cross Roads* (Philost. p. 496; Xenophon, *Mem.* ii, 1, § 21, only quotes the σύγγραμμα περὶ τοῦ Ἡρακλέους). It was entitled Ωραι (Suid. s.v. Ωραι and Πρόδ).; Schol. ad Aristoph. *Nub.* 1.360. Respecting the different explanations of this title, see Welcker, p. 466, etc., who refers it to the youthful bloom of Hercules). To Hercules, as he was on the point, at his entrance on the age of youth, of deciding for one of the two paths of life — that of virtue and that of vice — there appear two women, the one of dignified beauty, adorned with purity, modesty, and discretion, the other of a voluptuous form and meretricious look and dress. The latter promises to lead him by the shortest road, without any toil, to the enjoyment of every pleasure. The other, while she reminds him of his progenitors and his noble nature, does not conceal from him that the gods have not granted what is really beautiful and good apart from trouble and careful striving. The one seeks to deter him from the path of virtue by urging the difficulty of it; the other calls attention to the unnatural character of enjoyment which anticipates the need of it, its want of the highest joy, that arising from noble deeds, and the consequences of a life of voluptuousness, and how she herself, honored by gods and men, leads to all noble works, and to true well-being in all circumstances of life. Hercules decides for virtue. This outline in Xenophon probably represents, in a very abbreviated form, and with the omission of all collateral references, the leading ideas of the original, of which no fragments remain (comp. Welcker, p. 469, etc., who also shows that the amplifications in Dio Chysostomus and Themistius belong to these rhetoricians, and are not derived from the *Horce* of Prodicus, p. 488, etc. Respecting the numerous imitations of this narrative in poets, philosophers, rhetoricians, and in works of art, see, in like manner, Welcker, p. 467, etc.). In another speech, which treated of riches, and the substance of which is reproduced in the dialogue *Eryxias*, Prodicus undertook to show that the value of external goods depends simply upon the use which is made of them, and that virtue must be learned. (Welcker endeavors to point out the coincidence of the former doctrine with that of Socrates and Antisthenes, p. 493, etc.) Similar sentiments were expressed in Prodicus's *Praise of Agriculture* (Themist. *Orat.* 30, p. 349; comp. Weicker, p. 496, etc.). His views respecting the worthlessness of earthly life in different ages and callings, and how we must long after freedom from connection with the body in the heavenly and cognate eather, are found represented in the dialogue *Axiochus*, from a lecture by Prodicus; as also his doctrine that death is not to be feared, as it affects neither the living nor the departed

(comp. Stob. *Serm.* 20:35). Whether the appended arguments for immortality are borrowed from him, as Welcker (p. 500) endeavors to show, is doubtful. The gods he regarded as personifications of the sun, moon, rivers, fountains, and whatever else contributes to the comfort of our life (Sext. *Emp. Adv. Math.* i, 52; Cicero, *De Nat. Deor.* i, 42), and he is therefore, though hastily, charged with atheism (ibid. 55). Prodicus declared death to be desirable as an escape from the evils of life. His moral consciousness therefore certainly lacked philosophical basis and depth. See, besides the authorities already quoted, Hummel, *De Prodicō Sophista* (Leyden, 1847); Cougny, *De Prodicō Ceio, Socratis magistro* (Paris, 1858); Diemer, *De Prod. Ceio* (Corbach, 1859); Kramer, *Die Allegorie des Prodikos u. der Traunt des Lukianos*, in the *Neue Jahrbücher Juir Phil. u. Padagogik*, 94 (1866), 439-443; Blass, *Die alte Beredsanzkeit* (Leips. 1868), p. 29 sq.; Ueberweg, *Hist. of Philosophy*, i, 78; Smith, *Dict. of Greek and Roman Biog. and Mythol.* s.v.

## Prodicus

(2). *SEE PRODICIANS.*

## Prodigies

Wonderful appearances which were supposed among the ancient heathens to be taken some impending misfortune or calamity. These being regarded as marks of the anger of the gods, they were considered as calling for prayers and sacrifices. Whenever prodigies were seen, the pontifices, or priests, proceeded to perform certain public rites by way of expiation. The fall of meteoric stones was accounted a prodigy, and almost all the others might be explained by peculiar natural phenomena which in those ancient times were not understood.

## Prodyrna

(or *Pradymnea* or *Pradyumna*) was, in the Indian mythology, an avatar of Kama (q.v.), the love-god.

## Proedri

(*πρόεδροι*, Lat. *presides, pcesidentes*) is one of the titles which were given in the ancient Church to the bishops, and was used in close connection with the word *πρεσβύτερος*. *SEE PRESBYTER.* It is derived from the *προεδρία*, the elevated seat which the bishop occupied in the

synod and in the religious assemblies of the people. See Coleman, *Ancient Christianity Exemplified* (Phila. 1856, 8vo), p. 131, and the references quoted on p. 601; Siegel, *Christliche Alterthümer* (see Index in vol. 4); Riddle, *Christ. Antiquities*, p. 211.

## Proedrosia

sacrifices, or, as some allege, a festival offered to Demeter or Ceres at seed-time, with the view of securing a bountiful harvest. — Gardner, *Faiths of the World*, s.v.

## Proestos

(προεστῶς), one of the names by which the early Church distinguished the teachers or preachers from the “brethren” (<sup><54517></sup>1 Timothy 5:17). Justin Martyr uses the term as synonymous with ἱεράρχης, when he speaks of the προεστῶς as the person whose duty it is to consecrate the elements in the administration of the Lord’s Supper (*Apoloq.* 2, 67), a duty subsequently performed only by the bishop except in his absence. (Pepin’s decree, A.D. 755, is as follows: “Nullus presbyter praesumat missas celebrare sine jussione episcopi in cujus parochia est.” The Council of Arles laid similar restrictions upon deacons [canon 15].) The title *Proestos* was translated into Latin by *Praepositus*, whence the English word *Provost* (q.v.). See Coleman, *Ancient Christianity Exemplified*, p. 102 et al.; Siegel, *Christ. Alterthümer* (see Index in vol. iv); Riddle, *Christ. Antiquities*, p. 211.

## Profane

(<sup><212></sup>ānj ; *chandph*, <sup><2231></sup>Jeremiah 23:11; <sup><2216></sup>βέβηλος, <sup><2216></sup>Hebrews 12:16). To profane is to put holy things to vile or common uses; as the money-changers did the Temple, by converting a part of it into a place of business (<sup><212></sup>Matthew 21:12), and as those do who allow secular occupations to engross any part of the Sabbath under the old, or of the Lord’s day under the new dispensation (<sup><2108></sup>Exodus 20:8-10). Esau, for despising his birthright and its privileges, is styled by the apostle “a profane person” (<sup><2216></sup>Hebrews 12:16). The term is also used in opposition to holy. Thus the general history of ancient nations is styled profane, as distinguished from that contained in the Bible; profane writings are such as have been composed by heathens, in contradistinction from the sacred books of Scripture, and the writings of Christian authors on sacred subjects.

## Professio Fidei, Tridentinae

is the form of the Roman Catholic profession of faith in which it took shape at the Council of Trent and in which it was afterwards published by pope Pius IV, so that it is sometimes called the *Creed of Pius IV* (q.v.). The general Christian confession of faith had been renewed in the third session of the Council of Trent on Feb. 3, 1546 (*decretum de symbolofidei*), but there was need of something for general use in the Church at large, so that all its members might become obligated to the Church and its teachings, not only for their own faithfulness, but for their arrayal against heretics. Hence Pius IV in 1556 ordered to be prepared a *Formulae Christianae et Catholicæ Fidei*, and on Sept. 4, 1560, presented it for consideration to the cardinal college. In 1564 it was finally promulgated, and persons on becoming members of the Church of Rome are expected to recite the creed. This profession of faith runs as follows:

“I most steadfastly admit and embrace apostolical and ecclesiastical traditions; and all other observances and constitutions of the same Church.

“I also admit the holy Scriptures, according to that sense which our holy mother the Church has held and does hold, to which it belongs to judge of the true sense and interpretation of the Scriptures: neither will I ever take and interpret them otherwise than according to the unanimous consent of the fathers.

“I also profess that there are truly and properly seven sacraments of the new law, instituted by Jesus Christ our Lord, and necessary for the salvation of mankind, though not all for every one-to wit: baptism, confirmation, the Eucharist, penance,\* extreme unction, holy orders,† and matrimony: and that they confer grace; and that of these, baptism, confirmation, and order cannot be reiterated without sacrilege. I also receive and admit. the received and approved ceremonies of the Catholic Church, used in the solemn administration of the aforesaid sacraments.

“I embrace and receive all and every one of the things which have been defined and declared in the holy Council of Trent concerning original sin and justification.



“I profess, likewise, that in the mass there is offered to God a true, proper, and propitiatory sacrifice for the living and the dead; and that in the most holy sacrament of the Eucharist there is truly, really, and substantially the body and blood, together with the soul and divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ: and that there is made a change of the whole substance of the bread into the body, and of the whole substance of the wine into the blood, which change the Catholic Church calls *transubstantiation*. I also confess that under either kind alone Christ is received whole and entire, and a true sacrament.

“I firmly hold that there is a *purgatory*, and that the souls therein detained are helped by the suffrages of the faithful.

“Likewise, that the saints reigning with Christ are to be honored and invoked, and that they offer up prayers to God for us; and that their relics are to be had in veneration.

“I most firmly assert that the images of Christ, of the mother of God, and also of other saints, ought to be had and retained, and that due honor and veneration are to be given them.

“I also affirm that the power of indulgences was left by Christ in the Church, and that the use of them is most wholesome to Christian people.

“I acknowledge the holy Catholic Apostolic Roman Church for the mother and mistress of all churches; and I promise true obedience to the bishop of Rome, successor to St. Peter, prince of the apostles, and vicar of Jesus Christ.”

Then follow clauses condemnatory of all contrary doctrines, and expressive of adhesion to all the definitions of the Council of Trent.

It is obvious that the *Confessio Fidei Tridentinae* was framed in accordance to the decrees of that council, and has chiefly in view the opinions of those who followed the Reformation. See Mihler, *Symbolics*; Kollner, *Die Symbolik der romischen Kirche*, p. 141 sq.; Schaff, *Creeeds of Christendom* (see Index in vol. iii); Fisher, *Hist. of the Reformation*, p. 402.

\* Under penance is included confession, as the Catholic sacrament of penance consists of three parts — contrition or sorrow, confession, and satisfaction.

† The clerical orders of the Catholic Church are divided into two classes, *sacred* and *minor* orders. The first consists of subdeacons, deacons, and priests, who are bound to celibacy, and the daily recitation of the *Breviary*, or collection of psalms and prayers, occupying a considerable time. The minor orders are four in number, and are preceded by the *tonsure*, an ecclesiastical ceremony in which the hair is shorn, initiatory to the ecclesiastical state.

## Profession

Among the ceremonies of baptism in the early Church, one of great importance was the profession of faith and vow of obedience. The catechumens first renounced the devil, and then professed to live in obedience to the laws of Christ. *SEE PACTUM.*

Christians are required to make a profession of their faith —

**1**, boldly (<sup><6016></sup>Romans 1:16);

**2**, explicitly (<sup><41516></sup>Matthew 5:16); **3**, constantly (<sup><38023></sup>Hebrews 10:23); **4**, yet not ostentatiously, but with humility and meekness.

Among the Romanists, *profession* denotes the entering into a religious order, whereby a person offers himself to God by a vow of inviolably observing obedience, chastity, and poverty.

## Professor

a term commonly used in the religious world to denote any person who makes an open acknowledgment of the religion of Christ, or who outwardly manifests his attachment to Christianity. All real Christians are professors, but all professors are not real Christians. In this, as in all other things of worth and importance, we find counterfeits. There are many who become professors, not from principle, from investigation, from love to the truth, but from interested motives; prejudice of education, custom, influence of connections, novelty, etc., as Saul, Jehu, Judas, Demas, the foolish virgins, etc. *SEE CHRISTIAN.*

## Profesti Dies

Days without any special service, in distinction from solemn or officiating days, which include stations, litanies, fasts, and feast-days or festivals.

## Profiat Duran

whose Jewish name was *Isaac ben Moses* (surnamed *Ephodeus* from his principal work **רמב"א חק"מ**), is noted as a gifted poet, philosopher, and astronomer. He flourished between 1360 and 1412. In the bitter persecution of 1391 he was driven outwardly to embrace Christianity to save his life. In order to throw off the mask of a religion which in the name of love nearly exterminated all his co-religionists, Protiat and a friend, who had become an apostate for like reasons, concluded to go to Palestine to confess Judaism. Profiat Duran left first and went to a seaplace in the south of France, awaiting the arrival of his friend. Meanwhile Ben-Giorno met with Paul of Burgos (q.v.), who persuaded him to remain steadfastly in his Christian faith. Ben-Giorno wrote a letter to Duran in full praise of the bishop of Burgos, expounding his religious belief and exhorting him at the same time to be also true to Christianity. This imbittered Duran not only against his friend, but especially against the bishop of Burgos, and he answered in a polemical epistle, full of bitter sarcasm and irony, entitled **יח"א איתב"א** (*Be not like thy Fathers*), called by Christians *Alteca Boteca*, who, misunderstanding its purpose, took it as a defence of Christianity, while in reality aimed against it. The whole letter was equivocal. It was believed at first reading that it was an exhortation to stand fast in the religion he had embraced, but the mystery was easily discovered, and it appeared by an attentive consideration that Duran meant to oblige his friend to return to Judaism. This celebrated work was first published at Constantinople in 1577 in a collection of other treatises. It was then republished by A. Gunzburg in the collection **מ"יך וכו' /ב"ק** (Breslau, 1844). Geiger published a German translation in his *Wissenscha (J/iche Zeitschrift*, 4:452-458 (Stuttgard, 1839), and an English translation was published in the *Jewish Messenger* (N. Y. Sept. 12, 1873). Besides, Duran wrote **מ"יג"ח תמ"ל כ** (*The Reproach of the Gentiles*), in 12 chapters, which has not as yet been published. An extract of it, as well as the contents of the chapters, is given in the *Catalogue* of Michael's Library, p. 364, 365 (Hamb. 1848) 1: — **ד"א חק"מ** (*The Work of Ephod*), a Hebrew grammar, divided into 32 chapters, with an interesting and

elaborate introduction. Endowed with remarkable grammatical tact, he was the first to demonstrate the reflexive or reciprocal instead of the passive meaning of Niphal. His important grammar, which he finished in 1403, of which fragments are printed in the notes to Goldberg's edition of Ibn-Ganach's (q.v.) *Sepher Harikmah* (Frankfort-on-the-Main, 1856); in Filipowski's edition of Menachem Ibn-Saruk's *Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon*, p. 76 (Lond. 1854), and by Jacob C. Chajim in his *Introduction to the Rabbinic Bible*, p. 42, 43 (ed. Ginsburg, Lond. 1865), has lately been published by Dr. Jonath. Friedlander and J. Kohn, with an introduction, notes, and elucidations (Vienna, 1865): a *Commentary* on two sections of Ibn-Ezra's commentary on the Pentateuch (De Rossi, No. 835): — a *Commentary* on Ibn-Ezra's enigma on the quiescent letters: — *Comment on The Guide of the Perplexed*: — and **bcj dpah** on astronomy, in 29 chapters. See First, *Bibl. Jud.* i, 215; Steinschneider. *Catalogus Librorum Hebr. in Biblioth. Bodlej.* col. 2112-2119; De Rossi, *Dizionario Storico degli Autori Ebrei*, p. 260 sq. (Germ. trans. by Hamberger); Ginsburg in Kitto's *Cyclop.* s.v.; Grhztz, *Gesch. der Juden*, 8:94, 403, etc. (Leips. 1864, p. 8689; *ibid.* 1875, p. 381 sq.); Basnage, *Histoire des Juifs*, p. 690 (Taylor's transl.); Lindo, *History of the Jews*, p. 195; Finn, *Sephardim*, p. 386; Kalisch, *Hebrew Grammar*, ii, 31; Geiger, *Judische Zeitschrift* (1866), p. 212; Steinschneider, *Jewish Literature*, p. 127, 137 sq.; Etheridge, *Introduction to Hebrew Literature*, p. 268; Jost, *Gesch. des Judenth. u. s. Sekten*, 3, 100; Gronemann. *De Profiatii Durani (Efodali) vita ac studiis cum in alias literas turn in grammaticam collatis* (Breslau, 1869). (B. P.)

### Profitt, George Marion,

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, was born in Yancey County, N. C., about 1835. He professed religion and joined the Church in 1849. He was admitted into the Holston Conference in 1858. His first appointment was to the Cleveland circuit as junior preacher; his second year was spent on Spencer mission; his third, on Sulphur Springs circuit; his fourth, on Newport circuit. His health having failed, he went to Florida where he died on Sunday, June 5, 1864. He led an exemplary and pious life.

## Prognosticator

The phrase “monthly prognosticators” occurs in the A.V. as a rendering of *מַיְלָדָא מַיְבָאֵי* 1, *making known as to the months*, in <sup>24713</sup>Isaiah 47:13, where the prophet is enumerating the astrological superstitions of the Chaldaeans. It is known that the Chaldaean astrologers professed to divine future events by the positions, aspects, and appearances of the stars, which they regarded as having great influence on the affairs of men and kingdoms; and it would seem, from the present text, that they put forth accounts of the events which might be expected to occur from month to month, like our old almanac-makers. Some carry the analogy further, and suppose that they also gave monthly tables of the weather; but such prognostications are only cared for in climates where the weather is uncertain and variable; while in Chaldea, where (as we know from actual experience) the seasons are remarkably regular in their duration and recurrence, and where variations of the usual course of the weather are all but unknown, no prognosticator would gain much honor by foretelling what every peasant knows. *SEE ASTROLOGY; SEE DIVINATION.*

## Pro-Hegoumenos

the ex-superior of a Greek convent who has completed his term of office, which is two years, and retires divested of nothing but his authority. — Gardner, *Faiths of the World*, s.v.

## Prohle, Heinrich Andreas,

Dr., a Lutheran minister, who died April 19, 1875, at Hornhausen, near Oschersleben, in Germany, is best known by his writings in the department of homiletics, liturgy, and poedagogics. He published, *Malteritalien zu Homilien isn katechetischer Form* (Halberstadt, 1846): — *Die körperliche, christliche und bürgerliche Schulerziehung* (Magdeburg, 1846): — *Leitfcden bei demn KonfirmandenUnterrichte, mit einemn Vorworte von Clans iHarms* (q.v.) (Halberstadt, 1851): *Litourgischer Festring* (Wernigerode, 1856): — *Predigt-Entwuii fe iiber die Evanqelien tt. Episteln*, etc. (ibid. 1856): — *Das Ialberstadtische Kichen- und Haus-Gesangbuch in seiner erneueten Gestalt* (Oschersleben, 1856): — *Kirchliche Sitten. Ein Bild aus demn Leben evangelischer Gemneinen* (Berlin, 1858). This latter work is the most important of his writings. See

Zuchold. *Bibliotheca Theologica*, 3, 1015; *Liternarischer Handweiser* (1875), p. 222; Hauck, *Theol. Jahresbericht* (1866), ii, 734. (B. P.)

### Proistameni

(προιστάμενοι) is only another title which was given to the preacher of the early Church. *SEE PROESTOS*.

### Prokimenon

(προκειμένον, *something that lies before*) is, in the Greek liturgy, the short anthem pronounced previous to the reading of the epistle from the Holy Scriptures. consisting of verse and response usually taken from the Psalms. The purpose is to give a hint as to the way in which the day ought to be celebrated. Such phrases are, for instance, "Praise ye the Lord." "Give ear to my prayer, O Lord," "Thy mercy, O Lord," "God help me through thy name," "My help comes from the Lord," "O Lord, thou art my protector." Previous to the calling-out of the *prokimenon* the deacon exclaims, "Let us listen!" — Wetzler u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* s.v.

### Prokopovitch, Teophan

a Russian prelate of great renown, especially as a pulpit orator, and therefore called the Chrysostom of the Russo-Greek Church, was born at Kief June 8, 1681. Baptized *Eleazar*, he exchanged it for *Elisha*, with the dress of St. Basil, in a United Greek monastery of that order in Lithuania. He was sent to Rome to finish his studies, and there had remained three years when he suddenly removed, by force of circumstances not known, and went to Potcherif, in Volhynia, where he renounced his faith, and was transferred, under the new name of *father Samuel*, to the chair of rhetoric in the Academy of Kief. When Peter I passed through the city, after the victory at Pultava, the duty of complimenting him was confided to Prokopovitch. He accompanied the czar in his unlucky campaign on the Pruth, and was made abbot of the monastery of Kief. In 1715 he was promoted to the seat of Pskopf, although he avowed that he had expressed heretical doctrines at the court and in his writings. The doctors of the Sorbonne, wishing to profit by the visit Peter I had paid to them in 1717, attempted to enter into friendly relations with the Russian Church. Appointed to reply to their address to the czar, Prokopovitch frustrated this attempt; and, yielding himself to all the views of the despot, he composed an ecclesiastical constitution which made of the Church a civil

institution, and the clergy servants employed by the State — a condition which remains unaltered in the Russian Church to this day. He also, at the emperor's instigation, consented to the sequestration of the Church domains, and apportioned to the clergy a share of the income proportionate to their several ranks. He received from Catharine, whom he had crowned empress, the presidency of the synod and the archbishopric of Novgorod, founded by Theodosius. Prokopovitch crowned Peter II, whose right to the throne he had attacked in a work condemned by a ukase of July 26, 1727, by the then empress Anna, and encouraged the latter to commit in 1730 the stroke of policy from the effects of which Russia yet suffers the most deplorable consequences. He died at St. Petersburg Sept. 8, 1736. He left a great number of panegyrics and expositions of all sorts, some in impure Russian, some in Latin Oustrailif admits that the works of this prelate were specimens of the basest adulation. — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, s.v. See Tchistovitch, *Theophane Prokopovitch et Theophilacte Lopatinski* (St. Petersburg. 1861); Otto, *Russ. Litt. s.v.*; *Meth. Quar. Rev.* July, 1873, p. 499.

### Prolocutor

the chairman or president of convocation in England. *SEE CONVOCATION.*

### Promater

*SEE SPONSOR.*

### Promise

(some form of *rmā*; *to say*, or *rbD*; *to speak*; ἐπαγγελία) is a solemn asseveration, by which one pledges his veracity that he will perform, or cause to be performed, for the benefit of another, the thing which he mentions. A promise, in the scriptural sense of the term, is a declaration or assurance of the divine will, in which God signifies what particular blessings or good things he will freely bestow, as well as the evils which he will remove. Promises differ from the commands of God, inasmuch as the former are significations of the divine will concerning a duty enjoined to be performed, while the promises relate to mercy to be received. The “exceeding great and precious promises” are applicable to all believers; they appertain to the present and the future life (<sup><6004></sup>2 Peter 1:4). Some particular promises are predictions, as the promise of the Messiah, and the blessings of the Gospel (<sup><6013></sup>Romans 4:13. 14; Galatians 3, 14-29). Hence

the Hebrews were called the “children of the promise” (~~808~~Romans 9:8). So all the true believers in the Lord Jesus Christ are called “children” and “heirs of the promise” (~~800~~Galatians 4:20; ~~802~~Hebrews 6:12, 17). There are four classes of promises mentioned in the Scriptures, particularly in the New Test.:

- 1, promises relating to the Messiah;
- 2, promises relating to the Church;
- 3, promises of blessings, both temporal and spiritual, to the pious; and,
- 4, promises encouraging the exercise of the several graces and duties that compose the Christian character.

The first two of these classes, indeed, are many of them predictions as well as promises. *SEE PROPHECY*. The consideration of the others should prove.

- 1, an antidote to despair;
- 2, a motive to patience under affliction;
- 3, an incentive to perseverance in well-doing;
- 4, a call for prayer.

PROMISE is a solemn asseveration by which one pledges his veracity that he shall perform, or cause to be performed, the thing which he mentions. The obligation of promises arises from the necessity of the well-being and existence of society. “Virtue requires,” as Dr. Doddridge observes, “that promises be fulfilled. The promise, i.e. the person to whom the promise is made, acquires a property in virtue of the promise. The uncertainty of property would evidently be attended with great inconvenience. By failing to fulfil my promise, I either show that I was not sincere in making it, or that I have little constancy or resolution, and either way injure my character, and consequently my usefulness in life. Promises, however, are not binding,

- 1, if they were made by us before we came to such exercise of reason as to be fit to transact affairs of moment; or if by any distemper or sudden surprise we are deprived of the exercise of our reason at the time when the promise is made;
- 2, if the promise was made on a false presumption, in which the promiser, after the most diligent inquiry, was imposed upon, especially if he were deceived by the fraud of the promise;



**3**, if the thing itself be vicious, for virtue cannot require that vice should be committed;

**4**, if the accomplishment of the promise be so hard and intolerable that there is reason to believe that, had it been foreseen, it would not have been an accepted case;

**5**, if the promise be not accepted, or if it depend on conditions not performed.” But really this question concerning the *validity* and obligation of a promise given or obtained under false views is a matter that falls within the *Casuistry of Ethics* — a very uncertain ground. See Grotius, *De Jure*, lib. ii, cap. xi; Paley, *Moral Philosophy*, vol. i, ch. v; Grove, *Moral Philosophy*, vol. ii, ch. 12:p. 2; Watts, *Sermons*, ser. 20; Dymond, *Essays*; Verplanck, *On Contracts*. *SEE OBLIGATION*; *SEE PROBABILISM*.

### Promises Of God

are the kind declarations of his Word, in which he hath assured us he will bestow blessings upon his people. The promises contained in the sacred Scriptures may be considered,

- 1**, divine as to their origin;
- 2**, suitable as to their nature;
- 3**, abundant as to their number;
- 4**, clear as to their expression;
- 5**, certain as to their accomplishment.

The consideration of them should,

- 1**, prove an antidote to despair;
- 2**, a motive to patience;
- 3**, a call for prayer;
- 4**, a spur to perseverance.

See Clark, *On the Promises*; Buck, *Sermons*, ser. 11.

### Promissum

*SEE PACTUM*.

### Promotio per saltum

is, in the Church of Rome, the intentional disregard of the legal scale of the different orders. It is the collation or the obtention of a higher order by way

of skipping one or several other orders, which, according to rule, ought to precede. In consequence, he who has been ordained *per saltum* cannot perform the functions of the order thus unlawfully bestowed until the next inferior order has been subsequently obtained also (*c. un. Dist. 52*); this inferior degree the bishop can confer on him, and allow him at once to perform the duties of the higher degree (*Conc. Trid. sess. 23:c. 14, De Ref.*). But if the promoted ecclesiastic officiates according to the higher order thus *illicitly* conferred on him without the episcopal dispensation, he becomes irregular, and needs papal dispensation (*c. un. 10, De Cler. per salt. proma. v, 29*). The consecration of a bishop, with omission of the presbyterate, would not only be illicit, but utterly void (*Arg. c. 10, fit. 10, De excess. proel. v, 31*). — Wetzler u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lexikon*, s.v.

### Prompsault, Jean Henri Romain

a French ecclesiastical writer, was born April 7, 1798, at Montalembert. He was the eldest of twelve children. After he had finished his classical studies in the little seminary, he was received into the large seminary of Valence, and was admitted to the priesthood two years before the required age, Nov. 5, 1821. At first employed to do curate's duty in the office of his parish, he taught dogmatic theology in the great seminary of Valence, and ended in doing parochial duty. Having been appointed in 1827 to the chair of philosophy in the College of Tournon, he refused, without being authorized by his bishop, to take the oath required by the professors by the ordinance of 1828. and was deposed. At the end of 1829 he went to Paris, and was attached to M. de Croi, then head chaplain to the hospital of Quinze Vingt, in the capacity of chaplain. He saved that establishment from downfall in 1831. In this humble position the abbe Prompsault, although scrupulously fulfilling the obligations of priest and chaplain, had yet considerable time to give to study. He put aside the largest share of the receipts of his publications and of his literary pension to buy books, and he formed an ecclesiastical library of 25,000 volumes. He began his literary career by publishing a critical edition of the works of Villon in 1832, and in 1835 he published a criticism of an edition of French literature published by Crapelet. This last work engaged him in a lively controversy with Crapelet, in which he defended himself with a calm and witty sarcasm which was afterwards the characteristic of his polemical writings. He occupied himself for many years with the Latin and Romance languages. In 1837 he published many translations of ascetic works. His principal study was canon law and the civil and ecclesiastical jurisprudence of France. Himself

a thorough Gallican, he discarded the ultramontane tendencies of the French episcopacy, and advocated the liberties of the Gallican Church. In this spirit he attacked the encyclical of pope Pius IX, and brought such odium upon himself that he was led to retract much that he had uttered against ultra-Romanism, though at heart he always felt his first course to have been the true and proper one. His last years were imbittered by remorse, and he died Jan. 7, 1858, neglected by those for whom he had sacrificed his honor. Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, s.v. See *Christian Remembrancer*, 44, 340; Vapereau, *Dict. des Contemporains*, s.v.

### Promulgation Or Publication

i.e. proclamation — usually of a law by the competent legislative power — is, in the Church of Rome, an absolute condition of its binding character (“lex non promulgata non obligat,” c. i, 9; *Cod. De Legib.* i, 14). In consequence, an ecclesiastical law, like any civil law, in order to become obligatory *in foro externo* must be promulgated in the customary way by the competent authorities of the Church. The binding power of the law rests entirely on the will of the legislator publicly expressed, and begins at the very moment of the promulgation (“lex promulgata statim obligat,” c. 1. 10; *De post. proel.* 1, 5), unless some future period is expressly indicated when it shall be enforced (f. inst. *Sext.* c. 32; *De Preb.* 3, 4; *Conc. Trid.* sess. 24 c. 1, fin. *De Ref. Matrim.*). A law has generally no retroactive power (“lex non retro agit,” c. 2, 10; *De Constit.* i, 2), unless it be merely all explanation or reiteration of a former disposition, or unless retroactive power be expressly given to it. From the moment of the promulgation takes effect also the juridical presumption of the general knowledge of the law, which excludes every excuse of *igzorantia legis* (*Sext.* c. 13; *De R. T.* v, 13), unless the legislator subordinates the validity of the ordinance to the observation of a certain form of promulgation, and this form has not been observed. Every one whom the law may concern is bound to conform to it as soon as he has obtained, no matter by what means, a knowledge of it. The diocesan ordinances of archbishops and bishops are, as a rule, communicated to the deaconries, and through them, by circular letters, to the curates, etc., who publish them from the pulpit, or by placards at the church doors. The papal see used in former times to address its ordinances to the chief ecclesiastical dignitaries of the countries, provinces, or dioceses which they concerned, and had them communicated by them to the subordinate clerical authorities, for further publication, by way of synods and circular letters. Afterwards the custom prevailed of

publishing the general prescriptions of the papal see only at Rome, *in acie campi Florae*, and of posting them at the door of the Vatican. Thus the principle was adopted, *publicatio Urbi et Orbi*. which was acknowledged without contest until the 17th century. It was only after the times of De Marca (*De Concordia Sacerdotii et Imperii*, lib. ii, c. 15) and Van Espen (*De Promulgatione Legum Eccl.*, etc., Lovan. 1712) that the necessity of a more special promulgation was from many quarters insisted upon. But the passages of the Roman and canon law quoted to support these views are all of them misunderstood or purposely distorted (Seitz, *Zeitschrift für Kirchenrecht u. Pastoral-Tissenschaft*, vol. i, § 1, No. 5, p. 90 sq.). It must strike every one that a really universal publication, which would be sure not only to reach every individual, but to be intelligible to him, is utterly impossible, and could not be obtained even by inserting the law in all official and local papers. The binding power of the law cannot depend on that circumstance that it was really made known in all places and to every individual, but on this sole condition that the legislator have publicly expressed his will in the customary way. This act of the legislator must not be confounded with the means and ways that are resorted to in order to insure the widest publicity to the law promulgated by the legislative authority. The latter is no concern of the legislator, but of the executive authorities; and it is not the power of the law that depends on it, but this other and quite different question, to be decided by the judge. whether in a given concrete case transgression of the law may be charged or not. However, the different modern civil legislations insist on a special publication of the ecclesiastical statutes as a condition of their validity, and subordinate this publication to the previous approbation of the civil power. If the Church is content to submit to the worldly governments her ordinances, so far as they affect in some way the civil and political relations of her members, it would be only fair if such papal and episcopal decrees which concern exclusively the dogma and the dogmatic side of the discipline should be independent of the civil placet, and left to the clerical functionaries for free publication. — Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lexikon*, s.v.

### Pronaos

is the *ante-temple* of Greek churches, and corresponds to the *narthex* (q.v.).

## Prone

(*praeconium*) is the publication in the pulpit of banns of marriage, pastoral letters, coming fasts and feasts, and a sermon (the dominicale, or homily for Sunday) after the Gospel, in the Romish Church.

## Prono

an idol of the ancient Sclavonians, worshipped at Altenburg, in Germany. It was a statue erected on a column, holding in one hand a ploughshare, and in the other a spear and a standard. Its head was crowned, its ears prominent, and under one of its feet was suspended a little bell. Gerold, Christian bishop of Altenburg, destroyed this idol with his own hand, and cut down the grove in which it was worshipped.

## Pronuba

a surname of *Juno* (q.v.) among the Romans of antiquity, because she was the goddess who presided over marriage.

## Propaganda

is a name appropriate to any institution intended for the propagation of a doctrine, but it is especially applied in ecclesiastical language to an institution for the propagation of the Roman Catholic faith. The chief institution of this kind is at Rome, and it consists of a congregation and a college. Its full title is *De Propaganda Fide*, i.e. "concerning the propagation of the faith." Its object is to direct and forward the propagation of the Roman Catholic religion, especially among the heathen. Gregory XIII (1572-1584), one of the popes who exerted themselves most zealously for the expansion of the Christian faith, had directed that a number of cardinals should be intrusted with the direction of the Oriental missions, and caused catechisms and other religious books to be printed for the use of Oriental Christians. But as the resources required for such a purpose were wanting, the matter could not have its proper development. Pope Gregory XV, desirous that this good work, so well begun, should be continued, established, by a bull of June 22, 1622, a congregation of cardinals, under the name above mentioned, and intrusted to it the direction of the whole Catholic missionary system. Every month they assembled once in the Vatican, and twice at the residence of the eldest. Besides some stipends of less importance, the pope presented the new institution with the

500 ducats which at the death of a cardinal accrue to the pontifical treasure. His successor, Urban VIII (1623-1644), increased its privileges and income, and founded the *Seminarium* (or *Collegium*) *de Propaganda Fide*, to which young men from all nations are brought at an early age and gratuitously instructed and fitted out for the missionary work. This college was subordinated entirely to the Congregation, and a splendid palace was built for both institutions. Through the provident care of the popes, and pious foundations made by the cardinals and other benefactors, the seminary grew to a most flourishing condition; and even in our days, when the income and foundations which support it have been considerably diminished by the State, under the new order of things, it entertains, instructs, and trains for missionary life nearly 200 young men from all quarters of the world. The alumni pledge themselves to serve the Church among the heathen, and are consecrated to this function. All rites actually subsisting in the Catholic Church (besides the Latin rite, the Armenian, Greek-Melchitic, Syrian, Coptic, Maronitic, and Chaldaic rites) are represented in the seminary by alumni from the corresponding provinces, and present every year, at the feast of Epiphany (Jan. 6), an imposing spectacle, called the *Feast of the Languages*. This feast is celebrated by an exhibition of exceeding interest and curiosity, in which are delivered recitations in every language represented in the college or its missions, amounting often to fifty or sixty. Of this festival the celebrated cardinal Mezzofanti (q.v.) used to be the guiding spirit, as well as to strangers its chief centre of attraction. It continues to be one of the chief literary sights of the Roman winter. In 1873 the college at Rome was deprived of its landed estate and made dependent upon private contributions.

With the congregation and college are connected,

- 1**, a library rich in precious works, especially translations of all kinds of important works in Chinese and Oriental manuscripts;
- 2**, a printing-office (richer formerly than it is now), in which the books required by the missionaries and the missionary work are printed in all foreign languages (“Ha questa congregazione una famosa stamperia co caratteri di tutte le nazione; ne si trovera altra stamperia che nella varietì di tanti caratteri l’ agguagli,” says Zaccaria, in his book *Della Corte di Roma* [Rome, 1774]);
- 3**, a remarkable museum, filled with a great variety of objects and monuments, mostly from countries visited and converted by the

missionaries. The congregation, which answers somewhat to a Protestant missionary board, consists of a president, managing secretary (all of cardinal's rank), an apostolic prothonotary, twenty-four cardinals appointed for life, one of whom is prefect, and who are assisted by a number of consulters (partly monastics and partly clergy), clerks (*minutanti*), and other officials. Originally their meetings were held weekly, and in the presence of the pope; now they are monthly, there being, however, weekly conferences (*congressi*) of the prefect, secretary, and consulters; and all important business is submitted to the pope in person by the prefect or the secretary. This congregation conducts the affairs not only of the missionary countries, properly so called, but also of those—as England, the northern kingdoms, the United States, Canada, South America, etc. — in which the hierarchical organization is not, or has not been, full and formal. To the Propaganda no small part of the aggressive power of the Church of Rome is due. It has complete military power, under the pope, over the whole missionary field, not only to send missionaries wherever it is the interest of the Church to send them, but to give them special training adapted to their special work. There are nowhere to be found better modern maps of the newly settled states of the United States than in the college of the Propaganda, and nowhere men better informed as to the probable points of future importance than the cardinals who compose the congregation of the Propaganda. The work of this congregation is greatly aided by several subordinate associations for the propagation of the faith, among the most important of which are those at Lyons (France), Vienna, and Bavaria. It supports, besides, another similar institution for the Chinese at Naples. The founder of this seminary was a prelate of the house of Urban VIII, Ion. Vives, born in Spain. It is part of the duties of the pope to superintend this vast and complicated work, and to invite all nations to the communion of the Church. See *Erectio S. Congregationis de Fide Cath. Propagandæ* (*Bullar.* 3, 441 sq.); *Bullar. Pontif. S. Congr. de Prop. Fide* (Rome, 1839-41, 5 vols. 4to); Boyer, *Congr. de Prop. Fide* (Regiom. 1721, 4to); Mejer, *Die Propaganda* (Getting. 1852-53, 2 vols. 8vo; a most valuable treatise); Hase, *Church Hist.* p. 470; Alzog, *Kirchengesch.* ii, 410, 429, 574; *Church Rev.* vol vii; Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lex. s.v.*; Aschbach, *Kirchen-Lex. s.v.*; Barnum, *Romanism* (see Index); Marsden, *Hist. of Christ. Churches and Sects*, ii, 202. (J. H.W.)

## Propagation of the Faith, Associations For,

ROMAN CATHOLIC. The earliest and the highest in dignity of these has been already described under the head PROPAGANDA *SEE PROPAGANDA* (q.v.); but the present century has produced several private associations, the resources of which arise entirely from voluntary annual contributions, and the organization of which is most complete and most extensive. The first of these is that founded at Lyons in 1822, under the title "Oeuvre de la Propagation de la Foi," with a branch at Paris, and subordinate branches in the other Catholic kingdoms. It is under the direction of a council, which communicates as well with the local associations through which the funds are supplied by small weekly, monthly, or yearly contributions, as with the missions to the aid of which the fund so raised is applied, by an apportionment regulated according to the necessities of each. The piety of contributors is stimulated by the exhortations of the popes, and the granting of indulgences to those who, with the other requisite dispositions, shall aid in the work. The journal of the society, entitled *Annales de la Propagation de la Foi*, is a very interesting bimonthly collection of letters and reports from the different missions connected with the central body. The receipts of this association for the year 1863 were 4,788,496 fr. 86 c. Of this sum, by far the largest proportion was raised in France-3,307,248 fr. Italy came next, though at a long interval, contributing 420,653 fr.; Belgium gave 271,597 fr.; Germany, 251,873 fr.; the British islands, 127,000 fr. Spain, once the great propagator of the Gospel in the New World, contributed but 12,549 fr.; but it is to be observed that Spain maintains for her own missionary enterprises a large and liberal establishment in connection with the mission of the Philippines and the South Sea. Another association of somewhat later date is the "Leopoldiner Verein," established at Vienna in 1829, the chief object of which is to assist the missions of German origin, especially in America.

This association also has its own journal, entitled *Berichte der Leopoldiner Stiftung*. It is under the presidency of the archbishop of Vienna. A third is that established in Bavaria as an offshoot of the Lyons association, under the name "Ludwigs Missions-Verein." Like that of Vienna, its chief; although not exclusive, object is the support of German missions. The Ludwigs Verein is conducted under the auspices of the archbishop of Munich. All these associations, although quite independent in their management and direction, nevertheless maintain close relations with the



Propaganda of Rome, and are often guided by the recommendations of the cardinal prefect in the distribution of their funds to particular missions.

## Propater

*SEE GODFATHER.*

## Proper Names

*chiefly of the Old Testament.* It is interesting, as well as useful, to know the original signification of proper names. The chief use which accrues from an accurate knowledge of them is that we are by their means enabled to attain a more lively apprehension of the truth of ancient history; for in ancient, especially Scriptural, times they were employed with greater discrimination than they are at present.

**I. Form of Proper Names.** — The first fact that strikes us, on a general view of them all, is that the ancient Hebrews always retained the greatest simplicity in the use of names. In reality there is always only one single name which distinguishes a person. Where it is necessary, the name of the father is added; sometimes that of the mother instead, in case she happens to be more celebrated (thus the three heroic brothers, Joab, Abishai, and Asael, are always called after their mother Zerujah [<sup><1326></sup>1 Chronicles 2:16]); or the line of descent is traced further back, often to the fourth generation, or even further. Mere epithets, like “David the king,” “Isaiah the prophet,” always express the actual and significant dignity of a man. The instances in which a person receives two names alternately, as Jacob-Israel, Gideon-Jerubbaal (Judges 6-9), are casual and rare, and are not to be ascribed to a general custom of the people.

**1.** The *simple* names exist in great abundance; and their signification, as to the mere word itself, is generally evident: as <sup>ˆ</sup>D; *Dan*, “judge;” <sup>ˆ</sup>ymꝯ *Janmin*, the Latin *dexter*, an ancient name, according to <sup><1460></sup>Genesis 46:10; <sup><1327></sup>1 Chronicles 2:27; <sup>I</sup>Wav; *Saul*, “desired,” also an ancient name, according to <sup><1460></sup>Genesis 46:10; comp. 36:37; <sup>r</sup>bꝯ, *Geber*, “hero” (<sup><1109></sup>1 Kings 4:19). Thus most of them express an honorable sense; although examples are not wanting of the direct contrary, as <sup>v</sup>Qꝯ *akkesh*, “crooked” (<sup><1033></sup>2 Samuel 23:26). With what ease also feminine words become names for men is shown by cases like <sup>h</sup>Yaj *Aiah*, “vulture” (3, 7; 21:8; comp. <sup><1324></sup>Genesis 36:24); <sup>h</sup>nꝯꝯ *Jonah*, “dove,” which are just as

applicable to men as the masculine **l [Wv**, *Shual*, “fox” (<sup><1373></sup>1 Chronicles 7:36). Diminutives, which are so frequently used as proper names by the Arabs, are rare among the Hebrews; but are by no means wanting, as is proved by **^Wl Wbz**]or **^l Wbz**] *Zebulun*, the name of the son of Jacob, and **^WtWdy**]or **^Wtydy**] *Jedithun*, the name of the singer of David. All those names which are formed with a prefixed *yod* are to be considered as especially ancient, because this nominal formation became entirely obsolete in the language, and recurs almost only in proper names, as is shown not only by the well known names **bq[ly**, *Jacob*, **āswy**, *Joseph*, **hdwhy**, *Judah*, **qj xy**, *Isaac*, but also by a number of less common ones, as **blvy**; *Jashub* (<sup><1024></sup>Numbers 26:24); **byrye** *Jarib* (<sup><1324></sup>1 Chronicles 4:24);: **Ēl ayi** *Jamlech* (ver. 34); **^K[ly** *Jachan* (v, 13); **rhxyazhar** (<sup><1018></sup>Exodus 6:18); **rj by**, *Ibhar* (<sup><1015></sup>2 Samuel 5:15); **hnpyl** *Jephunneh* (<sup><1015></sup>Numbers 13:6; <sup><1378></sup>1 Chronicles 7:38); **uj ry**] *Jeroham* (<sup><1001></sup>1 Samuel 1:1; <sup><1327></sup>1 Chronicles 8:27); and others. There is an ancient adjective ending, that in *iam* or *unm*, which has fixed itself most firmly in proper names, as **μZj a**] *Ahuzzam* (<sup><1346></sup>1 Chronicles 4:6); **μZgi** *Gazzam* (<sup><1328></sup>Ezra 2:48); **μyr hā** *Miriam*, the sister of Moses, and **μwor tē** *Gershom*, his son; **μhmKa** *Chimham* (<sup><1018></sup>2 Samuel 19:38), which not only exists also in the form **μwbmKa** *Chimhom* (<sup><1427></sup>Jeremiah 42:17), but in **^hmKa** *Chinzhan* (<sup><1094></sup>2 Samuel 19:40), according to customary changes.

**2.** The *compound* names, however, are more important for history, because they express more complete and distinct ideas than the simple names. Some of them are altogether isolated, as **shnyPa** *Phinehas*, properly “serpent’s mouth,” the grandson of Aaron; **rkclya** *Issachar*, the son of Jacob; *Oholiab* (<sup><1016></sup>Exodus 31:6), “father’s tent,” a name resembling the Greek Patroclus. But most of them bear a general resemblance to each other, and follow in shoals certain dominant opinions and customs; and these last are what we must particularly consider here.

A great number of them owe their origin to the relations of the house, as the sense of the first word of the compound shows. Most of these have the word **yba**] *abi*, “father,” for their first member, as *Abiezer*, *Abital*, *Abigail*. Fuirst (*Handwörterbuch*, p. 7, 50) regards these words as names for the Divine Being, rendering such a name as *Abimelek*, *Ab* (i.e. God) *is king*; *Abidan*, *Ab* (God) *is judge*; and so *Achitub*, *Ach* (God) *is good*. Others

deny any reference to the Deity in these words, but cannot agree whether they are to be taken literally or figuratively. The Easterns use the word *ab* (*father*), etc., to express the possession of any quality. *The fox is abu 'lhusain* (“father of the little fort,” i.e. the burrower). The *mosquito is abu 'lha 's* (“father of the axe”), from its sharp instrument of incision. The *camel is cbu aeyyub* (“father of Job”), from his patience. Many therefore think that such a name as Abinoam (“father of kindness”) means merely *very kind*. Others, as Ewald, regard the words *ab*, *ach*, *ben*, etc., as at least at one time expressive of real relationship, and think such names exhibit an approach to our family names. It sometimes happens that a person appears with the name both in its simple as well as its compound state. For example, Nadab, as well as Abinadab, Ezer and Abiezer, and Abner (“father of Ner”) was son of Ner. This seems to imply that something like the present Arabic practice had begun to prevail among the Hebrews. Certain names become hereditary in a family, and a man is expected to name his son by the traditional name. To such an extent is this custom carried that a man whose son should have been called “Yusuf” is styled “Abu Yusuf,” even if he has no son; and a woman who is childless rejoices in the name *Umm Musa* (“Mother of Moses”), because, had she had a son, he would have borne the name “Musa.” In all likelihood these words, *ab*, etc., have not always the same meaning; the connective vowel *i* is not always a sign of the genitive, but merely of the construct or state of composition. We could more easily admit a metaphorical sense in the compounds with *son*, since *ḅ* is really often used in a highly metaphorical sense. Bathsheba is certainly not the daughter of a man named Sheba (<sup>1008</sup>2 Samuel 11:3). Such compound names with *son*, however, are, on the whole, rare, and are only found in some frequency in <sup>1007</sup>1 Kings 4:7 sq. **SEE AB-**; **SEE BEN-**.

Under this class we may also include *vya*, *Ish*, “man,” with which several names are compounded. Another, but a smaller, class consists of names compounded with *μ[ī* *Am*, “people,” resembling the many Greek compositions with *λαός* and *δῆμος*; and just as in Greek *δῆμος* is placed first or last (Demosthenes, Aristodemos), so also *Am* is at one time found in the first, and at another in the last place; only that, according to the laws of the Shemitic language, the sense of one of these positions is exactly the reverse of the other. As all these compounds must be conceived to be in the state construct, so likewise we are probably to take the names *μ[ḅ]ṯ\* y*, *Jeroboam*, properly “people’s increaser,” a suitable name for a

prince, and  $\mu[\text{b}y]^*$  *y*, *Jashobeam*, “people’s turner” or “leader;” for, as was observed above, the simple names are often formed with a prefixed jod; and we actually find  $\text{bWvy}$ ; *Jashub*, as a simple name in <sup><0469></sup>Numbers 26:29; <sup><1000></sup>1 Chronicles 7:1.

Many compound names endeavor to express a religious sense, and therefore contain the divine name. Here we at the same time find a new law of formation: as these compounds are intended to express a complete thought, such as the religious sentiment requires, a name may consist of an entire proposition with a verb, but of course in as brief a compass as possible; and indeed shorter compounds are made with a verb than with a passive participle, as  $\text{I aetih}$  *Nathanael* (in the New Test.  $\text{Ναθαναήλ}$ , properly “God-gave,” i.e. whom God gave, given by God,  $\text{θεόδοτος}$  or  $\text{θεόδωρος}$ ), sounds shorter than  $\text{I aynWtēh}$  *Nethuniel*, with the participle, which would certainly express the same sense. But since the finite verb, as also any other predicate, can just as well precede as follow, accordingly a great freedom in the position of the divine name has prevailed in this class; and this peculiarity is preserved, in the same case, in the following period: but indeed the Greeks use  $\text{Δωροθεός}$  as well as  $\text{θεόδωρος}$ . Thus  $\text{I aatēh}$  *Nethaneel* (<sup><1314></sup>1 Chronicles 2:14), or  $\text{^t ih} \text{ā}$ , *Elnathan* (<sup><2362></sup>Jeremiah 36:12). The two names are there generally assigned to two different persons; nevertheless, both combinations may form names for the same person, as  $\text{I aymā}$  *Ammiel* (<sup><1385></sup>1 Chronicles 3:5), and  $\mu[\text{yl} \text{ē}]$  *Eliam* (<sup><1018></sup>2 Samuel 11:3), belong to the same individual.

**3.** Lastly, many proper names have assumed the derivative syllable – *i*, or – *ai* (which appears to be only dialectically different from — *i*, and is chiefly frequent in the later periods); and we must certainly consider that, in some cases, this syllable may possibly form mere adjectives, and therewith simple names, as  $\text{yTmā}$  *Amittai*, “truelike,” from  $\text{tmā}$ , *Emeth*, “truth,” and *Barzillai*, “Iron,” or “Ironman,” the name of a celebrated Gileadite family (<sup><1578></sup>Ezra 2:61; <sup><1077></sup>2 Samuel 17:27); or that it is derived from a place, as  $\text{yraB}$  *Beeri* (<sup><2000></sup>Hosea 1:1; <sup><1376></sup>1 Chronicles 7:36), “he of the well,” or he of a place known as the well. But it undoubtedly very often also expresses a genealogical relation, like the Greek ending –  $\text{ιδης}$  and presupposes a previous proper name from which it is derived; thus the name  $\text{yrua}$ , *Houri* (<sup><1354></sup>1 Chronicles 5:14), as surely presupposes the above-mentioned *Char*, as the Greek Philippides does Philippos, and as *Ketubai* (2:9), one of the

descendants of Judah, is connected with the Ketul in 4:11. It is remarkable that the genealogical relation appears to be sometimes expressed by the mere **hA**; of motion, as **hbqḏyi**, *Jacobah* (ver. 36), which would be equivalently expressed by a German name, *Zu-Jacob*; **hl æy̆y̆j**, *Isharelah*, *De Israel* (25:14; comp. ver. 2); and most distinctly in **hn\* DB̆j̆ j̆**, *Hashbadanah*, “reckoned to Dan” (<sup><1604></sup>Nehemiah 8:4; comp. **hv\* qB̆y̆j̆**; *Joshebekashah*, in <sup><1304></sup>1 Chronicles 25:4).

Among the names of women, the oldest as well as the simplest which are found are actually only suited for women, as *Rachel*, “Ewe;” *Deborah*, “Bee;” *Tamar*, “Palm-tree;” *Hannah*, “Favor,” the mother of Samuel. Those which express such a delicate and endearing sense as *Qeren Happuk*, “box of eye-ointment” (<sup><1824></sup>Job 42:14), and **hbyx̆p̆j̆**, *Hephzibah*, “my delight is in her” (<sup><1201></sup>2 Kings 21:1), betray that they were generally formed in much later times. It appears indeed to have been customary, at an early period, to form names for women from those of men, by means of the feminine termination; as **tyḡp̆j̆** *Haggith* (<sup><1004></sup>2 Samuel 3:4), besides **yḡp̆j̆** *Haggai* (<sup><0915></sup>Numbers 26:15); **tm̆L̆vm̆j̆** *Meshullemeth*, i.e. *Pia* (<sup><1219></sup>2 Kings 21:19), besides **μ̆L̆vm̆m̆** *Meshullam*, *Pius* (<sup><1161></sup>1 Chronicles 5:13; 8:17), and **tymb̆w̆j̆** *Shelomith*, *Friederike* (<sup><0911></sup>Numbers 24:11), besides **hmb̆w̆j̆** *Shelomoh*, *Friederich*. But we must not overlook the fact that all these are instances of simple names; or of those also in which the *masculine* has already dropped the second member; for Chanani and Zabdi, as is shown below, are shortened from Chananjah, Zabdijah: no single example occurs from a compound man’s name. As the same compound names, however, are sometimes used both for men and women, and as even those very names are applied to women which could not originally have been applicable to any but men, as *Abigail*, *Achiznoam*, accordingly we must assume that the plastic power of the language had already exhausted itself in this remote province, and that, for that reason, the distinction of the feminine was omitted.

**II. Symbolical Import of Proper Names.** — As the name was the “sign” of the thing, it expressed as nearly as possible its character; it was the expression of the impression which was produced by the thing named on the beholder. The truer the expression was to the impression, and the truer the impression was to the object, the more nearly did the name represent the thing named. Hence the name in Hebrew is used to signify the collected

attributes or characteristics of the object named. This is particularly the case with the divine name. “The Lord descended in the cloud and proclaimed the *name* of the Lord. And the Lord passed by him and proclaimed, The Lord, the Lord God, merciful and gracious,” etc. (<sup>Exodus</sup> Exodus 34), where all these terms furnish but the exegesis of the word *name*. The use is similar in the New Test. Our Lord says, “I have manifested thy *name* unto the men which thou gavest me out of the world” (<sup>John</sup> John 17:6); where *name* embraces the whole divine nature revealed by the Son, who hath “declared” the Father. In general the name was the result of an effort to embody in language as nearly as possible the nature of objects. When the whole nature could not be taken in, the chief characteristic was seized upon—what struck the eye or any of the senses mainly—and hence arose such names as Esau (“hairy”). When there was no outstanding attribute to seize and embody, some incident was laid hold of connected with the object named, e.g. Moses (“drawn out” of the water); or some feeling in the mind of the namer at the moment of imposing the name, as Benoni (“my son of sorrow”). Even the names of natural objects are full of meaning, often full of poetry, often having reminiscences of ancient times and deeds floating about them. The river names are very suggestive. The Jordan (*Yarden, yarad*, “to come down” [comp. Ganges, Rhenus]) is the two rapids, one into the Sea of Galilee, and one into the Dead Sea. The Arnon is the stream that “sings” (*ranan*, to “make a tremulous sound”) among the mountains. Jabbok, that which “belches” (“byoks”) through the rocky gorge. The Cherith, that which “cuts” its way. So are the names of mountains. Lebanon is the Mont Blanc of Syria, but perhaps named less from its snowy mantle than its bare white ribs of naked stone. Sirion, the “breastplate” of rock. The whole land is full of *Abels* (grassy meads), *Beers* (wells), *Ayins* (fountains); and in the evening the maidens danced in the meads, and called them Abel-meholah (<sup>Judges</sup> Judges 7:22); and the kids around the fountain, and it was named En-gedi (<sup>Joshua</sup> Joshua 15:62); and the scorpions basked in the sunny slopes, and their haunts were named Akrabbim; and the gazelles bounded across the heights, and men called their favorite resorts Ajalon. See each of the above terms in its place.

For the philological questions involved in the above examination, see the Hebrew lexicons. More special treatises are the following: Redslob, *Die alttestam. Namen* (Hamb. 1846); Farrar, *Proper Names of the Bible*

(Lond. 1844); Jones, *Names in the Old Test.* (ibid. 1856); Wilkinson, *Names in the Bible* (ibid. 1865). *SEE NAME.*

## Proper Psalms

i.e. psalms adapted by their contents to the subjects of particular Sundays or festivals and holydays. St. Chrysostom refers to ancient prescription in this matter, and St. Augustine mentions as an old custom the use of Psalm 22 on Good Friday. Cassian informs us that Psalm 63 was sung at matins, and the 141st at evensong. St. Athanasius and St. Augustine appointed special psalms on certain occasions.

## Prophecies

is the name given to the Biblical texts which are read in the Church of Rome on the day before Easter-Sunday, after the consecration of the paschal taper. They are the following: <sup><01000></sup>Genesis 1:1; 2:2; 5:31; 8:21; 22:1-19; <sup><01044></sup>Exodus 14:24; 15:1; <sup><2547></sup>Isaiah 54:17; 55:11; Bar. 3:9-38; <sup><5701></sup>Ezekiel 37:1-14; Isaiah 4; <sup><02010></sup>Exodus 12:1-11; Jonah 3; <sup><6512></sup>Deuteronomy 31:22-30; <sup><27010></sup>Daniel 3:1-24. They are called *prophecies*, inasmuch as they are symbols of the redemption of mankind through Jesus Christ, and have a direct bearing upon the mysteries which the Church is at that period solemnly commemorating. The first prophecy relates the creation of the world: we are to remember here that Christ, by his death on the cross, became the originator of a new, spiritual creation. The second prophecy is about the flood, about Noah saved with his family in the ark: it must remind the faithful that the Redeemer saves through the waters of baptism all those who believe in him. The third prophecy brings before our eyes Abraham, whose faith was as firm as a rock, and invites to similar confidence in our Lord. The fourth prophecy relates the exodus from Egypt and the passage through the Red Sea, showing how Christians should leave the bondage of sill and follow their own god-sent leader. The fifth and sixth prophecies recommend constancy in our purpose, teaching — the former — that the Lord bestows eternal bliss upon such as follow him; the latter, that ruin awaits the sinner. To give us the necessary forces for the struggle we are to go through, God sends us the Holy Ghost: this is what we are reminded of by the vision of Ezekiel in the seventh prophecy. The eighth prophecy points out the eternal glory which awaits those who fight under the cross. The ninth prophecy is about the Jewish passover, the tenth about Jonah's preaching in Nineveh, the eleventh about the respect to

be paid to the Pentateuch, and the twelfth about the three young men in the oven. The custom of extraordinary readings on Saturday before Easter is very ancient; it was made necessary by another custom which consisted in spending several hours of the Easter-night in the place of worship, more especially to await midnight there. Gregory of Nyssa (*Orat. ii, De Resurr. Christi*) speaks of these readings, only their number was not the same at all times. The *Ordo Rom.* i speaks of four lections, each of which was read in Latin and in Greek. According to Belet (c. 106), there were at Rome twelve Greek and as many Latin lections; in other places twelve, or only seven. William Durand (1. 6, c. 81) knows of four, six, twelve, and fourteen of them. In some churches five were read, in others eight. Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* s.v. See Siegel, *Christliche Alterthuner* (Index in vol. 4); Riddle, *Christian Antiquities* (see Index).

## Prophecy

Under this head we propose to treat of certain general aspects of the subject of permanent interest, reserving for the head of PROPHET what relates more *personally* to the organs or media of true prophecy, as found in the Bible. In doing so we combine the Biblical elements with the best results of modern criticism and discussion.

**I. Design of Prophecy.** — In this respect we would define prophecy as “God’s communication to the Church, to be her light and comfort in time of trouble and perplexity.” Vitranga defines it as “a prediction of some contingent circumstance or event in the future received by immediate or direct revelation.” Dr. Pye Smith speaks of it “as a declaration made by a creature under the inspiration and commission of the omniscient God relating to an event or series of events, which have not taken place at the time the prophecy is uttered, and which could not have been certainly foreknown by any science or wisdom of man.” Other writers say, “Prophecy is nothing but the history of events before they come to pass.” Dean Magee dissents from this popular but erroneous view. In a lecture on the uses of prophecy he defines a prophet as “the religious teacher of his age, whose aim is the religious education of those whom he addresses.” To have received a call and message direct from God, and to deliver it, is the essence of prophetism. The Jewish lawgiver in delivering moral and ceremonial precepts received from God, and our blessed Lord in the Sermon on the Mount, were prophets just as much as when they predicted the future of Israel (M’Caul, *Aids to Faith*). As a reaction from the general



body of writers on prophecy, who exalt the predictive and neglect the moral element of God's communication to man, there have arisen in Germany, and to some extent in our own land, writers who speak exclusively of the moral stream of light flowing through prophecy, and deny altogether its predictive character. Both errors will be avoided by bearing in mind that the word of prophecy was profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction, to the first recipients of the message, as well as for succeeding ages.

The usual view of prophecy as anticipated history virtually excludes from the roll the great Prophet who was its theme and author, Moses his distinguished prototype, John the Baptist his eminent forerunner, Elijah, Samuel, under the old covenant, as well as the apostles and prophets under the new. According to this view, prophecy is virtually limited to what the Spirit saith unto the churches in the four hundred years between Hosea and Malachi. and by the beloved John, the writer of the Apocalypse. But if we agree to regard the prophet as the forthteller, possessing the *munus praedicandi* — rather than the foreteller, possessing only the *munus praedicendi* — we see at once how the very highest place is assigned to our Lord and to Moses; how John the Baptist was more than a prophet, as he stood within the actual dawn of the day of Christ, and as a religious teacher did really more for the religious training of those whom he addressed than any of the prophets of the old covenant. We see, too, how naturally and clearly the earlier prophets were subordinate to Moses, so that the test of their commission was conformity to the lawgiver; and how appropriately the term is applied to the apostles of our Lord and Saviour, as charged by Christ with the whole ordering and establishing of the Church in its institutions, government, and progress. In fact, students of prophecy perpetually use the word in a *non-natural* sense. Hence the variety and discordancy of their interpretations. Our attention must be rigidly fixed on the natural and proper sense of the terms, if we would gain any satisfactory results.

In all communications from God to man two elements may be traced, the moral and the predictive. Neither element must be pressed or insisted on, so as to depress and exclude the other. Yet the moral element is the fundamental, to which the predictive is always subsidiary. The moral element occupies the highest place in the communications made by our Lord, by Moses, by the apostles; the predictive element prevails in those who had the more ordinary gifts, as all their announcements appealed to

the revelations made by Moses and by Christ. The testimony of Jesus as the author, and the testimony borne to Jesus as the theme, is the spirit of prophecy. According to this view prophecy is always didactic; the moral element is fundamental, the predictive is entirely subsidiary. All who bore testimony to Jesus before his incarnation were preachers of righteousness, and all who testify that Jesus is come in the flesh exercise the prophetic function.

**II. Value of Prophecy as Evidence of the Truth of Revelation.** — Davison, in his *Discourses on Prophecy*, fixes a “Criterion of Prophecy,” and in accordance with it he describes “the condition is which would confer cogency of evidence on single examples of prophecy” in the following manner: first, “the known promulgation of the prophecy prior to the event; secondly, the clear and palpable fulfilment of it; lastly, the nature of the event itself — if, when the prediction of it was given, it lay remote from human view, and was such as could not be foreseen by any supposable effort of reason, or be deduced upon principles of calculation derived from probability and experience” (*Disc.* 8:378). Applying his test, the learned writer finds that the establishment of the Christian religion and the person of its Founder were predicted when neither reason nor experience could have anticipated them; and that the predictions respecting them have been clearly fulfilled in history. Here, then, is an adequate proof of an inspired prescience in the prophets who predicted these things. He applies his test to the prophecies recorded of the Jewish people, and their actual state, to the prediction of the great apostasy and to the actual state of corrupted Christianity, and finally to the prophecies relating to Nineveh, Babylon, Tyre, Egypt, the Ishmaelites, and the Four Empires, and to the events which have befallen them; and in each of these cases he finds proof of the existence of the predictive element in the prophets.

In the book of Kings we find Micaiah, the son of Imlah, uttering a challenge, by which his predictive powers were to be judged. He had pronounced, by the word of the Lord, that Ahab should fall at Ramoth-Gilead. Ahab, in return, commanded him to be shut up in prison until he came back in peace. “And Micaiah said, If thou return at all in peace” (that is, if the event do not verify my words), “the Lord hath not spoken by me” (that is, I am no prophet capable of predicting the future) (<sup><1228></sup>1 Kings 22:28). The test is sound as a negative test, and so it is laid down in the law (<sup><1822></sup>Deuteronomy 18:22); but as a positive test it would not be sufficient. Ahab’s death at Ramoth-Gilead did not prove Micaiah’s

predictive powers, though his escape would have disproved them. But here we must notice a very important difference between single prophecies and a series of prophecy. The fulfilment of a single prophecy does not prove the prophetic power of the prophet, but the fulfillment of a long series of prophecies by a series or number of events does in itself constitute a proof that the prophecies were intended to predict the events, and, consequently, that predictive power resided in the prophet or prophets. We may see this in the so far parallel cases of satirical writings. We know for certain that Aristophanes refers to Cleon, Pericles, Nicias (and we should be equally sure of it were his satire more concealed than it is), simply from the fact of a number of satirical hits converging together on the object of his satire. One, two, or three strokes might be intended for more persons than one, but the addition of each stroke makes the aim more apparent; and when we have a sufficient number before us, we can no longer possibly doubt his design. The same may be said of fables, and still more of allegories. The fact of a *complicated* lock being opened by a key shows that the lock and key were meant for each other. Now the Messianic picture drawn by the prophets as a body contains at least as many traits as these: That salvation should come through the family of Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Judah, David; that at the time of the final absorption of the Jewish power, Shiloh (the tranquilizer) should gather the nations under his rule; that there should be a great Prophet, typified by Moses; a King descended from David; a Priest forever, typified by Melchizedek; that there should be born into the world a child to be called Mighty God, Eternal Father, Prince of Peace; that there should be a Righteous Servant of God on whom the Lord would lay the iniquity of all; that Messiah the Prince should be cut off, but not for himself; that an everlasting kingdom should be given by the Ancient of Days to one like the Son of man. It seems impossible to harmonize so many apparent contradictions. Nevertheless, it is an undoubted fact that at the time seemingly pointed out by one or more of these predictions there was born into the world a child of the house of David, and therefore of the family of Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and Judah, who claimed to be the object of these and other predictions; who is acknowledged as Prophet, Priest, and King, as Mighty God and yet as God's Righteous Servant who bears the iniquity of all; who was cut off, and whose death is acknowledged not to have been for his own, but for others' good: who has instituted a spiritual kingdom on earth, which kingdom is of a nature to continue forever, if there is any continuance beyond this world and this life; and in whose doings and sufferings on earth a number of specific predictions were

minutely fulfilled. Then we may say that we have here a series of prophecies which are so applicable to the person and earthly life of Jesus Christ as to be thereby shown to have been designed to apply to him. If they were designed to apply to him, prophetic prediction is proved.

*Objections* have been urged:

**(a.) Vagueness.** — It has been said that the prophecies are too darkly and vaguely worded to be proved predictive by the events which they are alleged to foretell. This objection is stated with clearness and force by Ammon. He says, “Such simple sentences as the following: Israel has not to expect a king, but a teacher; this teacher will be born at Bethlehem during the reign of Herod; he will lay down his life under Tiberius, in attestation of the truth of his religion; through the destruction of Jerusalem, and the complete extinction of the Jewish state, he will spread his doctrine in every quarter of the world—a few sentences like these, expressed in plain historical prose, would not only bear the character of true predictions, but, when once their genuineness was proved, they would be of incomparably greater worth to us than all the oracles of the Old Test. taken together” (*Christology*, p. 12). But to this it might be answered, and has been in effect answered by Hengstenberg:

- 1.** That God never forces men to believe, but that there is such a union of definiteness and vagueness in the prophecies as to enable those who are willing to discover the truth, while the willfully blind are not forcibly constrained to see it.
- 2.** That, had the prophecies been couched in the form of direct declarations, their fulfilment would have thereby been rendered impossible, or, at least, capable of frustration.
- 3.** That the effect of prophecy (e.g. with reference to the time of the Messiah’s coming) would have been far less beneficial to believers, as being less adapted to keep them in a state of constant expectation.
- 4.** That the Messiah of Revelation could not be so clearly portrayed in his varied character as God and Man, as Prophet, Priest, and King, if he had been the mere “teacher” which is all that Ammon acknowledges him to be.
- 5.** That the state of the prophets, at the time of receiving the divine revelation, was (as we shall presently show) such as necessarily to make

their predictions fragmentary, figurative, and abstracted from the relations of time.

**6.** That some portions of the prophecies were intended to be of double application, and some portions to be understood only on their fulfilment (comp. ~~John~~ John 14:29; ~~Ezekiel~~ Ezekiel 36:33).

**(b.)** *Obscurity of a Part or Parts of a Prophecy otherwise Clear.* — The objection drawn from “the unintelligibleness of one part of a prophecy, as invalidating the proof of foresight arising from the evident completion of those parts which are understood” is akin to that drawn from the vagueness of the whole of it. It may be answered with the same arguments, to which we may add the consideration urged by Butler that it is, for the argument in hand, the same as if the parts not understood were written in cipher, or not written at all: “Suppose a writing, partly in cipher and partly in plain words at length; and that in the part one understood there appeared mention of several known facts — it would never come into any man’s thought to imagine that, if he understood the whole, perhaps he might find that these facts were not in reality known by the writer” (*Analogy*, pt. 2, ch. 7). Furthermore, if it be true that prophecies relating to the first coming of the Messiah refer also to his second coming, some part of those prophecies must *necessarily* be as yet not fully understood.

It would appear from these considerations that Davison’s second “condition,” above quoted, “the *clear* and *palpable* fulfilment of the prophecy,” should be so far modified as to take into account the necessary difficulty, more or less great, in recognizing the fulfilment of a prophecy which results from the necessary vagueness and obscurity of the prophecy itself.

**(c.)** *Application of the Several Prophecies to a more Immediate Subject.* — It has been the task of many Biblical critics to examine the different passages which are alleged to be predictions of Christ, and to show that they were delivered in reference to some person or thing contemporary with, or shortly subsequent to, the time of the writer. The conclusion is then drawn, sometimes scornfully, sometimes as an inference not to be resisted, that the passages in question have nothing to do with the Messiah. We have here to distinguish carefully between the conclusion proved and the corollary drawn from it. Let it be granted that it may be proved of all the predictions of the Messiah (it certainly may be proved of many) that they primarily apply to some historical and present fact: in that case a

certain law, under which God vouchsafes his prophetic revelations, is discovered; but there is no semblance of disproof of the further Messianic interpretation of the passages under consideration. That some such law does exist has been argued at length by Mr. Davison. He believes, however, that “it obtains only in some of the more distinguished monuments of prophecy,” such as the prophecies founded on, and having primary reference to, the kingdom of David, the restoration of the Jews, the destruction of Jerusalem (*On Prophecy*, disc. 5). Dr. Lee thinks that Davison “exhibits too great reserve in the application of this important principle” (*On Inspiration*, lect. 4). He considers it to be of universal application; and upon it he founds the doctrine of the “double sense of prophecy,” according to which a prediction is fulfilled in two or even more distinct but analogous subjects: first in type, then in antitype; and after that perhaps awaits a still further and more complete fulfilment. This view of the fulfilment of prophecy seems necessary for the explanation of our Lord’s prediction on the Mount, relating at once to the fall of Jerusalem and to the end of the Christian dispensation. It is on this principle that Pearson writes: “Many are the prophecies which concern him, many the promises which are made of him; but yet some of them very obscure... Wheresoever he is spoken of as the anointed, it may well be *first* understood of some other person; except one place in Daniel, where Messiah is foretold ‘to be cut off’“ (*On the Creed*, art. 2).

Whether it can be proved by an investigation of Holy Scripture that this relation between divine announcements for the future and certain present events does so exist as to constitute a law, and whether, if the law is proved to exist, it is of universal or only of partial application, we do not pause to determine. But it is manifest that the existence of a primary sense cannot exclude the possibility of a secondary sense. The question, therefore, really is, whether the prophecies are applicable to Christ: if they are so applicable, the previous application of each of them to some historical event would not invalidate the proof that they were designed as a whole to find their full completion in him. Nay, even if it could be shown that the prophets had in their thoughts nothing beyond the primary completion of their words (a thing which we at present leave undetermined), no inference could thence be drawn against their secondary application; for such an inference would assume what no believer in inspiration will grant — viz. that the prophets are the sole authors of their prophecies. The rule *Nihil in scripto quod non pius in scripture* is sound;

but the question is, who is to be regarded as the true author of the prophecies—the human instrument or the divine author? See Hengstenberg, *Christology*, appendix 6:p. 433. *SEE DOUBLE SENSE.*

**(d.) *Miraculous Character.*** — It is probable that this lies at the root of the many and various efforts made to disprove the predictive power of the prophets. There is no question that if miracles are, either physically or morally, impossible, then prediction is impossible; and those passages which have ever been accounted predictive must be explained away as being vague, as being obscure, as applying only to something in the writer's lifetime, or on some other hypothesis. This is only saying that belief in prediction is not compatible with the theory of atheism, or with the philosophy which rejects the overruling providence of a Personal God. See Maitland, *Argument from Prophecy* (Lond. 1877); Row, *Bampton Lecture* for 1877, p. 219. *SEE MIRACLE.*

For a copious list of treatises on Scripture prophecy in general, see Darling, *Cyclopaedia Bibliographica*, col. 1785 sq.; and Malcolm, *Theological Index*, s.v. Comp. Kurtz, *Gesch. d. Alten Bundes*, ii, 513 sq.; Hardwick, *Christ and other Masters*, vol. i, ch. 3, esp. p. 135 sq.; Smith, (*Bampton Lecture*) *On Prophecy* (Bost. 1870, 12mo); *Brit. and For. Ev. Rev.* 1863. art. 8; *Bibl. Repos.* p. 11, 138, 217; *Westm. Rev.* Jan. 1868, p. 106; Kitto, *Journ. of Sac. Lit.* 30:1 sq., April, 1853, p. 35; *Aids to Faith*, essay 3; *E Rsgl. Rev.* 8:181; Fisher, *The Beginnings of Christianity*, p. 8, et al.; Stanley, *Lectures on the Jewish Church*, 1st series, lect. 17-20; Fairbairn, *Prophecy Viewed in respect to its Distinctive Nature, its Special Function, and Proper Interpretation* (Edinb. 1856); and for the vast field of German literature on the subject, see Keil, *Introd. to the Old Test.* (ibid. 1869), i, 265 sq.

### Prophecy, Jewish Interpretation Of.

The Hebrew and the Christian alike recognise the reality of the predictive element in the chosen oracles of the great *I am*. The two religionists, however, differ widely in their manner and sense of interpretation and in the application of the oracular utterances. This difference regarding a portion of Scripture accepted alike by both is easily accounted for. The divergence is in the two religions themselves, and is called out by the question whether the predictions for a Messiahship to the "chosen race" have ever been fulfilled. Upon this query all turns. The Israelite, refusing to recognise in Christ the long-promised divine messenger, either declares it a

vain attempt to decipher the prophetic images, if he be a rationalist; or, if he be more faithfully wedded to the canon of the synagogue, patiently sits back, awaiting the final solution of the problem of God's salvation of his people. *SEE JEWS; SEE MESSIAH; SEE PHARISEE; SEE RATIONALISM.*

In the early and mediaeval days of Christianity, the Jews did not deny the facts of the Christian miracles, but explained them away, and so nothing remained for settlement but the verity of the prophecies and the question of their fulfilment. The first of these the Jew conceded to the Christian, but on the last point a somewhat rich literature of polemics is preserved to us. It begins with the New Test. itself. Paul and other apostles were frequently called upon to argue the Messiahship of Christ. We have the same phase of the contest in the apology of Justin Martyr (q.v.) against Trypho, to which a new kind of objection expressive of prejudice is added in the discourse which Celsus, as preserved in Origen (*Contr. Cels.* bk. i and ii), puts into the mouth of the Jew whom he introduces. (In reference to this contest, these Church fathers, and especially Semisch's work on Justin Martyr and the works on the Jewish Talmudic literature and philosophy, may be consulted. See also, for later continuations of this contest, Hagenbach, *Hist. of Doctr.* i, § 144, and the art. **POLEMICS, JEWISH.**) The Jew contends with the Christian not only for a special spiritual elevation in the prophet — an intenser degree of the same divine intuition which God gives to all who worship him in love and reverence—but for a gift of light vouchsafed to him different from any ordinary endowment. Maimonides remains the chief of the Jewish hermeneutists. "This sage of mediseval Judaism thus teaches: Prophecy signifies the communication of verities to the human mind from God by the medium of the active reason, with or without the power to foretell future events or to perform miracles. The first point is essential, the other is merely accidental. Prophecy is a capacity of the human mind. All possess it more or less. Like other human capacities, it may remain dormant in this or that mind, or be developed partially or perfectly. In the development of this capacity, it is necessary, in the first place, to cultivate and purify the imagination, i.e. the ability of beholding internally, clearly, and truly things external and distant, either in space or time, and to place the imagination under the control of mental judgment. In the second place, the moral nature of the individual must be trained to purity, goodness, love of the true and the sublime, and the desire to understand the voice of the eternal Deity. This cannot be done outside of



society, but within it and in its active service. It cannot be done by asceticism and the renunciation of the world and its charms; it must be done in gladness and joy, by chastity, temperance, and a life of moderation, governing and controlling the lower passions and developing the nobler, finer, and higher ones to a harmonious moral character. Passionate, immoral, and wicked persons bewilder their imagination, pervert their judgment, and benight their reason. In the third place, reason must be fully developed to control all other powers of the individual, without weakening them or disturbing the harmony of the soul, and to elevate him to universal reason, which Maimonides calls the 'active reason,' which enables him to grasp universal truth and to depict it clearly to himself or others by the power of his imagination. Man so prepared, so developed and trained, is a prophet, although he still may receive no special messages from on high, either because his age requires none, or outer influences, climatical or social, disturb the mind. But the man so prepared, and he only, can be a prophet of the Lord. So the ancient prophets were prepared for their messages and their missions. Others, also, may conceive original ideas and prophecies; but if the reason predominates over the imagination, they cannot realize or reproduce their own internal visions. If the imagination predominates, they produce phantasmagorias-wild, disconnected, and confused images. If the moral character supports not both, falsehood, deception, imposition, and even self-delusion spring from reason's light and imagination's vision. If one profess to be a prophet of the Lord, says Maimonides, we would first be obliged to investigate whether his education, his learning, his character, and his antecedents warrant such a presumption. If this be not the case — if he be a vulgar, uncultivated, or an impious man, but maintains that God or an angel spoke to him this or that, we should be bound to declare him a deluded fantasy or a wilful impostor. The genuine prophets, Maimonides further maintains, are not all of the same category. They are as different as are their natural capacities and the development thereof. With the one reason and with the other imagination may predominate, and another, again, may be influenced by moral deficiencies. Therefore, while one prophet, like Moses, is always ready and prepared to receive prophecies in a sound, waking, and clear state of mind, and in words perfectly prosaic and perfectly definite and accurate, others can receive visions in a state of dream, in eccentric agitation, or hallucination only. Then they see phantasms which are expounded to them or which they themselves must expound; or they see an angel or a person — in themselves, of course — who speaks to them; or they hear a voice

without seeing any vision, in which they suppose they have heard God speak. Therefore the prophetic style varies so much with the various writers of Scriptures, and the oracles of some are announced in different poetical forms. The prophet knows how to distinguish divine visions from vulgar ones by the profound impression which the former make upon him, carrying conviction into his mind, and we must know it by the test of reason to which the matter revealed is subjected. All visions recorded in the Bible, Maimonides advances, were subjective, psychological processes. Wherever it is said God appeared, an angel appeared, this or that vision was seen, it must always be understood to have appeared so in the prophet's imagination. Only one prophet received his revelations through and to reason directly, without poetical garbs or visionary assistance, and that was Moses. Only one divine manifestation of this nature did actually come to pass, and that was the revelation on Mount Sinai, and this, also, Maimonides rationalizes in his own way. In all these rational expositions of prophecy, Maimonides refers to the Bible and the Talmud for support" (comp. his *Yesodai Haftorah*, which forms the *Introd.* to his *Yad-Hachazakah*). **SEE MAIMONIDES.**

Another sage, whose authority the ultra-orthodox prefer to depend upon, is Joseph Albo (q.v.). He has expressed his opinion on the various grades of prophets in his book on *Principles* (*Sepher Ikkarim*, ch. 10:§ 3). It differs materially from that of Maimonides. Albo has four grades of prophets; the first class consists of prophets with whom the understanding has no dominion over the phantasy. They receive the prophetic vision in a state of slumber and dream, after an attack of pain and terror. The second class consists of prophets in whom the understanding and the phantasy are well balanced; they receive the prophetic visions without pain or terror, in quiet dreams. The third class consists of prophets with whom the understanding predominates over the phantasy; they see no imaginary visions, as the above two classes do, which must be expounded; they see real objects in their visions, and hear them speak intelligible words; there is neither pain nor terror, nor doubtful visions in the prophetic ecstasy of this class. The fourth class consists of prophets with whom phantasy has no influence whatever upon the understanding; they see no visions, no symbols whatever, but hear prophetic words addressed to them, not in a dream or vision—not merely sometimes and in a state of ecstasy — but waking, intelligent, and whenever they wish. Albo adds, "If a man has elevated himself to this high state of mind, he should no longer be called

man — he should be called angel. None of us mortals has ever reached this perfection, except our teacher Moses.” See Dr. Wise, *Lectures on the Philosophy and Philosophers of the Jews* as reported in the *Israelite* (Cincinnati, 1873); Rothschild (Miss), *Hist. and Lit. of the Israelites*, vol. 2; Geiger, *Judaism*, vol. 1; M’Caul, *Old Paths*. (J. H. W.)

## Prophesyings

Religious exercises of the Puritan clergy in the reign of queen Elizabeth, instituted for the purpose of promoting knowledge and piety. The ministers of a particular division, at a set time, met together in some church of a market or other large town, and there each in his order explained, according to his ability, some portion of Scripture previously allotted to him. This done, a moderator made his observations on what had been said, and determined the true sense of the place, a certain space of time being fixed for despatching the whole. These institutions, borrowed evidently from the *Conventicles* (q.v.) of Scotland, like all others, however, it seems, were in England soon marked by irregularity, disputations, and divisions. Archbishop Grindal endeavored to regulate the prophesyings and cover them from the objections which the court made against them, by enjoining the ministers to observe decency and order, by forbidding them to meddle with politics and Church government, and by prohibiting all nonconformist ministers and laymen from being speakers. The queen, however, seeing that they spread the religious notions of the Puritans and estranged the people from all Romanistic tendency, was resolved to suppress them; and having sent for the archbishop, told him she was informed that the rites and ceremonies of the Church were not duly observed in these prophesyings; that persons not lawfully called to be ministers exercised in them; that the assemblies themselves were illegal, not being allowed by public authority; that the laity neglected their secular affairs by repairing to these meetings, which filled their heads with notions, and might occasion disputes and sedition in the State; that it was good for the Church to have but few preachers, three or four in a county being sufficient. She further declared her dislike of the number of these exercises, and therefore commanded him peremptorily to put them down. The archbishop, however, instead of obeying the commands of his royal mistress, thought that she had made some infringement upon his office, and wrote the queen a long and earnest letter, declaring that his conscience would not suffer him to comply with her commands. The queen was so inflamed with this letter that the archbishop was sequestered from his office, and he never afterwards

recovered the queen's favor. Thus ended the prophesyings. See Neal, *Hist. of the Puritans*.

## Prophet

a person who acts as the organ of divine communication with men, especially with regard to the future. He differs from a *priest* in representing the *divine* side of this mediation, while the priest rather acts from the human side. The following article therefore discusses chiefly the *personal* relations of the prophet himself. *SEE PROPHECY*.

**I. The Title in Scripture.** — The ordinary Hebrew word for prophet is **aybaē**(*nabi*), derived from the verb **abn**; connected by Gesenius with [ **bi**]; “to bubble forth,” like a fountain. If this etymology be correct, the substantive would signify either a person who, as it were, involuntarily bursts forth with spiritual utterances under the divine influence (comp. <sup><941></sup>Psalm 40:1, “My heart is *bubbling up* of a good matter”), or simply one who pours forth words. The analogy of the word **āfñ**(*natdph*), which has the force of “dropping” as honey, and is used by <sup><3116></sup>Micah 2:6, 11, <sup><202></sup>Ezekiel 21:2, and <sup><3176></sup>Amos 7:16 in the sense of prophesying, points to the last signification. The verb **abn** is found only in the *niphal* and *hithpael*, a peculiarity which it shares with many other words expressive of speech (comp. *loquifari*, *vociferari*, *concionari*, **φθέγγομαι**, as well as **μαντεύομαι** and *vaticinari*). Bunsen (*Gott in Geschichte*, p. 141) and Davidson (*Intr. Old Test.* 2, 430) suppose *nabi* to signify the man *to whom announcements are made* by God, i.e. inspired. <sup><1045></sup>Exodus 4:1-17 is the classical passage as to the meaning of this word. There God says to Moses, “Aaron shall be thy **aybaē**(*nabi*) unto the people, and thou shalt be unto him instead of God.” The sense is. “Aaron shall speak what thou shalt communicate to him.” This appellation implies, then, the prophet's relation to God: he speaks not of his own accord, but what the Spirit puts into his mouth. Thus **aybaē**(*nabi*) is an adjective of passive signification: he who has been divinely inspired, who has received from God the revelations which he proclaims. But it is more in accordance with the usage of the word to regard it as signifying (actively) one *who announces or pours forth* the declarations of God. The latter signification is preferred by Ewald, Havernick, Oehler, Hengstenberg, Bleek, Lee, Pusey, M'Cauley, and the great majority of Biblical critics. We have the word in Barnabas (**ῥβι aybaē**), which is rendered **υἱὸς παρακλήσεως** (<sup><4085></sup>Acts 4:36), one whom

God has qualified to impart consolation, light, and strength to others. Augustine says, “The prophet of God is nothing else *nisi enunciator verborum Dei hominibus*. So Heidegger, “*Nabi* is properly every utterer of the words of another, not from his own, but from another’s influence and will.”

Two other Hebrew words are used to designate a prophet— *har* (נרֵב) and *hzej* (צֹחֶזֶה)—both signifying *one who sees*. They are rendered in the A.V. by “seer;” in the Sept. usually by βλέπων or ὀρωῶν, sometimes by προφήτης (1 Chronicles 26:28; 2 Chronicles 16:7, 10). The three words seem to be contrasted with each other in 1 Chronicles 29:29. “The acts of David the king, first and last, behold they are written in the book of Samuel the seer (*roeh*), and in the book of Nathan the prophet (*nabi*), and in the book of Gad the seer (*chozeh*).” *Roeh* is a title almost appropriated to Samuel. It is only used ten times, and in seven of these it is applied to Samuel (1 Samuel 9:9, 11, 18, 19; 1 Chronicles 9:22; 26:28; 29:29). On two other occasions it is applied to Hanani (2 Chronicles 16:7, 10). Once it is used by Isaiah 30:10 with no reference to any particular person. It was superseded in general use by the word *nabi*, which Samuel (himself entitled *nabi* as well as *roeh* [1 Samuel 3:20; 2 Chronicles 35:18]) appears to have revived after a period of desuetude (1 Samuel 9:9), and to have applied to the prophets organized by him. The verb *har*; from which it is derived, is the common prose word signifying “to see:” *hzej*;— whence the substantive *hzej o* (*chozeh*) is derived—is more poetical, q.d. “to gaze.” *Chozeh* is rarely found except in the books of the Chronicles, but *zj* is the word constantly used for the prophetic vision. It is found in the Pentateuch, in Samuel, in the Chronicles, in Job, and in most of the prophets. In 1 Samuel 9:9 we read, “He that is now called a prophet (*nabi*) was beforetime called a seer (*roeh*);” from whence Stanley (*Lect. on Jewish Church*) has concluded that *roeh* was “the oldest designation of the prophetic office,” “superseded by *nabi* shortly after Samuel’s time, when *nabi* first came into use” (*ibid.* 18, 19). This seems opposed to the fact that *nabi* is the word commonly used in the Pentateuch, whereas *roeh* does not appear until the days of Samuel. The passage in the book of Samuel is clearly a parenthetical insertion, perhaps made by the *nabi* Nathan (or whoever was the original author of the book), perhaps added at a later date, with the view of explaining how it was that Samuel bore the title of *roeh*, instead of the now

usual appellation of *nabi*. To the writer the days of Samuel were “beforetime,” and he explains that in those ancient days — that is, the days of Samuel — the word used for prophet was *roeh*, not *nabi*. But that does not imply that *roeh* was the primitive word, and that *nabi* first came into use subsequently to Samuel (see Hengstenberg, *Beitrage zur Einleitung ins A. T.* 3, 335). Stanley represents *chozeh* as “another antique title;” but on no sufficient grounds. *Chozdth* is first found in <sup><1041></sup>2 Samuel 24:11; so that it does not seem to have come into use until *roeh* had almost disappeared. It is also found in the books of Kings (2 Kings, 17:13) and Chronicles (frequently), in <sup><3072></sup>Amos 7:12, <sup><2190></sup>Isaiah 19:10, <sup><3337></sup>Micah 3:7, and the derivatives of the verb *chazah* are used by the prophets to designate their visions down to the Captivity (comp. <sup><2001></sup>Isaiah 1:1; <sup><2701></sup>Daniel 8:1; <sup><3834></sup>Zechariah 13:4). The derivatives of *raah* are rarer, and, as being prose words, are chiefly used by Daniel (comp. <sup><3001></sup>Ezekiel 1:1; <sup><2707></sup>Daniel 10:7). On examination we find that *nabi* existed before and after and alongside of *roeh* and *chozeh*, but that *chozehl* was somewhat more modern than *roeh*.

Whether there is any difference in the usage of these three words, and, if any, what that difference is, has been much debated (see Witsius, *Miscell. Sacra*, i, 1, § 19; Carpzovius, *Introd. ad Libros Canon.* V T. 3, 1, §2; Winer, *Real-Wortebuch*, art. “Propheten”). Havernick (*Einleitung*, Th. i; *roeh. i.* § 56) considers *nabi* to express the title of those who officially belonged to the prophetic order, while *roeh* and *chozeh* denote those who received a prophetic revelation. Dr. Lee (*Inspiration of Holy Scripture*, p. 543) agrees with Hivernick in his explanation of *nabi*, but he identifies *roeh* in meaning rather with *nabi* than with *chozeh*. He further throws out a suggestion that *chozeh* is the special designation of the prophet attached to the royal household. In <sup><1041></sup>2 Samuel 24:11, Gad is described as “the prophet (*nabi*) Gad, David’s seer (*chozeh*),” and elsewhere he is called “David’s seer (*chozeh*)” (<sup><1310></sup>1 Chronicles 21:9), “the king’s seer (*chozeh*)” (<sup><4225></sup>2 Chronicles 29:25). “The case of Gad,” Dr. Lee thinks, “affords the clew to the difficulty, as it clearly indicates that attached to the royal establishment there was usually an individual styled “the king’s seer,” who might at the same time be a *nabi*.” The suggestion is ingenious (see, in addition to places quoted above, <sup><1326></sup>1 Chronicles 25:5; 29:29; <sup><4230></sup>2 Chronicles 29:30; 35:15), but it was only David (possibly also Manasseh, <sup><4638></sup>2 Chronicles 33:18) who, so far as we read, had this seer attached to his person; and in any case there is nothing in the word *chozeh* to denote the relation of the prophet to the king, but only in the connection in which it

stands with the word king. On the whole, it would seem that the same persons are designated by the three words *nabi*, *roeh*, and *chozeh* the last two titles being derived from the prophets' power of seeing the visions presented to them by God; the first from their function of revealing and proclaiming God's truth to men. When Gregory Naz. (*Or.* 28) calls Ezekiel ὁ τῶν μεγάλων ἐπόπτης καὶ ἐξηγητὴς μυστηρίων, he gives a sufficiently exact translation of the two titles *chozeh* or *roeh*, and *nabi*.

Sometimes the prophets are called **μυαροῦ** (*tsophiim*), i.e. those who espy, explore for the people, a "watchman" (<sup><2467></sup>Jeremiah 6:17; <sup><2617></sup>Ezekiel 3:17; 33:7). Such also is the usage of **ρῆμα** (*shomer*), i.e. "a watchman" (<sup><2911></sup>Isaiah 21:11; 62:6); and *roiim*, i.e. shepherds (<sup><3815></sup>Zechariah 11:5; 8:16), in reference to the spiritual care and religious nurture of the people. Other names, as "man of God," "servant of Jehovah," and now and then "angel," or "messenger of Jehovah," etc., do not belong to the prophets as such, but only in so far as they are of the number of servants and instruments of God. The phrase "man of the Spirit" (**ἄνθρωπος**, <sup><3907></sup>Hosea 9:7) explains the agency by which the communication came. In the appointment of the seventy elders the Lord says to Moses, "I will take of the Spirit which is upon thee, and will put it on them" (<sup><4017></sup>Numbers 11:17). So with regard to Eldad and Medad, "the Spirit rested upon them,... and they prophesied in the camp." The resting of the Spirit upon them was equivalent to the gift of prophecy (see <sup><6021></sup>2 Peter 1:21).

The word *nabi* is uniformly translated in the Sept. by **προφήτης**, and in the A.V. by "prophet." In classical Greek, **προφήτης** signifies *one who speaks for another*, specially *one who speaks for a god*, and so interprets his will to man (Liddell and Scott, s.v.). Hence its essential meaning is "an interpreter." Thus Apollo is a **προφήτης**, as being the interpreter of Zeus (Eschylus, *Eum.* 19). Poets are the Prophets of the Muses, as being their interpreters (Plato, *Phcedr.* 262 d). The **προφήται** attached to heathen temples are so named from their interpreting the oracles delivered by the inspired and unconscious **μάντις** (Plato, *Tim.* 72 b; Herod. 7:111, note [ed. Bahr]). We have Plato's authority for deriving **μάντις** from **μαίνομαι** (*l.c.*). The use of the word **προφήτης** in its modern sense is post-classical, and is derived from the Sept.

From the mediaeval use of the word **προφητεία**, *prophecy* passed into the English language in the sense of *prediction*, and this sense it has retained as its popular meaning (see Richardson, s.v.). The larger sense of

*interpretation* has not, however, been lost. Thus we find in Bacon, “An exercise commonly called *prophesying*, which was this: that the ministers within a precinct did meet upon a week-day in some principal town, where there was some ancient grave minister that was president, and an auditory admitted of gentlemen or other persons of leisure. Then every minister successively, beginning with the youngest, did handle one and the same part of Scripture, spending severally some quarter of an hour or better, and in the whole some two hours. And so the exercise being begun and concluded with prayer, and the president giving a text for the next meeting, the assembly was dissolved” (*Pacification of the Church*). This meaning of the word is made further familiar to us by the title of Jeremy Taylor’s treatise *On Liberty of Prophesying*. Nor was there any risk of the title of a book published in our own days, *On the Prophetical Office of the Church* (Oxf. 1838), being misunderstood. In fact, the English word prophet, like the word *inspiration*, has always been used in a larger and in a closer sense. In the larger sense our Lord Jesus Christ is a “prophet,” Moses is a “prophet,” Mohammed is a “prophet.” The expression means that they proclaimed and published a new religious dispensation. In a similar, though not identical sense, the Church is said to have a “prophetical,” i.e. an expository and interpretative, office. But in its closer sense the word, according to usage, though not according to etymology, involves the idea of foresight. This is and always has been its more usual acceptation. The different meanings, or shades of meaning, in which the abstract noun is employed in Scripture have been drawn out by Locke as follows:

“Prophecy comprehends three things: prediction; singing by the dictate of the Spirit; and understanding and explaining the mysterious, hidden sense of Scripture by an immediate illumination and motion of the Spirit” (*Paraphrase of 1 Corinthians 12*, note, p. 121 [Lond. 1742]). It is in virtue of this last signification of the word that the prophets of the New Test. are so called (1 Corinthians 12); by virtue of the second that the sons of Asaph, etc., are said to have “prophesied with a harp” (25:3), and Miriam and Deborah are termed “prophetesses.” That the idea of potential if not actual prediction enters into the conception expressed by the word prophecy, when that word is used to designate the function of the Hebrew prophets, seems to be proved by the following passages of Scripture: <6182>Deuteronomy 18:22; <2819>Jeremiah 28:9; <4123>Acts 2:30; 3:18-21; <6010>1 Peter 1:10; <6019>2 Peter 1:19, 20; 3:2. Etymologically, however, it is certain that neither prescience nor prediction is implied by the term used in the Hebrew language. But it seems to be incorrect to say that the English word



was “originally” used in the wider sense of “preaching,” and that it became “limited” to the meaning of “predicting” in the 17th century, in consequence of “an etymological mistake” (Stanley, *Lect.* 19, 20). The word entered into the English language in its sense of predicting. It could not have been otherwise, for at the time of the formation of the English language the word *προφητεία* had, by usage, assumed popularly the meaning of prediction. We find it ordinarily employed by early as well as by late writers in this sense (see Polydore Virgil, *Hist. of England*, 4:161 [Camden ed. 1846]; *Coventry Mysteries*, p. 65 [Shakespeare Soc. ed. 1841]). It is probable that the meaning was “limited” to “prediction” as much and as little before the 17th century as it has been since.

## II. *The Prophetical Order.* —

**1. *Its Historical Development.*** — Generally speaking, every one was a prophet to whom God communicated his mind in this peculiar manner. Thus, e.g. Abraham is called a prophet (<sup><0107></sup>Genesis 20:7), not, as is commonly thought, on account of general revelations granted him by God, but because such as he received were in the special form described; as, indeed, in chap. 15 it is expressly stated that divine communications were made to him in *visions* and *dreams*. The patriarchs as a class are in the same manner called prophets (<sup><0985></sup>Psalm 105:15). Moses is more specifically a prophet, as being a proclaimer of a new dispensation, a revealer of God’s will, and in virtue of his divinely inspired songs (Exodus 15; Deuteronomy 32, 33; Psalm 90); but his main work was not prophetical, and he is therefore formally distinguished from prophets (<sup><04126></sup>Numbers 12:6) as well as classed with them (<sup><05815></sup>Deuteronomy 18:15; 34:10). Aaron is the prophet of Moses (<sup><0700></sup>Exodus 7:1); Miriam (<sup><0250></sup>Exodus 15:20) is a prophetess; and we find the prophetic gift in the elders who “prophesied” when “the Spirit of the Lord rested upon them,” and in Eldad and Medad, who “prophesied in the camp” (<sup><04127></sup>Numbers 11:27). At the time of the sedition of Miriam, the possible existence of prophets is recognised (<sup><04126></sup>Numbers 12:6).

When the Mosaic economy had been established, a new element was introduced. The sacerdotal caste then became the instrument by which the members of the Jewish theocracy were taught and governed in things spiritual. Feast and fast, sacrifice and offering, rite and ceremony, constituted a varied and ever-recurring system of training and teaching by type and symbol. To the priests, too, was intrusted the work of “teaching

the children of Israel all the statutes which the Lord hath spoken unto them by the hand of Moses” (<sup><B011></sup>Leviticus 10:11). Teaching by act and teaching by word were alike their task. This office they adequately fulfilled for some hundred or more years after the giving of the law at Mount Sinai. But during the time of the Judges the priesthood sank into a state of degeneracy, and the people were no longer affected by the acted lessons of the ceremonial service. They required less enigmatic warnings and exhortations. Under these circumstances a new moral power was evoked—the regular Prophetic Line. Special functionaries of this kind had from time to time already appeared. In the days of the Judges we find that Deborah (<sup><0048></sup>Judges 4:4) was a prophetess; a prophet (6:8) rebuked and exhorted the Israelites when oppressed by the Midianites; and in Samuel’s childhood “a man of God” predicted to Eli the death of his two sons, and the curse that was to fall on his descendants (<sup><0027></sup>1 Samuel 2:27). But it was now time for a more formal institution of the prophetic order. Samuel, himself a Levite, of the family of Kohath (<sup><1328></sup>1 Chronicles 6:28), and certainly acting as a priest, was the instrument used at once for effecting a reform in the sacerdotal order (<sup><1322></sup>1 Chronicles 9:22), and for giving to the prophets a position of influence which they had never before held. So important was the work wrought by him that he is classed in Holy Scripture with Moses (<sup><2451></sup>Jeremiah 15:1; <sup><3906></sup>Psalms 99:6; <sup><4034></sup>Acts 3:24), Samuel being the great religious reformer and organizer of the prophetic order, as Moses was the great legislator and founder of the priestly rule. Nevertheless, it is not to be supposed that Samuel created the prophetic order as a new thing before unknown. The germs both of the prophetic and of the regal order are found in the law as given to the Israelites by Moses (<sup><6331></sup>Deuteronomy 13:1; 18:20; 17:18), but they were not yet developed, because there was not yet the demand for them. Samuel, who evolved the one, himself saw the evolution of the other. It is a vulgar error respecting Jewish history to suppose that there was an antagonism between the prophets and the priests. There is not a trace of such antagonism. Isaiah may denounce a wicked hierarchy (<sup><2310></sup>Isaiah 1:10), but it is because it is wicked, not because it is a hierarchy. Malachi “sharply reproves” the priests (<sup><3001></sup>Malachi 2:1), but it is in order to support the priesthood (comp. 1, 14). Mr. F. W. Newman even designates Ezekiel’s writings as “hard sacerdotalism,” “tedious and unedifying as Leviticus itself” (*Hebr. Monarch.* p. 330). The prophetic order was, in truth, supplemental, not antagonistic, to the sacerdotal. *SEE SAMUEL.*

Samuel took measures to make his work of restoration permanent as well as effective for the moment. For this purpose he instituted companies, or colleges of prophets. One we find in his lifetime at Ramah (<sup><099></sup>1 Samuel 19:19, 20); others afterwards at Bethel (<sup><121></sup>2 Kings 2:3), Jericho (<sup><125></sup>2 Kings 2:5), Gilgal (<sup><128></sup>2 Kings 4:38), and elsewhere (<sup><131></sup>2 Kings 6:1). Their constitution and object were similar to those of theological colleges. Into them were gathered promising students, and here they were trained for the office which they were afterwards destined to fulfil. So successful were these institutions that from the time of Samuel to the closing of the Canon of the Old Test. there seems never to have been wanting a due supply of men to keep up the line of official prophets. There appears to be no sufficient ground for the common statement that after the schism the colleges existed only in the Israelitish kingdom, or for Knobel's supposition that they ceased with Elisha (*Prophetismus*, 2, 39), nor again for Bishop Lowth's statement that "they existed from the earliest times of the Hebrew republic" (*Sacred Poetry*, lect. 18), or for M. Nicolas's assertion that their previous establishment can be inferred from 1 Samuel 8, 9, 10 (*Etudes Critiques sur la Bible*, p. 365). We have, however, no *actual proof* of their existence except in the days of Samuel and of Elijah and Elisha. The apocryphal books of the Maccabees (1, 4:46; 9:27; 14:41) and of Ecclesiasticus (36:15) represent them as extinct. The colleges appear to have consisted of students differing in number. Sometimes they were very numerous (<sup><118></sup>1 Kings 18:4; 22:6; <sup><126></sup>2 Kings 2:16). One elderly, or leading prophet, presided over them (<sup><099></sup>1 Samuel 19:20), called their father (<sup><092></sup>1 Samuel 10:12), or master (<sup><121></sup>2 Kings 2:3), who was apparently admitted to his office by the ceremony of anointing (<sup><119></sup>1 Kings 19:16; <sup><230></sup>Isaiah 61:1; <sup><045></sup>Psalms 105:15). They were called his sons. Their chief subject of study was, no doubt, the law and its interpretation; oral, as distinct from symbolical, teaching being henceforward tacitly transferred from the priestly to the prophetic order. Subsidiary subjects of instruction were music and sacred poetry, both of which had been connected with prophecy from the time of Moses (<sup><025></sup>Exodus 15:20) and the Judges (<sup><004></sup>Judges 4:4; 5:1). The prophets that meet Saul "came down from the high place with a psaltery and a tabret, and a pipe and a harp before them" (<sup><095></sup>1 Samuel 10:5). Elijah calls a minstrel to evoke the prophetic gift in himself (<sup><121></sup>2 Kings 3:15). David "separates to the service of the sons of Asaph and of Heman and of Jeduthun, who should *prophesy* with harps and with psalteries and with cymbals.... All these were under the hands of their father for song in the house of the Lord with cymbals, psalteries, and

harp for the service of the house of God” (<sup><12516></sup>1 Chronicles 25:16). Hymns, or sacred songs, are found in the books of <sup><3111></sup>Jonah 2:2, <sup><2111></sup>Isaiah 12:1; 26:1, <sup><3111></sup>Habakkuk 3:2. It was probably the duty of the prophetic students to compose verses to be sung in the Temple (see Lowth, *Sacred Poetry of the Hebrews*, lect. 18). Having been themselves trained and taught, the prophets, whether still residing within their college or having left its precincts, had the task of teaching others. From the question addressed to the Shunamite by her husband, “Wherefore wilt thou go to him to-day? It is neither new moon nor Sabbath” (<sup><11013></sup>2 Kings 4:23), it appears that weekly and monthly religious meetings were held as an ordinary practice by the prophets (see Patrick, *Conmm.* ad loc.). Thus we find that “Elisha sat in his house” engaged in his official occupation (comp. <sup><3111></sup>Ezekiel 8:1; 14:1; 20:1), “and the elders sat with him” (<sup><11112></sup>2 Kings 6:32), when the king of Israel sent to slay him. It was at these meetings, probably, that many of the warnings and exhortations on morality and spiritual religion were addressed by the prophets to their countrymen. **SEE *PROPHETS, SCHOOLS OF.***

The schools of the prophets were thus engaged in what we may call pastoral functions, rather than in the disclosure of things to come; their office was to bring home to men’s business and bosoms the announcements already made. Selected from the Levitical and priestly classes, they performed services chiefly of a priestly character (<sup><11013></sup>1 Samuel 9:13), but presided over devotional exercises and gave spiritual instruction. We may regard Elijah as the type of the whole prophetic order at this period; “a man of heroic energy in action, rather than of prolific thought or excellent discourse. Power was given him to smite the earth with plagues (<sup><61116></sup>Revelation 11:6). When an impression had been made by these extraordinary displays of power, a still small voice was heard to quicken the people to newness of life.” If we pass on to the religious teachers who are associated with the name and age of David — Nathan, Solomon, and others, who composed the Psalms — we shall see that these aimed at the religious education of their contemporaries by a pure stream of didactic and devotional poetry. Their object was to advance the members of the ancient economy to the highest degree of light and purity which was attainable in that state of minority. The predictive element crops out most distinctly in the Messianic psalms, which point to the ultimate completion of the kingdom in David’s Lord, and the universal reign of righteousness, truth, and peace. When these efforts failed to stem the tide of corruption

and to rescue the chosen people from disorder, ancient prophecy assumed the form of specific prediction. The moral element is chiefly seen in denouncing the iniquity and unrighteousness of the age, but the distinctive characteristic is that, in exposing the evils which prevailed, they directed the eye to the future. This band of religious teachers who are popularly spoken of as “the prophets” commenced with Hosea soon after the ministry of Elijah and Elisha. Hosea’s labors commenced in the days of Uzziah, king of Judah, and Jeroboam II, king of Israel, and were prolonged to the time of Hezekiah, comprising more than sixty years, so that with him were contemporary Amos, Jonah, Joel, Obadiah, Isaiah, Micah, Nahum. Next to these in order of time came Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Daniel, Habakkuk, Zephaniah. The last three were Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi. From these we derive our amplest materials for comparing the anticipations of prophecy with the subsequent events of history. Thus the prophets of the Old Covenant form a regular succession; they are members of an unbroken continuous chain, of which one perpetually reaches forth the hand to the other. *SEE PROPHETS, MAJOR, AND MINOR.*

In the first book of the Maccabees (9:17) the discontinuance of the prophetic calling is considered as forming an important era in Jewish history (see Stemmann, *De TerDmino Prophetarum* [Rost. 1723]), while at the same time an expectation of the renewal in future ages of prophetic gifts is avowed (1 Maccabees 4:46; 14:41). After the Babylonian exile the sacred writings were collected, which enabled every one to find the way of salvation; but the immediate revelations to the people of Israel were to cease for a while, in order to raise a stronger longing for the appearance of the Messiah, and to prepare for him a welcome reception. For the same reason the ark of the covenant had been taken away from the people. The danger of a complete apostasy, which in earlier times might have been incurred by this withdrawal, was not now to be apprehended. The external worship of the Lord was so firmly established that no extraordinary helps were wanted. Taking also into consideration the altered character of the people, we may add that the time after the exile was more fit to produce men learned in the law than prophets. Before this period, the faithful and the unbelieving were strongly opposed to each other, which excited the former to great exertions. These relaxed when the opposition ceased, and pious priests now took the place of prophets. The time after the exile is characterized by weakness and dependence; the people looked up to the past as to a height which they could not gain; the earlier writings obtained

unconditional authority, and the disposition for receiving prophetic gifts was lost. About a hundred years after the return from the Babylonian exile, the prophetic profession ceased. The Jewish tradition uniformly states that after Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi no prophet arose among the Jews till John the Baptist woke afresh the echoes of a long lost inspiration as the prelude to a new dispensation. For its resumption under the New Test. economy, see § 10 below.

**2. Manner of Life of the Prophets.**— The prophets went about poorly and coarsely dressed (<sup><1008></sup>2 Kings 1:8), not as a mere piece of asceticism, but that their very apparel might teach what the people ought to do; it was a “sermo propheticus realis.” Comp. <sup><1217></sup>1 Kings 21:27, where Ahab does penance in the manner figured by the prophet: “And it came to pass, when Ahab heard these words, that he rent his clothes, and put sackcloth upon his flesh and fasted” (see Nicolai, *De Prophetarum Vestitu* [Magdeb. 1746]; Zacharia, *De Propheta Tumn labitu* [Sodin, 1756]). The general appearance and life of the prophet were very similar to those of the Eastern dervish at the present day. His dress was a hairy garment, girt with a leathern girdle (<sup><2302></sup>Isaiah 20:2; <sup><8134></sup>Zechariah 13:4; <sup><4034></sup>Matthew 3:4). He was married or unmarried as he chose; but his manner of life and diet were stern and austere (<sup><1240></sup>2 Kings 4:10, 38; <sup><1196></sup>1 Kings 19:6; <sup><4034></sup>Matthew 3:4). Generally the prophets were not anxious to attract notice by ostentatious display; nor did they seek worldly wealth, most of them living in poverty and even want (<sup><1143></sup>1 Kings 14:3; <sup><1300></sup>2 Kings 4:1, 38, 42; 6:5). The decay of the congregation of God deeply chagrined them (comp. <sup><3706></sup>Micah 7:1, and many passages in Jeremiah). Insult, persecution, imprisonment, and death were often the reward of their godly life. The author of the Epistle to the Hebrews says (<sup><8157></sup>Hebrews 11:37): “They were stoned, they were sawn asunder, were tempted, were slain with the sword; they wandered about in sheep-skins and goat-skins, being destitute, afflicted, tormented” (comp. Christ’s speech, <sup><4123></sup>Matthew 23:29 sq.; <sup><1247></sup>2 Chronicles 24:17 sq.). The condition of the prophets, in their temporal humiliation, is vividly represented in the lives of Elijah and Elisha in the books of the Kings; and Jeremiah concludes the description of his sufferings in the 20th chapter by cursing the day of his birth. Repudiated by the world in which they were aliens, they typified the life of him whose appearance they announced, and whose spirit dwelt in them. They figured him, however, not only in his lowliness, but in his elevation. The Lord stood by them, gave evidence in their favor by fulfilling their predictions, frequently proved by miracles that

they were his own messengers, or retaliated on their enemies the injury done them. The prophets addressed the people of both kingdoms: they were not confined to particular places, but prophesied where it was required. For this reason they were most numerous in capital towns, especially in Jerusalem, where they generally spoke in the Temple. Sometimes their advice was asked, and then their prophecies take the form of answers to questions submitted to them (<sup>2300</sup>Isaiah 37; <sup>3000</sup>Ezekiel 20; <sup>3000</sup>Zechariah 7). But much more frequently they felt themselves inwardly moved to address the people without their advice having been asked, and they were not afraid to stand forward in places where their appearance, perhaps, produced indignation and terror. Whatever lay within or around the sphere of religion and morals formed the object of their care. They strenuously opposed the worship of false gods (<sup>2010</sup>Isaiah 1:10 sq.), as well as the finery of women (3, 16 sq.). Priests, princes, kings, all must hear them — must, however reluctantly, allow them to perform their calling as long as they spoke in the name of the true God, and as long as the result did not disprove their pretensions to be the servants of the invisible King of Israel (<sup>2475</sup>Jeremiah 37:15-21).

As seen above, there were institutions for training prophets; the senior members instructed a number of pupils and directed them. These schools had been first established by Samuel (<sup>900</sup>1 Samuel 10:8; 19:19); and at a later time there were such institutions in different places, as Bethel and Gilgal (<sup>1100</sup>2 Kings 2:3; 4:38; 6:1). The pupils of the prophets lived in fellowship united, and were called “sons of the prophets;” while the senior or experienced prophets were considered as their spiritual parents, and were styled fathers (comp. <sup>1200</sup>2 Kings 2:12; 6:21). Samuel, Elijah, and Elisha are mentioned as principals of such institutions. From them the Lord generally chose his instruments. Amos relates of himself (<sup>3074</sup>Amos 7:14, 15), as a thing uncommon, that he had been trained in no school of prophets, but was a herdsman, when the Lord took him to prophesy unto the people of Israel. At the same time, this example shows that the bestowal of prophetic gifts was not limited to the school of the prophets. Women also might come forward as prophetesses, as instanced in Miriam, Deborah, and Huldah, though such cases are of comparatively rare occurrence. We should also observe that only as regards the kingdom of Israel we have express accounts of the continuance of the schools of prophets. What is recorded of them is not directly applicable to the kingdom of Judah, especially since, as stated above, prophecy had in it an

essentially different position. We cannot assume that the organization and regulations of the schools of the prophets in the kingdom of Judah were as settled and established as in the kingdom of Israel. In the latter, the schools of the prophets had a kind of moastic constitution: they were not institutions of general education, but missionary stations; which explains the circumstance that they were established exactly in places which were the chief seats of superstition. The spiritual fathers travelled about to visit the training-schools; the pupils had their common board and dwelling, and those who married and left ceased not on that account to be connected with their colleges, but remained members of them. The widow of such a pupil of the schools of prophets who is mentioned in ~~2~~2 Kings 4:1 sq., considered Elisha as the person bound to care for her. The offerings which, by the Mosaic law, were to be given to the Levites were by the pious of the kingdom of Israel brought to the schools of the prophets (4:42). The prophets of the kingdom of Israel thus in some sort stood in a hostile position to the priests. These points of difference in the situation of the prophets of the two kingdoms must not be lost sight of; and we further add that prophecy in the kingdom of Israel was much more completed with extraordinary events than in the kingdom of Judah: the history of the latter offers no prophetic deeds equalling those of Elijah and Elisha. Prophecy in the kingdom of Israel not being grounded on a hierarchy venerable for its antiquity, consecrated by divine miracles, and constantly flavored with divine protection, it needed to be supported more powerful, and to be legitimized more evidently. In conclusion, it may be observed that the expression “schools of the prophets” is not exactly suited to their nature; as general instruction was not their object. The so-called prophets’ schools were associations of men endowed with the spirit of God, for the purpose of carrying on their work, the feeble powers of junior members being directed and strengthened by those of a higher class. To those who entered these unions the Divine Spirit had already been imparted, which was the imperative condition of their reception. *SEE PROPHETS, SONS OF.*

**III.** *The Prophetic Functions.* — These have already been in part glanced at, but the importance of the subject demands a fuller exposition. To belong to the prophetic order and to possess the prophetic gift are not convertible terms. There might be members of the prophetic order to whom the gift of prophecy was not vouchsafed. There might be inspired prophets who did not belong to the prophetic order. As we have seen above, the inspired prophet generally came from the college of the



prophets, and belonged to the prophetic order; but this was not always the case. In the instance of the prophet Amos, the rule and the exception are both manifested. When Amaziah, the idolatrous Israelitish priest, threatens the prophet and desires him to “flee away into the land of Judah, and there eat bread and prophesy there, but not to prophesy again any more at Bethel,” Amos in reply says “I was no prophet, neither was I a prophet’s son; but I was an herdsman, and a gatherer of sycamore fruit: and the Lord took me as I followed the flock, and the Lord said unto me, Go prophesy unto my people Israel” (<sup><3074></sup>Amos 7:14). That is, thought called to the prophetic *office*, he did not belong to the prophetic *order*, and had not been trained in the prophetic colleges; and this, he indicates, was an unusual occurrence (see J. Smith *On Prophecy*, ch. 9).

**1.** In a general way, we may indicate that the sphere of action of the prophets was absolutely limited to Israelites, and there is only one case of a prophet going to the heathen to preach among them — that of Jonah sent to Nineveh. He goes, however, to Nineveh to shame the Hebrews by the reception which he meets with there, and acting upon his own nation was thus even in this case the prophet’s ultimate object. Many predictions of the Old Test. concern, indeed, the events of foreign nations, but they are always uttered and written with reference to Israel, and the prophets thought not of publishing them among the heathens themselves. The conversion of the pagans to the worship of the true God was indeed a favorite idea of the prophets; but the Divine Spirit told them that it was not to be effected by their exertions, as it was connected with extensive future changes, which they might not forestall.

That the Lord would send such prophets was promised to the people by Moses, who by a special law (<sup><1581></sup>Deuteronomy 18:1) secured them authority and safety. As his ordinary servants and teachers, God appointed the priests: the characteristic mark which distinguished the prophets from them was inspiration; and this explains the circumstance that, in times of great moral and religious corruption, when the ordinary means no longer sufficed to reclaim the people, the number of prophets increased. The regular religious instruction of the people was no part of the business of the prophets: their proper duty \ as only to rouse and excite. ‘The contrary — viz. that a part of the regular duty of the prophets was to instruct the people—is often argued from <sup><1102></sup>2 Kings 4:23, where it is said that the Shunamitess on the sabbaths and days of new moon used to go to the prophet Elisha; but this passage applies only to the kingdom of Israel, and

admits of no inference with respect to the kingdom of Judah. As regards the latter, there is no proof that prophets held meetings for instruction and edification on sacred days. Their position was here quite different from that of the prophets in the kingdom of Israel. The agency of the prophets in the kingdom of Judah was only of a subsidiary kind. These extraordinary messengers of the Lord only filled there the gaps left by the regular servants of God, the priests and the Levites: the priesthood never became there utterly degenerate, and each lapse was followed by a revival of which the prophets were the vigorous agents. The divine election always vindicated itself, and in the purity of the origin of the priesthood lay the certainty of its continued renewal. On the contrary, the priesthood in the kingdom of Israel had no divine sanction, no promise; it was corrupt in its very source: to reform itself would have been to dissolve itself. The priests there were the mercenary servants of the king, and had a brand upon their own consciences. Hence in the kingdom of Israel the prophets were the regular ministers of God: with their office all stood or fell, and hence they were required to do many things besides what the original conception of the office of a prophet implied—a circumstance from the oversight of which many erroneous notions on the nature of prophecy have sprung. This led to another difference, to which we shall revert below, viz. that in the kingdom of Judah the prophetic office did not, as in Israel, possess a fixed organization and complete construction.

In their labors, as respected their own times, the prophets were strictly bound to the Mosaic law, and not allowed to add to it or to diminish aught from it. What was said in this respect to the whole people (<sup>(~~ROM~~)</sup>Deuteronomy 4:2; 13:1) applied also to them. We find, therefore, prophecy always takes its ground on the Mosaic law to which it refers, from which it derives its sanction, and with which it is fully impressed and saturated. There is no chapter in the prophets in which there are not several references to the law. The business of the prophets was to explain it, to lay it to the hearts of the people, and to preserve vital its spirit. It was, indeed, also their duty to point to future reforms, when the ever-living spirit of the law would break its hitherto imperfect form, and make for itself another: thus <sup>(~~HEB~~)</sup>Jeremiah 3:16 foretells days when the ark of the covenant shall be no more, and (<sup>(~~BIB~~)</sup>Jeremiah 31:31) days when a new covenant will be made with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah. But for their own times they never once dreamed of altering any, even the minutest and least essential precept, even as to its form; how much less as to its spirit, which

even the Lord himself declares (<sup><4058></sup>Matthew 5:18) to be immutable and eternal! The passages which some interpreters have alleged as opposed to sacrifices as instituted by the Mosaic law have been misunderstood; they do not denounce sacrifices generally, but only those of the Canaanites, with whom sacrifice was not even a form of true worship. but opposed to the genuine and spiritual service of God.

**2.** More specifically, the sixteen prophets whose books are in the Canon have that place of honor because they were endowed with the *prophetic gift* as well as ordinarily (so far as we know) belonging to the *prophetic order*. There were hundreds of prophets contemporary with each of these sixteen prophets; and no doubt numberless compositions in sacred poetry and numberless moral exhortations were issued from the several schools, but only sixteen books find their place in the Canon. Why is this? Because these sixteen had what their brother collegians had not — the divine call to the office of prophet, and the divine illumination to enlighten them. It was not sufficient to have been taught and trained in preparation for a future call. Teaching and training served as a preparation only. When the schoolmaster's work was done, then, if the instrument was worthy, God's work began. Moses had an external call at the burning bush (Exodus 3, 2). The Lord called Samuel so that Eli perceived, and Samuel learned, that it was the Lord who called him (1 Samuel 3, 10). <sup><268></sup>Isaiah 6:8, <sup><306></sup>Jeremiah 1:5, <sup><306></sup>Ezekiel 2:4, <sup><307></sup>Amos 7:15, declare their special mission. Nor was it sufficient for this call to have been made once for all. Each prophetic utterance is the result of a communication of the divine to the human spirit, received either by "vision" (<sup><301></sup>Isaiah 6:1) or by "the word of the Lord" (<sup><301></sup>Jeremiah 2:1). (See *Aids to Faith*, essay 3, "On Prophecy.") What, then, are the characteristics of the sixteen prophets thus called and commissioned, and intrusted with the messages of God to his people?

**(1.)** They were the national poets of Judaea. We have already shown that music and poetry, chants and hymns, were a main part of the studies of the class from which, generally speaking, they were derived. As is natural, we find not only the songs previously specified, but the rest of their compositions, poetical, or breathing the spirit of poetry. Bishop Lowth "esteems the whole book of Isaiah poetical, a few passages excepted, which, if brought together. would not at most exceed the bulk of five or six chapters," "half of the book of Jeremiah," "the greater part of Ezekiel." The rest of the prophets are mainly poetical, but Haggai is "prosaic," and Jonah and Daniel are plain prose (*Sacred Poetry*, lect. 21). The prophetic

style differs from that of books properly called poetical, whose sublimity it all but outvies, only in being less restrained by those external forms which distinguish poetical language from prose, and in introducing more frequently than prose does plays upon words and thoughts. This peculiarity may be explained by the practical tendency of prophetic addresses, which avoid all that is unintelligible, and studiously introduce what is best calculated for the moment to strike the hearers. The same appears from many other circumstances, e.g. the union of *music* with prophesying, the demeanor of Saul when among the prophets (<sup><9015></sup>1 Samuel 10:5), Balaam's description of himself (<sup><0913></sup>Numbers 24:3) as a man whose eyes were opened, who saw the vision of the Almighty, and heard the words of God, the established phraseology to denote the inspiring impulse, viz. "the hand of the Lord was strong upon him" (<sup><2014></sup>Ezekiel 3:14; comp. <sup><2014></sup>Isaiah 8:11; <sup><1101></sup>2 Kings 3:15), etc. (See § 6, below.)

(2.) They were annalists and historians. A great portion of Isaiah, of Jeremiah, of Daniel, of Jonah, of Haggai, is direct or indirect history.

(3.) They were preachers of patriotism; their patriotism being founded on the religious motive. To the subject of the theocracy, the enemy of his nation was the enemy of God, the traitor to the public weal was a traitor to his God: a denunciation of an enemy was a denunciation of a representative of evil; an exhortation in behalf of Jerusalem was an exhortation in behalf of God's kingdom on earth, "the city of our God, the mountain of holiness, beautiful for situation, the joy of the whole earth, the city of the great King" (<sup><1901></sup>Psalms 48:1, 2).

(4.) They were preachers of morals and of spiritual religion. The symbolical teaching of the law had lost much of its effect. Instead of learning the necessity of purity by the legal washings, the majority came to rest in the outward act as in itself sufficient. It was the work, then, of the prophets to hold up before the eyes of their countrymen a high and pure morality, not veiled in symbols and acts, but such as none could profess to misunderstand. Thus, in his first chapter, Isaiah contrasts ceremonial observances with spiritual morality: "Your new moons and your appointed feasts my soul hateth: they are a trouble unto me; I am weary to bear them... Wash ye, make you clean; put away the evil of your doings from before mine eyes; cease to do evil; learn to do well; seek judgment; relieve the oppressed, judge the fatherless, plead for the widow" (<sup><2014></sup>Isaiah 1:14-17). He proceeds to denounce God's judgments on the oppression and

covetousness of the rulers, the pride of the women (ch. 3), on grasping, profligacy, iniquity, injustice (ch. 5), and so on throughout. The system of morals put forward by the prophets, if not higher or sterner or purer than that of the law, is more plainly declared, and with greater, because now more needed, vehemence of diction. “Magna fides et grandis aldacia prophetarum,” says St. Jerome (*In Ezekiel*). This was their general characteristic, but that gifts and graces might be dissevered is proved by the cases of Balaam, Jonah, Caiaphas, and the disobedient prophet of Judah.

**(5.)** They were extraordinary, but yet authorized, exponents of the law. As an instance of this we may take Isaiah’s description of a true fast (<sup><280B></sup>Isaiah 58:3-7); Ezekiel’s explanation of the sins of the father being visited on the children (ch. 18); Micah’s preference of “doing justly, loving mercy, and walking humbly with God,” to “thousands of rams and ten thousands of rivers of oil” (<sup><300B></sup>Micah 6:6-8). In these, as in other similar cases (comp. <sup><300B></sup>Hosea 6:6; <sup><300B></sup>Amos 5:21), it was the task of the prophets to restore the balance which had been overthrown by the Jews and their teachers dwelling on one side or oil the outer covering of a truth or of a duty, and leaving the other side or the inner meaning out of sight.

**(6.)** They held, as we have shown above, a pastoral or quasi-pastoral office.

**(7.)** They were a political power in the state. Strong in the safeguard of their religious character, they were able to serve as a counterpoise to the royal authority when wielded even by an Ahab.

**(8.)** But the prophets were something more than national poets and annalists, preachers of patriotism, moral teachers, exponents of the law, pastors, and politicians. We have not yet touched upon their most essential characteristic, which is that they were instruments of revealing God’s will to man; as in other ways, so, specially, by predicting future events, and, in particular, by foretelling the incarnation of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the redemption effected by him. There are two chief ways of exhibiting this fact — one is suitable when discoursing with Christians, the other when arguing with unbelievers. To the Christian it is enough to show that the truth of the New Testament and the truthfulness of its authors, and of the Lord himself, are bound up with the truth of the existence of this predictive element in the prophets. To the unbeliever it is necessary to show that facts have verified their predictions.

(a.) In Matthew's Gospel, the first chapter, we find a quotation from the prophet Isaiah, "Behold a virgin shall be with child, and shall bring forth a son, and they shall call his name Emmanuel;" and, at the same time, we find a statement that the birth of Christ took place as it did "that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the prophet," in those words (<sup>2312</sup>Isaiah 1:22, 23). This means that the prophecy was the declaration of God's purpose, and that the circumstances of the birth of Christ were the fulfilment of that purpose. Then, either the predictive element exists in the book of the prophet Isaiah, or the authority of the evangelist Matthew must be given up. The same evangelist testifies to the same prophet having "spoken of" John the Baptist (<sup>488B</sup>John 3:3) in words which he quotes from <sup>234B</sup>Isaiah 40:3. He says (<sup>404B</sup>John 4:13-15) that Jesus came and dwelt in Capernaum "that" other words "spoken by" the same prophet (<sup>490E</sup>John 9:1) "might be fulfilled." He says (<sup>488T</sup>John 8:17) that Jesus did certain acts "that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by Esaias the prophet" (<sup>2354</sup>Isaiah 53:4). He says (<sup>4817</sup>John 12:17) that Jesus acted in a particular manner "that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by Esaias the prophet" in words quoted from <sup>2341</sup>Isaiah 42:1. Then, if we believe Matthew, we must believe that in the pages of the prophet Isaiah there was predicted that, which Jesus some seven hundred years afterwards fulfilled. This conclusion cannot be escaped by pressing the words ἵνα πληρωθῆ, for if they do not mean that certain things were done in order that the divine predestination might be accomplished, which predestination was already declared by the prophet, they must mean that Jesus Christ knowingly moulded his acts so as to be in accordance with what was said in an ancient book which in reality had no reference to him, a thing which is entirely at variance with the character drawn of him by Matthew. and which would make him a conscious impostor, inasmuch as he himself appeals to the prophecies. Further, it would imply (as in <sup>4012</sup>Matthew 1:22) that God himself contrived certain events (as those connected with the birth of Christ), not in order that they might be in accordance with his will, but in order that they might be agreeable to the declarations of a certain book—than which nothing could well be more absurd.

But further, we have not only the evidence of the evangelist; we have the evidence of the Lord himself. He declares (<sup>4034</sup>Matthew 13:14) that in the Jews of his age "is fulfilled the prophecy of Esaias, which saith —" (<sup>2369</sup>Isaiah 6:9). He says (<sup>4017</sup>Matthew 15:7), "Esaias well prophesied of them" (<sup>2393</sup>Isaiah 19:13). Then, if we believe our Lord's sayings and the

record of them, we must believe in prediction as existing in the prophet Isaiah. This prophet, who is cited between fifty and sixty times, may be taken as a sample; but the same argument might be brought forward with respect to Jeremiah (~~4028~~ Matthew 2:18; ~~3808~~ Hebrews 8:8), Daniel (~~4245~~ Matthew 24:15), Hosea (~~4025~~ Matthew 2:15; ~~6025~~ Romans 9:25), Joel (~~4427~~ Acts 2:17), Amos (~~4074~~ Acts 7:42; 15:16), Jonah (~~4024~~ Matthew 12:40), Micah (~~4027~~ Matthew 12:7), Habakkuk (~~4134~~ Acts 13:41), Haggai (~~3925~~ Hebrews 12:26), Zechariah (~~4215~~ Matthew 21:5; ~~4147~~ Mark 14:27; ~~3957~~ John 19:37), Malachi (~~4110~~ Matthew 11:10; ~~4002~~ Mark 1:2; ~~4077~~ Luke 7:27). With this evidence for so many of the prophets, it would be idle to cavil with respect to Ezekiel, Obadiah, Nahum, Zephaniah; the more so as “the prophets” are frequently spoken of together (~~4023~~ Matthew 2:23; ~~4134~~ Acts 13:40; 15:15) as authoritative. The Psalms are quoted no less than seventy times, and very frequently as being predictive.

**(b.)** The argument with the unbeliever does not admit of being brought to an issue so concisely. Here it is necessary

- [1] to point out the existence of certain declarations as to future events, the probability of which was not discernible by human sagacity at the time that, the declarations were made;
- [2] to show that certain events did afterwards take place corresponding with those declarations;
- [3] to show that a chance coincidence is not an adequate hypothesis on which to account for that correspondence. *SEE PROPHECY.*

Dr. Davidson pronounces it as “now commonly admitted that the essential part of Biblical prophecy does not lie in predicting contingent events, but in divining the essentially religious in the course of history... In no prophecy can it be shown that the literal predicting of distant historical events is contained... . In conformity with the analogy of prophecy generally, special predictions concerning Christ do not appear in the Old Testament.” Dr. Davidson must mean that this is “now commonly admitted” by writers like himself, who, following Eichhorn, resolve “the prophet’s delineations of the future” into, “in essence, *nothing but forebodings — efforts of the spiritual eye* to bring up before itself the distinct form of the future. The prevision of the prophet is intensified presentiment.” Of course, if the powers of the prophets were simply “forebodings” and “presentiments” of the human spirit in “its preconscious region,” they could not do more than

make indefinite guesses about the future. But this is not the Jewish nor the Christian theory of prophecy. See Basil (*In Esai.* c. iii), Chrysostom (*Hom.* 22 t. v, 137, ed. 1612), Clem. Alex. (*Strom.* lib. ii), Eusebius (*Dem. Evang.* v, 132, ed. 1544), and Justin Martyr (*Dial. cum Tryph.* p. 224, ed. 1636). See Suicer, s.v. **προφήτης**.

The view commonly taken of the prophets is, indeed, that they were mere predictors of future events; but this view is one-sided and too narrow; though, on the other hand, we must beware of expanding too much the acceptance of the term prophet. Not to mention those who, like Hendewerk, in the introduction to his *Commentary on the Prophet Isaiah*, identify the notion of a prophet with that of an honest and pious man, yet we see from the above considerations that the conception of those is likewise too wide who place the essential feature of a prophet in his divine inspiration. That this does not meet the whole subject appears from <sup>(412)</sup>Numbers 12:6 sq.. where Moses, who enjoyed divine inspiration in its highest grade, is represented as differing from those called prophets in a stricter sense, and as standing in contrast with them. Divine inspiration is only the general basis of the prophetic office, to which other elements must be added, especially the gift of that inspiration in a formal manner and for a specific purpose. This will become still more clear from the considerations adduced under the next heads.

**IV. Test of the Prophetic Character.** — As Moses had foretold, a host of false prophets arose in later times among the people, who promised prosperity without repentance, and preached the Gospel without the law. The writings of the prophets are full of complaints of the mischief done by these impostors. Jeremiah significantly calls them “prophets of the deceit of their own heart” — i.e. men who followed the suggestions of their own fancy in prophesying (Jeremiah 23, 26 comp. ver. 16, and ch. 14:14). All their practices prove the great influence which true prophetism had acquired among the people of Israel. But how were the people to distinguish between true and false prophets? This is decided partly by positive or negative criteria, and partly by certain general marks.

**1.** In the law concerning prophets (<sup>(413)</sup>Deuteronomy 18:20; comp. 13:7-9) the following enactments are contained:

**(1.)** The prophet *who speaks in the name of other gods* — i.e. professes to have his revelations from a god different from Jehovah — is to be



considered as false, and to be punished capitally; and this even though his predictions should come to pass.

(2.) The same punishment is to be inflicted on him who speaks in the name of the true God, but *whose predictions are not accomplished*.

These enactments established a peculiar right of the prophets. He who prophesied in the name of the true God was, even when he foretold calamity, entitled to be tolerated, until it happened that a prediction of his failed of accomplishment. He might then be imprisoned, but could not be put to death, as instanced in <sup><2368></sup>Jeremiah 26:8-16, who is apprehended and arraigned, but acquitted: "Then, said the princes and the people unto the priests and the prophets, This man is not worthy to die, for he has spoken to us in the name of the Lord our God." Ahab is by false prophets encouraged to attack Ramoth-gilead, but Micaiah prophesied him no good; on which the king becomes angry, and orders the prophet to be confined (<sup><1221></sup>1 Kings 22:1-27): "Take Micaiah and put him in prison, and feed him with bread of affliction, and with water of affliction, until I come in peace." Micaiah answers (ver. 28), "If thou return at all in peace, the Lord has not spoken by me." Until the safe return of the king, Micaiah is to remain in prison; after that, he shall be put to death. The prophet agrees to it, and the king goes up to Ramoth-gilead, but is slain in the battle.

(3.) From the above two criteria of a true prophet flows the third, that *his addresses must be in strict accordance with the law*. Whoever departs from it cannot be a true prophet, for it is impossible that the Lord should contradict himself.

(4.) In the above is also founded the fourth criterion that *a true prophet must not promise prosperity without repentance*; and that he is a false prophet, "of the deceit of his own heart," who does not reprove the sins of the people, and who does not inculcate on them the doctrines of divine justice and retribution.

2. In addition to these negative criteria there were positive ones to procure authority to true prophets. First of all, it must be assumed that the prophets themselves received, along with the divine revelations, assurance that these were really divine. Any true communion with the Holy Spirit affords the assurance of its divine nature, and the prophets could, therefore, satisfy *themselves* of their divine mission. There was nothing to mislead and delude them in this respect, for temporal goods were not bestowed upon

them with the gift of prophesying. Their own native disposition was often much averse to this calling, and could be only conquered by the Lord forcibly impelling them, as appears from <sup><4018></sup>Jeremiah 20:8, 9: “Since I spake, the word of the Lord was made a reproach unto me, and a derision daily. Then I said, I will not make mention of him, nor speak any more in his name, but his word was in mine heart as a burning fire shut up in my bones, and I was weary with forbearing, and I could not stay.” Now, when the prophets themselves were convinced of their divine mission, they could in various ways prove it to others whom they were called on to enlighten.

(1.) To those who had any sense of truth, the Spirit of God gave evidence that the prophecies were divinely inspired. This *testimonium Spiritus Sancti* is the chief argument for the reality of a divine revelation; and he who is susceptible of it does not, indeed, disregard the other proofs suiting the wants of unimproved minds, but lays less stress on them.

(2.) The prophets themselves utter their firm conviction that they act and speak by divine authority, not of their own accord (comp. the often recurring phrase **hwby]magl** “a prophecy of Jehovah,” <sup><4032></sup>Jeremiah 26:12, etc.). Their pious life bore testimony to their being worthy of a nearer communion with God, and defended them from the suspicion of intentional deception; their sobriety of mind distinguished them from all fanatics, and defended them from the suspicion of self-delusion; their fortitude in suffering for truth proved that they had their commission from no human authority.

(3.) Part of the predictions of the prophets referred to proximate events, and their accomplishment was divine evidence of their divine origin. Whoever had been once favored with such a testimonial, his authority was established for his whole life, as instanced in Samuel. Of him it is said (<sup><4089></sup>1 Samuel 3:19): “The Lord was with him, and let none of his words fall to the ground (i.e. fulfilled them); and all Israel knew (from this) that Samuel was established to be a prophet of the Lord.” Of the divine mission of Isaiah no doubt could be entertained after, for instance, his prophecies of the overthrow of Sennacherib before Jerusalem had been fulfilled. The credentials of the divine mission of Ezekiel were certified when his prediction was accomplished, that Zedekiah should be brought to Babylon, but should not see it, for the king was made prisoner and blinded (<sup><4322></sup>Ezekiel 12:12, 13); they were further confirmed by the fulfilment of his prediction concerning the destruction of the city (ch. 24). Jeremiah’s claims

were authenticated by the fulfilment of his prediction that Shallum, the son of Josiah, king of Judah, should die in his prison, and see his native country no more (<sup><2021></sup>Jeremiah 22:11, 12).

(4.) Sometimes the divine mission of the prophets was also proved by miracles; but this occurred only at important crises, when the existence of the kingdom of Israel was in jeopardy, as in the age of Elijah and Elisha. Miracles are mentioned as criteria of true prophets (<sup><6132></sup>Deuteronomy 13:2), still with this caution, that they should not be trusted alone, but that the people should inquire whether the negative criteria were extant.

(5.) Those prophets whose divine commission had been sufficiently proved bore testimony to the divine mission of others. It has been observed above that there was a certain gradation among the prophets; the principals of the colleges of prophets procured authority to the “sons” of prophets. Thus the deeds of Elijah and Elisha at the same time authenticated the hundreds of prophets whose superiors they were. Concerning the relation of the true prophets to each other, the passage <sup><1200></sup>2 Kings 2:9 is remarkable; Elisha says to Elijah, “I pray thee, let a double portion of thy spirit be upon me.” Here Elisha, as the first-born of Elijah in a spiritual sense, and standing to him in the same relation as Joshua to Moses, asks for a double portion of his spiritual inheritance, alluding to the law concerning the hereditary right of the lawfully begotten first-born son (<sup><6217></sup>Deuteronomy 21:17). This case supposes that other prophets also of the kingdom of Israel took portions of the fulness of the spirit of Elijah. It is plain, then, that only a few prophets stood in immediate communion with God, while that of the remaining was formed by mediation. The latter were spiritually incorporated in the former, and, on the ground of this relation, actions performed by Elisha, or through the instrumentality of one of his pupils, are at once ascribed to Elijah, e.g. the anointing of Hazael to be king over Syria (<sup><1195></sup>1 Kings 19:15; comp. <sup><1283></sup>2 Kings 8:13); the anointing of Jehu to be king over Israel (<sup><1196></sup>1 Kings 19:16; comp. <sup><1201></sup>2 Kings 9:1 sq.); the writing of the letter to Joram, etc. Thus in a certain sense it may be affirmed that Elijah was in his time the only prophet of the kingdom of Israel. Similarly of Moses it is recorded, during his passage through the desert, that a portion of his spirit was conveyed to the seventy elders (<sup><4117></sup>Numbers 11:17). The history of the Christian Church itself offers analogies; look, e.g. at the relation of the second-class Reformers to Luther and Calvin.

(6.) It hardly needs to be mentioned that before a man could be a prophet he must be converted. This clearly appears in the case of Isaiah, “whose iniquity was taken away and his sin purged” previous to his entering on his mission to the people of the covenant.

For a single momentary inspiration, however, the mere beginning of spiritual life sufficed, as instanced in Balaam and Saul.

3. As to prophecy in its circumscribed sense, or the foretelling of future events by the prophets, some expositors would explain all predictions of special events; while others assert that no prediction contains anything but general promises or threatenings, and that the prophets knew nothing of the particular manner in which their predictions might be realized. Both these classes deviate from the correct view of prophecy: the former often resort to the most arbitrary interpretations, and the latter are opposed by a mass of facts against which they are unable successfully to contend: e.g. when Ezekiel foretells (<sup>3122</sup>Ezekiel 12:12) that Zedekiah would try to break through the walls of the city and to escape, but that he would be seized, blinded, and taken to Babylon. The frailty of the people, under the Old test., required external evidence of the real connection of the prophets with God, and the predictions of particular forthcoming events were to them **σημεία**, signs. These were the more indispensable to them, because the ancients generally, and the Orientals in particular, showed the greatest tendency towards the exploration of futurity, which tended to foster superstition and forward idolatry. All other methods of knowing future events by necromancy, conjuration, passing through the fire. etc., having been strictly forbidden (<sup>6180</sup>Deuteronomy 18:10, 11), it might be expected that the deep-rooted craving for the knowledge of forthcoming events would be gratified in some other and nobler manner. The success of a prophet depended on the gift of special knowledge of futurity; this, it is true, was granted comparatively to only few, but in the authority thus obtained all those shared who were likewise invested with the prophetic character. It was the seal impressed on true prophecy, as opposed to false. From <sup>0906</sup>1 Samuel 9:6, it appears that, to inspire uncultivated minds with the sense of divine truths, the prophets stooped occasionally to disclose things of common life, using this as the means to reach a higher mark. On the same footing with definite predictions stand miracles and tokens, which prophets of the highest rank, as Elijah and Isaiah, volunteered or granted. These also were requisite to confirm the feeble faith of the people; but Ewald justly remarks that with the true prophets they never appear as the

chief point; they only assist and accompany prophecy, but are not its object, not the truth itself; which supersedes them as soon as it gains sufficient strength and influence.

Some interpreters, misunderstanding passages like <sup><3488></sup>Jeremiah 18:8; 26:13, have asserted, with Dr. Koster, (p. 226 sq.), that all prophecies were conditional; and have even maintained that their revocability distinguished the true predictions (*Weissagung*) from soothsaying (*Wahrsagung*). But beyond all doubt, when the prophet denounces the divine judgments, he proceeds on the assumption that the people will not repent, an assumption which he knows from God to be true. Were the people to repent, the prediction would fail; but because they will not, it is uttered *absolutely*. It does not follow, however, that the prophet's warnings and exhortations are useless. These serve "for a witness against them;" and besides, amid the ruin of the mass, individuals might be saved. Viewing prophecies as conditional predictions nullifies them. The Mosaic criterion (<sup><682></sup>Deuteronomy 18:22), that he was a false prophet who predicted "things which followed not nor came to pass," would then be of no value, since recourse might always be had to the excuse that the case had been altered by the fulfilment of the condition. The fear of introducing fatalism, if the prophecies are not taken in a conditional sense, is unfounded; for God's omniscience, his foreknowledge, does not establish fatalism, and from divine omniscience simply is the prescience of the prophets to be derived. The prophets feel themselves so closely united to God that the words of Jehovah are given as their own, and that to them is often ascribed what God does, as slaying and reviving (<sup><305></sup>Hosea 6:5), rooting out nations and restoring them (<sup><300></sup>Jeremiah 1:10; 18:7; <sup><3528></sup>Ezekiel 32:18; 43:3); which proves their own consciousness to have been entirely absorbed into that of God.

**V. The Prophetic State of Inspiration.** — WE learn from Holy Scripture that it was by the agency of the Spirit of God that the prophets received the divine communication. Thus, on the appointment of the seventy elders, "The Lord said, I will take of the Spirit which is upon thee, and will put it upon them... And the Lord... took of the Spirit that was upon him, and gave it unto the seventy elders; and it came to pass that when the Spirit rested upon them, they prophesied and did not cease... And Moses said Would God that all the Lord's people were prophets, and that the Lord would put his Spirit upon them" (<sup><0417></sup>Numbers 11:17, 25, 29). Here we see that what made the seventy prophesy was their being endued with the

Lord's Spirit by the Lord himself. So it is the Spirit of the Lord which made Saul (<sup><9116></sup>1 Samuel 10:6) and his messengers (19:20) prophesy. Thus Peter assures us that "prophecy came not in old time by the will of man, but holy men of God spake, moved (**φερόμενοι**) by the Holy Ghost" (<sup><6021></sup>2 Peter 1:21), while false prophets are described as those "who speak a vision of their own heart, and not out of the mouth of the Lord" (<sup><2426></sup>Jeremiah 23:16), "who prophesy out of their own hearts,... who follow their own spirit, and have seen nothing" (<sup><2332></sup>Ezekiel 13:2, 3). Hence the emphatic declarations of the Great Prophet of the Church that he did not speak of himself (<sup><8377></sup>John 7:17, etc.). The prophet held an intermediate position in communication between God and man. God communicated with him by his Spirit, and he, having received this communication, was "the spokesman" of God to man (comp. <sup><1071></sup>Exodus 7:1, and 4:16). But the means by which the Divine Spirit communicated with the human spirit, and the conditions of the human spirit under which the divine communications were received, have not been clearly declared to us. They are, however, indicated. On the occasion of the sedition of Miriam and Aaron, we read, "And the Lord said, Hear now my words: It there be a prophet among you, I the Lord will make myself known unto him in a vision, and will speak unto him in a dream. My servant Moses is not so, who is faithful in all mine house: with him will I speak mouth to mouth, even apparently, and not in dark speeches, and the similitude of the Lord shall he behold" (<sup><4126></sup>Numbers 12:6-8). Here we have an exhaustive division of the different ways in which the revelations of God are made to man: 1. Direct declaration and manifestation — "I will speak mouth to mouth, apparently, and the similitude of the Lord shall he behold;" 2. Vision; 3. Dream. It is indicated that, at least at this time, the vision and the dream were the special means of conveying a revelation to a prophet, while the higher form of direct declaration and manifestation was reserved for the more highly favored Moses. Joel's prophecy appears to make the same division, "Your old men shall dream dreams, and your young men shall see visions," these being the two methods in which the promise, "your sons and your daughters shall prophesy," is to be carried out (<sup><2428></sup>Joel 2:28). Of Daniel we are told that "he had understanding in all visions and dreams" (<sup><2017></sup>Daniel 1:17). Can these phases of the prophetic state be distinguished from each other? and in what did they consist?

According to the theory of Philo and the Alexandrian school, the prophet was in a state of entire unconsciousness at the time that he was under the

influence of divine inspiration, “for the human understanding,” says Philo, “takes its departure on the arrival of the Divine Spirit, and on the removal of the latter again returns to its home, for the mortal must not dwell with the immortal” (*Quis Rer. Div. Hoer.* 1, 511). Balaam is described by him as an unconscious instrument through whom God spoke (*De Vita Mosis*, lib. 1, vol. 2, p. 124). Josephus makes Balaam excuse himself to Balak on the same principle: “When the Spirit of God seizes us, it utters whatsoever sounds and words it pleases, without any knowledge on our part,... for when it has come into us, there is nothing in us which remains our own” (*Ant.* 4:6, 5). This theory identifies Jewish prophecy in all essential points with the heathen **μαντική**, or divination, as distinct from **προφητεία**, or interpretation. Montanism adopted the same view: “Defendimus, in causa novae propheti e, gratiae extasin, id est amentiam, convenire. In spiritu enim homo constitutus, praesertim cum gloriam Dei conspicit, vel cum per ipsum Deus loquitur, necesse est excidat sensu, obumbratus scilicet virtute divina; de quo inter nos et Psychicos (catholicos) questio est” (Tertullian, *Adv. Marcion.* 4:22). According to the belief, then, of the heathen, of the Alexandrian Jews, and of the Montanists, the vision of the prophet was seen while he was in a state of ecstatic unconsciousness, and the enunciation of the vision was made by him in the same state. The fathers of the Church opposed the Montanist theory with great unanimity. In Eusebius’s *History* (v, 17) we read that Miltiades wrote a book **Περὶ τοῦ μὴ δεῖν προφήτην ἐν ἐκστάσει λαλεῖν**. St. Jerome writes: “Non loquitur propheta **ἐν ἐκστάσει**, ut Montanus et Prisca Maximillaque delirant, sed quod prophetat liber est visionis intelligentis universa quae loquitur” (*Prolog. in Nahum*). Again: ‘ Neque vero ut Montanus cum insanis fenminis somniat, prophetae in ecstasi locuti sunt ut nescierint quid loquerentur, et cum alios erudirent ipsi ignorarent quid dicerent’ (*Prolog. in Esai.*). Origen (*Contr. Celsum*, 7:4) and St. Basil (*Commentary on Isaiah*, Prooem. c. 5) contrast the prophet with the soothsayer, on the ground of the latter being deprived of his senses. St. Chrysostom draws out the contrast: **Τοῦτο γὰρ μάντεως ἴδιον, τὸ ἐξεστηκέναι, τὸ ἀνάγκην ὑπομένειν, τὸ ὠθεῖσθαι, τὸ ἔλκεσθαι, τὸ σύρεσθαι σπερ μαινόμενον. Ὁ δὲ προφήτης οὐχ οὕτως, ἀλλὰ μετὰ διανοίας νηφούσης καὶ σωφρονούσης καταστάσεως, καὶ εἰδῶς ἃ φθέγγεται, φησὶν ἅπαντα: στε καὶ πρὸ τῆς ἐκβάσεως κἀντεῦθεν γνώριζε τὸν μάντιν καὶ τὸν προφήτην** (*Hom. 29 in Epist. ad Corinth.*). At the same time, while drawing the distinction sharply between heathen soothsaying and Montanist prophesying in the one side, and Hebrew prophecy on the

other, the fathers use expressions so strong as almost to represent the prophets to be passive instruments acted on by the Spirit of God. Thus it is that they describe them as musical instruments — the pipe (Athenagoras, *Leg. pro Christianis*, c. ix; Clem. Alex. *Cohort. ad Gent.* c. i), the lyre (Justin Martyr, *Cohort. ad Graec.* c. viii; Ephraem Syr. *Rhythm.* 29; Chrysostom, *Ad Pop. Antioch.* Haom. i, t. ii), or as pens (St. Greg. Magn. *Praef. in Aaor. in Job*). Expressions such as these (many of which are quoted by Dr. Lee, *On Inspiration*, Appendix ()) must be set against the passages which were directed against the Montanists. Nevertheless, there is a very appreciable difference between their view and that of Tertullian and Philo. Which is most in accordance with the indications of Holy Scripture?

It does not seem possible to draw any very precise distinction between the prophetic “dream” and the prophetic “vision.” In the case of Abraham (<sup><4159></sup>Genesis 15:1) and of Daniel (<sup><2701></sup>Daniel 7:1), they seem to melt into each other. In both the external senses are at rest, reflection is quiescent, and intuition energizes. The action of the ordinary faculties is suspended in the one case by natural, in the other by supernatural or extraordinary causes (see Lee, *Inspiration*, p. 173). The state into which the prophet was, occasionally, at least, thrown by the ecstasy, or vision, or trance, is described poetically in the book of Job (<sup><3043></sup>Job 4:13-16; 33:15), and more plainly in the book of Daniel. In the case of Daniel, we find first a deep sleep (<sup><208></sup>Daniel 8:18; 10:9) accompanied by terror (<sup><2787></sup>Daniel 8:17; 10:8). Then he is raised upright (<sup><2788></sup>Daniel 8:18) on his hands and knees, and then on his feet (<sup><2700></sup>Daniel 10:10, 11). He then receives the divine revelation (<sup><2789></sup>Daniel 8:19; 10:12). After this he falls to the ground in a swoon (<sup><2705></sup>Daniel 10:15, 17); he is faint, sick, and astonished (<sup><2782></sup>Daniel 8:27). Here, then, is an instance of the ecstatic state; nor is it confined to the Old Test., though we do not find it in the New Test accompanied by such violent effects upon the body. At the Transfiguration, the disciples fell on their face, being overpowered by the divine glory, and were restored, like Daniel, by the touch of Jesus’ hand. Peter fell into a trance (ἔκστασις) before he received his vision, instructing him as to the admission of the Gentiles (<sup><4100></sup>Acts 10:10; 11:5). Paul was in a trance (ἐν ἔκστασει) when he was commanded to devote himself to the conversion of the Gentiles (<sup><427></sup>Acts 22:17), and when he was caught up into the third heaven (<sup><4700></sup>2 Corinthians 12:1). John was probably in the same state (ἐν πνεύματι) when he received the message to the seven churches (<sup><4010></sup>Revelation 1:10). The prophetic trance, then, must be acknowledged as a scriptural account



of the state in which the prophets and other inspired persons, sometimes, at least, received divine revelations. It would seem, in such particular cases, to have been of the following nature:

- (1.) The bodily senses were closed to external objects as in deep sleep;
- (2.) The reflective and discursive faculty was still and inactive;
- (3.) The spiritual faculty ( $\piνεῦμα$ ) was awakened to the highest state of energy.

Hence it is that revelations in trances are described by the prophets as “seen” or “heard” by them, for the spiritual faculty energizes by immediate perception on the part of the inward sense, not by inference and thought. Thus Isaiah “*saw* the Lord sitting” (<sup><2300></sup>Isaiah 6:1). Zechariah “*lifted up his eyes and saw*” (<sup><300></sup>Zechariah 2:1); “the word of the Lord which Micah *saw*” (<sup><300></sup>Micah 1:1); “the wonder which Habakkuk did *see*” (<sup><300></sup>Habakkuk 1:1). “Peter *saw* heaven opened... and there came a *voice* to him” (<sup><400></sup>Acts 10:11). Paul was “in a trance, and *saw* him *saying*” (<sup><428></sup>Acts 22:18). John “*heard* a great voice... and *saw* seven golden candlesticks” (<sup><6012></sup>Revelation 1:12). Hence it is, too, that the prophets’ visions are unconnected and fragmentary, inasmuch as they are not the subject of the reflective, but of the perceptive faculty. They described what they saw and heard, not what they had themselves thought out and systematized. Hence, too, succession in time is disregarded or unnoticed. The subjects of the vision being, to the prophets’ sight, in juxtaposition or enfolding each other, some in the foreground, some in the background, are necessarily abstracted from the relations of time. Hence, too, the imagery with which the prophetic writings are colored, and the dramatic cast in which they are moulded; these peculiarities resulting, as we have already said, in a necessary obscurity and difficulty of interpretation.

But though it must be allowed that Scripture language seems to point out the state of dream and of trance, or ecstasy, as a condition in which the human instrument occasionally received the divine communications, it does not follow that all the prophetic revelations were thus made. We must acknowledge the state of trance in such passages as Isaiah 6 (called ordinarily the vision of Isaiah), as Ezekiel 1 (called the vision of Ezekiel), as Daniel 7, 8, 10, 11, 12 (called the visions of Daniel), as Zechariah 1, 4, 5, 6 (called the visions of Zechariah), as Acts 10 (called the vision of St. Peter), as 2 Corinthians 12 (called the vision of St. Paul), and similar instances, which are indicated by the language used. But it does not seem

true to say, with Hengstenberg, that “the difference between these prophecies and the rest is a vanishing one, and if we but possess the power and the ability to look more deeply into them, the marks of the vision may be discerned” (*Christology*, 4:417). This view is advocated also by Velthusen (*De Optica Rerum Futurarum Descriptione*), Jahn (*Einleit. in die gottlichen Bücher des A. B.*), Tholuck (*Die Propheten und ihre Weissagungen*). St. Paul distinguishes “revelations” from “visions” (ἀποκ. 2 Corinthians 12:1). In the books of Moses “speaking mouth to mouth” is contrasted with “visions and dreams” (ἀποκ. Numbers 12:8). It is true that in this last-quoted passage “visions and dreams” alone appear to be attributed to the prophet, while “speaking mouth to mouth” is reserved for Moses. But when Moses was dead, the cause of this difference would cease. During the era of prophecy there were none nearer to God, none with whom he would. we may suppose, communicate more openly than the prophets. We should expect, then, that they would be the recipients, not only of visions in the state of dream or ecstasy, but also of the direct revelations which are called speaking mouth to mouth. The greater part of the divine communications we may suppose to have been thus made to the prophets in their waking and ordinary state, while the visions were exhibited to them either in the state of sleep or in the state of ecstasy. “The more ordinary mode through which the word of the Lord, as far as we can trace, came, was through a divine impulse given to the prophet’s own thoughts” (Stanley, p. 426). Hence it follows that. while the fathers in their opposition to Montanism and **μανία** were pushed somewhat too far in their denial of the ecstatic state, they were yet perfectly exact in their descriptions of the condition under which the greater part of the prophetic revelations were received and promulgated. No truer description has been given of them than that of Hippolytus and that of St. Basil: Οὐ γὰρ ἐξ ἰδίας δυνάμεως ἐφθέγγοντο, οὐδὲ ἄπερ αὐτοὶ ἐβούλοντο ταῦτα ἐκήρυττον, ἀλλὰ πρῶτον μὲν διὰ τοῦ Λόγου ἐσοφίζοντο ὀρθῶς, ἔπειτα δὲ ὁραμάτων προεδιδάσκοντο τὰ μέλλοντα καλῶς: εἰθ οὕτω πεπεισμένοι ἔλεγον ταῦτα ἄπερ αὐτοῖς ἦν μόνοις ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ ἀποκεκρυμμένα (Hippol. *De Antichristo*, c. ii). Πῶς προεφήτευον α καθαρά καὶ διαυγεῖς ψυχαί; οἶονεὶ κάτοπτρα γινόμενα τῆς θείας ἐνεργείας, τὴν ἔμφασιν ῥανῆν καὶ ἀσύγχυτον καὶ οὐδὲν ἐπιθολουμένην ἐκ τῶν παθῶν τῆς ταρκὸς ἐπεδείκνυντο: πᾶσι μὲν γὰρ πάρεστι τὸ Ἅγιον Πνεῦμα (St. Basil, *Conn. in Esti. Procem.*). The state of ecstasy, though ranking high above the ordinary sensual existence, is still not the highest, as appears from

Numbers 12, and the example of Christ, whom we never find in an ecstatic state. To the prophets, however, it was indispensable, on account of the frailty of themselves and the people. The forcible working upon them by the Spirit of God would not have been required, if their general life had already been altogether holy; for which reason we also find ecstasy to manifest itself the stronger the more the general life was ungodly; as, for instance, in Balaam, when the Spirit of God came upon him (~~1000~~ Numbers 24:4, 16), and in Saul, who throws himself on the ground, tearing his clothes from his body. With a prophet whose spiritual attainments were those of an Isaiah, such results are not to be expected. As regards the people, their spiritual obtuseness must be considered as very great to have rendered necessary such vehement excitations as the addresses of the prophets caused.

Had the prophets a full knowledge of that which they predicted? It follows from what we have already said that in many cases they had not, and could not have. They were the “spokesmen” of God (~~1000~~ Exodus 7:1), the “mouth” by which his words were uttered, or they were enabled to view, and empowered to describe, pictures presented to their spiritual intuition; but there are no grounds for believing that, contemporaneously with this miracle, there was wrought another miracle enlarging the understanding of the prophet so as to grasp the whole of the divine counsels which he was gazing into, or which he was the instrument of enunciating. We should not expect it beforehand; and we have the testimony of the prophets themselves (~~2000~~ Daniel 12:8; ~~3000~~ Zechariah 4:5), and of St. Peter (~~4000~~ 1 Peter 1:10) to the fact that they frequently did not fully comprehend them. The passage in Peter’s epistle is very instructive: “Of which salvation the prophets have inquired and searched diligently, who prophesied of the grace that should come unto you: searching what, or what manner of time the Spirit of Christ which was in them did signify, when it testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ, and the glory that should follow. Unto whom it was revealed, that not unto themselves, but unto us they did minister the things which are now reported unto you by them that have preached the gospel unto you with the Holy Ghost sent down from heaven.” It is here declared (1) that the Holy Ghost through the prophet, or the prophet by the Holy Ghost, testified of Christ’s sufferings and ascension, and of the institution of Christianity; (2) that after having uttered predictions on those subjects, the minds of the prophets occupied themselves in searching into the full meaning of the words that they had

uttered; (3) that they were then divinely informed that their predictions were not to find their completion until the last days, and that they themselves were instruments for declaring good things that should come not to their own but to a future generation. This is exactly what the prophetic state above described would lead us to expect. While the divine communication is received, the human instrument is simply passive. He sees or hears by his spiritual intuition or perception, and declares what he has seen or heard. Then the reflective faculty, which had been quiescent but never so overpowered as to be destroyed, awakens to the consideration of the message or vision received, and it strives earnestly to understand it, and more especially to look at the revelation as *in* instead of *out* of time. The result is a comparative failure, but this failure is softened by the divine intimation that the time is not vet. The two questions. What did the prophet understand by this prophecy? and What was the meaning of this prophecy? are somewhat different in the ultimate estimation of every one who believes that “the Holy Ghost spake by the prophets,” or who considers it possible that he did so speak. It is on this principle rather than as it is explained by Dr. M’Caul (*Aids to Faith*) that the prophecy of ~~HOSEA~~ Hosea 11:1 is to be interpreted. Hosea, we may well believe, understood in his own words no more than a reference to the historical fact that the children of Israel came out of Egypt. But Hosea was not the author of the prophecy — he was the instrument by which it was promulgated. The Holy Spirit Intended something further, and what this something was he informs us by the evangelist Matthew (~~MATTHEW~~ Matthew 2:15). The two facts of the Israelites being led out of Egypt and of Christ’s return from Egypt appear to Prof. Jowett so distinct that the reference by Matthew to the prophet is to him inexplicable except on the hypothesis of a mistake on the part of the evangelist (see Jowett, *Essay on the Interpretation of Scripture*). A deeper insight into Scripture shows that “the Jewish people themselves, their history, their ritual, their government, all present one grand prophecy of the future Redeemer” (Lee, p. 107). Consequently “Israel” is one of the *forms* naturally taken in the prophetic vision by the *idea* “Messiah.” It does not follow from the above, however, that the prophets had no intelligent comprehension of their ordinary vaticinators. These, so far at least as the *primary* reference is concerned, were plain to their own mind, although the future and full significance was of necessity dim and imperfectly apprehended. Time, in the order of providence, is God’s own best expounder of prophecy.

While the prophets were under the influence of inspiration, the scenery might produce deep, absorbing, or elevated emotion, which would sometimes greatly affect their physical system (<sup><0152></sup>Genesis 15:12; <sup><0216></sup>Numbers 24:16; <sup><2108></sup>Daniel 10:8; <sup><3103></sup>Ezekiel 1:28; <sup><6017></sup>Revelation 1:17). Still they had an intelligent consciousness of what they were describing, they retained their distinct mental faculties; they did not utter frantic ravings like the prophets of Baal. Undoubtedly, as the prophecies are a revelation from God, the prophets well understood, at least in a general way, the predictions they uttered; but they did not necessarily testify or know anything respecting the *time when* the events predicted should happen (<sup><2108></sup>Daniel 12:8, 9; <sup><6010></sup>1 Peter 1:10-12). Occasionally even this was revealed to them (<sup><2420></sup>Jeremiah 2:10). The symbols which were often exhibited to the prophets they described as they came before them in succession, and in some instances they were subsequently favored with a more full and particular explanation of the scenery which passed before them (<sup><2571></sup>Ezekiel 37:11). Though the prophetic office was generally permanent, it need not, and should not, be supposed that *at all times* and on all occasions the prophets spoke and acted under the special aid and guidance of the Holy Spirit. So much was not true of even the apostles of Christ. It is enough that at all due times, and in appropriate circumstances, they were specially guided and aided by the Spirit of God. Nor is it necessary to assume that all the prophets were endowed with *miraculous powers*. Such was not the case even with Christian prophets (<sup><4210></sup>1 Corinthians 12:10). **SEE INSPIRATION.**

## **VI.** *Form and Peculiarities of the Prophetic Utterances.* —

**1.** *Verbal Modes of Delivery.* — Usually the prophets promulgated their visions and announcements in public places before the congregated people. Still some portions of the prophetic books, as the entire second part of Isaiah and the description of the new Temple (Ezekiel 40-48), probably were never communicated orally. In other cases the prophetic addresses first delivered orally were next, when committed to writing, revised and improved. Especially the books of the lesser prophets consist, for the greater part, not of separate predictions, independent of each other, but form, as they now are, a whole — that is, they give the quintessence of the prophetic labors of their authors. In this case it is certain that the authors themselves caused the collection to be made. But it is so likewise in some cases where their books really consist of single declarations, and in others it is at least highly probable. Further particulars concerning the manner in

which prophetic rolls were collected and published we have only respecting Jeremiah, who, being in prison, called Baruch “to write from his mouth his predictions, and to read them in the ears of the people” (<sup>2480b</sup>Jeremiah 38:414). There is evidence that the later prophets sedulously read the writings of the earlier, and that a prophetic canon existed before the present was formed. The predictions of Jeremiah throughout rest on the writings of earlier prophets, as Kiiiper has established (in his *feremias Librorum Sacrorum Interpres atque Vindex*, Berlin, 1837). Zechariah explicitly alludes to writings of former prophets; “to the words which the Lord has spoken to earlier prophets, when Jerusalem was inhabited and in prosperity” (<sup>300b</sup>Zechariah 1:4; 7:7, 12). In all probability we have complete those predictions which were committed to writing; at least the proofs which Ewald gives (p. 43 sq.) for his opinion, of prophecies having been lost, do not stand trial. The words “as the Lord hath said,” in <sup>2472b</sup>Joel 2:32, refer to the predictions of Joel himself. In Isaiah 2 and Micah 4 nothing is introduced from a lost prophetic roll, but Isaiah borrows from Micah. Hosea alludes (<sup>3082b</sup>Hosea 8:12), not to some unknown work, but to the Pentateuch. In Isaiah 15 and 16 the prophet repeats, not another’s prediction, but his own, previously delivered, to which he adds a supplement. Obadiah and Jeremiah do not avail themselves of the written address of a former prophet, but Jeremiah makes the prophecy of Obadiah the groundwork of his own. The opinion that in <sup>2560b</sup>Isaiah 56:10; 57:11, there was inserted, unaltered, a long remnant of an older roll is founded on erroneous views respecting the time of its composition. The same holds good of Isaiah 24, where Ewald would find remnants of several older rolls. The very circumstance that in the prophets there nowhere occurs a tenable ground for maintaining that they referred to rolls lost and unknown to us, but that they often allude to writings which we know and possess, clearly proves that there is no reason for supposing, with Ewald, that a *great number* of prophetic compositions have been lost, “and that of a large tree, only a few blossoms have reached our time.” In consequence of the prophets being considered as organs of God, much care was bestowed on the preservation of their publications. Ewald himself cannot refrain from observing (p. 56), “We have in <sup>2201b</sup>Jeremiah 26:1-19 a clear proof of the exact knowledge which the better classes of the people had of all that had, a hundred years before, happened to a prophet — of his words, misfortunes, and accidents.”

**2. Symbolic Actions.** — In the midst of the prophetic declarations symbolic actions are often mentioned which the prophets had to perform. The opinions of interpreters on these are divided. Most interpreters hold that they always, at least generally, were really done; others assert that they had existence only in the mind of the prophets, and formed part of their visions. **SEE HOSEA.** Another symbolic action of Jeremiah prefigures the people's destruction. He says (<sup><2481></sup>Jeremiah 8:1-10) he had been by the Lord directed to get a linen girdle, to put it on his loins, to undertake a long tour to the Euphrates, and to hide the girdle there in a hole of the rock. He does so, returns, and after many days the Lord again orders him to take the girdle from the place where it was hidden, but "the girdle was marred and good for nothing." In predicting the destruction of Babylon and a general war (<sup><2452></sup>Jeremiah 25:12-38), he receives from the Lord a wine-cup, to cause a number of kings of various nations, among whom the sword would be sent, to drink from it till they should be overcome. He then goes with this cup to the kings of Egypt, Arabia, Persia, Media, and many other countries. When the prophet Ezekiel receives his commission and instructions to prophesy against the rebellious people of Israel, a roll of a book is presented to him, which he eats by the direction of the Lord (<sup><3111></sup>Ezekiel 2:9; 3, 2, 3). He is next ordered to lie before the city of Jerusalem on his left side three hundred and ninety days; and when he had accomplished them, on his right side forty days. He must not turn from one side to the other, and he is ordered to bake with dung of man the bread which he eats during this time (<sup><3004></sup>Ezekiel 4:4, 8, 12). Isaiah is ordered to walk naked and barefoot, for a sign upon Egypt and Ethiopia (<sup><2310></sup>Isaiah 20:2, 3). But, however we may understand these directions, we cannot refer all symbolic actions to internal intuition; at least, of a false prophet we have a sure example of an externally performed symbolic action (<sup><1121></sup>1 Kings 22:11), and the false prophets always aped the true ones (comp. <sup><2491></sup>Jeremiah 19:1 sq.). These undoubted instances of a literal action warrant the presumption that in the other cases likewise there was a substantial fact as the basis of a spiritual symbolism. **SEE VISION.**

In the case of visions the scenery passed before their mind, something like a panoramic view of a landscape, gradually unfolding, in symbolical imagery, forms of glory or of gloom; accompanied with actions of a corresponding character, not unfrequently exhibiting, as in actual occurrence, the future and distant events. The prophets occasionally beheld themselves as actors in the symbolical scenery. In the visionary pageant

many objects would appear to be grouped, or lying near together, which were in fact separated by considerable intervals of time; so that it is not to be expected that the prophets would describe what they saw in their connections and relations. *SEE SYMBOL.*

**3. *Prophetic Style and Diction.*** — The idea of prophecy as anticipated history has given rise to many erroneous views of prophetic language. No prophecy can be rightly interpreted which does not illustrate the name of God in the elements of his character, the principles of his government, his purposes of mercy and judgment towards men. The human race presents the only proper object of moral treatment. When judgments or blessings are announced upon states and kingdoms, to have respect to the territory rather than the inhabitants is to merge the spiritual in the natural. The promises which are associated with Mount Zion, and the threatenings uttered against Edom, belong not to the locality, but to the people, and to all who imbibe their spirit and walk in their steps.

The mission of the prophets was the religious education of the Jewish people. They were raised up, according to the exigencies of the times, to preserve them from error, and to prepare their minds for the future development of the kingdom of God. Their object was twofold — to maintain the Church in due allegiance to prescribed rites, institutions, ordinances, and yet to prepare the people for a further manifestation of the blessings of the new covenant. By their writings they designed to impart to future ages an explanation of the vanishing-away of the system under which they lived, and to confirm the divine origin and authority of the new order of things. The prophetic style and diction exactly accords with this view of their design. This will account for the various hues of light and shade which streak the scroll of prophecy.

If the future course of events had been clearly marked out and formally laid down, all motives to present duty would have been obliterated; no room would have been left for the exercise of faith, of hope, of fear, and love; all thoughts, all feelings, all desires, would have been absorbed in the overpowering sense of expectation. But enough is revealed to support faith and animate hope. The remoter future is seen afar off in promises indistinct yet glorious. Confidence is bespoken for these distant predictions, by the clear and precise terms which portray some nearer event, fulfilled in that generation as a sign and token that all shall be accomplished in its season. Heathen divination, when it refers to any event which is near at hand, uses



language remarkable for its ambiguity, but speaks distinctly of those matters which are reserved for the distant future. Those who spake in the name of Jehovah pursue the directly opposite course. Their language is much more express, distinct, and clear when they speak of events in the nearer future than in describing what shall take place in the latter days. Prophecy of this nature would not raise its voice at all times, lest that voice from its familiarity should be unheeded; but at every critical and eventful period prophecy led them on “a pillar of cloud in the brighter daylight of their purer and better times; a pillar of fire gleaming in the darker night of their calamity or sin” (Dean Magee).

The moral results of prophecy would have been lost if the historical element had been clear prior to the occurrence of the prefigured events. A certain veil must necessarily hang over the scene until its predictions passed into realities. The best form in which a prophecy can be delivered is to leave the main circumstances unintelligible before the fulfilment, yet so clear as to be easily recognised after the event. It was necessary as a touchstone for the faith and patience of the Church that a certain disguise should veil the coming events till they become facts in providence. “Whatever private information the prophet might enjoy, the Spirit of God would never permit him to disclose the ultimate intent and particular meaning of the prophecy” (Bishop Horsley).

**4. *Prophetical Language.*** — This takes its hue and coloring from the political condition of the kingdom, from the local standpoint of the writer, from the position of those to whom the message was delivered.

To say that prophetical language is *figurative* is simply to say that it is used for a spiritual purpose, and directed to spiritual ends. Our ordinary language in reference to mental and moral subjects is founded on analogy or resemblance. In early times language is nearly all figure; natural symbols are employed to denote common facts. It is the necessity of man’s state that scarcely any fact connected with the mind or with spiritual truth can be described but, in language borrowed from material things. The visible world is the dial-plate of the invisible. God has stamped his own image on natural things, which he employs to describe and illustrate his own nature and his dealings with the Church. The Author of the spiritual kingdom is also the Author of the natural kingdom, and both kingdoms develop themselves after the same laws. Nature is a witness for the kingdom of God. Whatever exists in the earthly is found also in the heavenly kingdom.

The religious teachers of the Hebrew nation might adopt the apostle's language, "We see through a glass;" we consider, we contemplate by means of a mirror in a dark saying (<sup><4612></sup>1 Corinthians 13:12). All who held the prophetic office could in a measure adopt the language of our Lord, "I will open my mouth in similitudes; I will give vent to things kept secret from the foundation of the world" (<sup><4035></sup>Matthew 13:35).

While prophecy frequently employed natural objects and scenery as the means of impressing the memory, instructing the judgment, interesting the heart, and charming the imagination, it made large use of the present and past condition of the nation, of the Levitical institutions and ceremonies, as symbols in representing good things to come. Thus we may observe

**(1.)** The future is described in terms of the past. The known is made use of to give shape and form to the unknown. We have a striking instance of this in Hosea (<sup><2813></sup>Hosea 8:13; 9:3): "They shall return to Egypt." "Ephraim shall return to Egypt. and shall eat unclean things in Assyria." The old state of bondage and oppression should come back upon them. The covenant whereby it was promised that the people should not return was virtually cancelled. They had made themselves as the heathen; they should be in the condition of the heathen. For in <sup><2816></sup>Hosea 11:5 we read: "He shall not return into the land of Egypt, but the Assyrian shall be his king; because they refused to return." They would not have God for their king; therefore the Assyrian should be their king, and a worse captivity than that of Egypt should befall them. In accordance with this, the teachers of false doctrine and the abettors of corruption in the Asiatic churches are spoken of as a resuscitation of Jezebel and Balaam (<sup><6610></sup>Revelation 14:20).

**(2.)** Prophecy made great use of the present, and especially of the standpoint and personal circumstances of the agent, to illustrate the future. Ezekiel describes the coming glory of the Church under the gorgeous and elaborate description of a temple. All the images in the nine concluding chapters are taken from this one analogy. He sums up his minute and precise representation with the significant hint, "The name of the city from that day shall be, The Lord is there." The Apocalyptic seer, living when the Temple was laid waste, and all its rites and institutions were superseded, describes the glory of the new Jerusalem in language that seems to be directly contradictory (<sup><6612></sup>Revelation 21:22), "I saw no temple therein;" but in entire harmony with <sup><3835></sup>Ezekiel 48:35, the Spirit testifies, "the Lord God Almighty and the Lamb are the temple of it." Both Ezekiel and John

speak of the same glorious future in language and imagery perfectly natural and appropriate to the times and circumstances in which they were placed.

**(3.)** Frequently the prophetic style received its complexion and coloring from the diversified circumstances of the parties addressed, as well as from the standpoint of the prophet. This is peculiarly the case with the language of Daniel, which presents such an approximation to the style of history that some have rashly assigned his writings to a date long posterior to the captivity of Babylon. The specific form which a portion of his prophecies assumes may be accounted for by considering the great feebleness and depression of the people on resuming their residence in Judaea; the anomalous and shattered condition of the theocratic constitution when the ark of the covenant, the Urim and Thummim, the kingly rule and government, were gone, when the vision was sealed, and no one of the prophetic order remained. This is the time selected for setting forth the external aspect of God's kingdom to one who was well conversant with political revolutions, who stood at the centre of the world's power and glory when earthly monarchies began to aspire after universal dominion. The visions granted to Daniel (<sup>(2781)</sup>8, 9), though plain to us who read them after the event, were far from being clear to himself or to others (<sup>(2782)</sup>Daniel 8:27; 12:4, 8, 9). In the symbols he employs we have a reflection of his own peculiar position and political experience; and in the detailed exhibition of the coming future, in the explicit predictions of the changes and vicissitudes which were at hand, the children of faith felt that the God of their fathers was still in the midst of them. Prophecy is always a revelation of specific events, when the events spoken of are to be fulfilled in the nearer future. The picture presented to the Church was minutely portrayed in a historical dress whenever the hope of the faithful required special and immediate support. (See § 8, below.)

**(4.)** The divine impulse under which the prophets spoke, though it was supernatural, acted in harmony with personal characteristics and native susceptibilities. The supernatural ever bases itself upon the natural. Constitutional tendencies are moulded by the plastic influence of divine grace, but are never entirely obliterated. The prophets never lost personal consciousness, or any distinctive characteristic of thought and feeling, even when they were raised into an ecstatic condition. Extraordinary impressions of divine light and influence affected the rational as well as the imaginative power. The false lights which pretended to prophecy were impressions made on the imagination exclusively, "whose conceptions ran

only in a secular channel, as the sect of diviners, enchanters, dreamers, and soothsayers” (J. Smith). The lowest degree of prophecy is when the imaginative power is most predominant, and the scene becomes too turbulent for the rational faculty to discern clearly the mystical sense. The highest is where all imagination ceases—as with Moses, “whom God knew face to face” — where truth is revealed to the reason and understanding.

**(5.)** The poetical element of prophecy arises from the ecstatic condition of the prophet, from the action of spiritual influences on constitutional tendencies. But as the primary aim of the religious teachers of the Hebrews was to influence the heart and conscience, the poetical element, though never entirely suppressed, was held in restraint, to further the higher ends of spiritual instruction. Hence, as Ewald remarks, “Prophetic discourse has a form and impress of its own, too elevated to sink to simple prose, too practical in its aim to assume the highest form of poetry.” Of the two ideas involved in *vates*, the prophetic ruled the poetical. The distinction between the poet and the prophet may be thus expressed: as the prophet’s aim was to work upon others in the most direct and impressive manner, he was at liberty to adopt any form or method of representation; but as the immediate aim of the poet is to satisfy himself and the requirements of his art, he cannot vary his definite manner, and change his mode of address at pleasure, in order to work upon others. The poetical elevation appears most vividly in the idealistic and imaginative form, when the patriarchal heads of the Jewish nation, their several families, Zion, Jerusalem, their religious and political centre, are addressed as living personalities present to the mind and eye of the prophet. A vivid instance of this personification occurs in <sup>23815</sup>Jeremiah 31:15, Rachel weeping for her children, refusing to be comforted. It was at Ramah that the Chaldean conqueror assembled the last band of captives (40:1): the prospect of perpetual exile lay before them. On their departure the last hope of Israel’s existence seemed to expire. In the bold freedom of Eastern imagery, the ancestral mother of the tribe is conceived of as present at the scene, and as raising a loud wail of distress. This scene was substantially repeated in the massacre at Bethlehem. The cruel Edomite who then held the government of Judaea aimed what was meant to be a fatal blow against the real hope of Israel. Though it was but a handful of children that actually perished, yet as among these the Child of Promise was supposed to be included, it might well seem as if all were lost” (Fairbairn). *SEE POETRY*,

**VII. Interpretation of Predictions.** — In addition the hints given above and below, we here have only space for a few rules, deduced from the account which we have given of the nature of prophecy. They are,

(1.) Interpose distances of time according as history may show them to be necessary with respect to the past, or inference may show them to be likely in respect to the future, because, as we have seen, the prophetic visions are abstracted from relations in time.

(2.) Distinguish the *form* from the *idea*. Thus <sup><23115></sup>Isaiah 11:15 represents the *idea* of the removal of all obstacles from before God's people in the *form* of the Lord's destroying the tongue of the Egyptian sea, and smiting the river into seven streams.

(3.) Distinguish in like manner figure from what is represented by it, e.g. in the verse previous to that quoted do not understand literally "They shall *fly upon the shoulders* of the Philistines" (ver. 14).

(4.) Make allowance for the imagery of the prophetic visions, and for the poetical diction in which they are expressed.

(5.) In respect to things past, interpret by the apparent meaning, checked by reference to events; in respect to things future, interpret by the apparent meaning, checked by reference to the analogy of the faith.

(6.) Interpret according to the principle which may be deduced from the examples of visions explained in the Old Test.

(7.) Interpret according to the principle which may be deduced from the examples of prophecies interpreted in the New Test. *SEE INTERPRETATION.*

**VIII. Use of Prophecy.** — Predictions are at once a part and an evidence of revelation: at the time that they are delivered, and until their fulfilment, a part; after they have been fulfilled, an evidence. An apostle (<sup><6019></sup>2 Peter 1:19) describes prophecy as "a light shining in a dark place," or "a taper glimmering where there is nothing to reflect its rays," that is, throwing some light, but only a feeble light as compared with what is shed from the Gospel history. To this light, feeble as it is, "you do well," says the apostle, "to take heed." And he warns them not to be offended at the feebleness of the light, because it is of the nature of prophecy until its fulfilment (in the case of Messianic predictions, of which he is speaking, described as "until

the day dawn, and the day star arise in your hearts”) to shed only a feeble light. Nay, he continues, even the prophecies are not to be limited to a single and narrow interpretation, “for the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man,” i.e. the prophets were not affected by personal considerations in their predictions, “but holy men of old spake by the impulse (φερόμενοι) of the Holy Ghost.” This is in entire keeping with the above views (§ vi) of the character of the prophetic utterances, and was the use of prophecy before its fulfilment — to act as a feeble light in the midst of darkness, which it did not dispel, but through which it threw its rays in such a way as to enable a true-hearted believer to direct his steps and guide his anticipations (comp. Acts 13:27). But after fulfilment, Peter says, “the word of prophecy” becomes “more sure” than it was before, that is, it is no longer merely a feeble light to guide, but it is a firm ground of confidence, and, combined with the apostolic testimony, serves as a trustworthy evidence of the faith; so trustworthy that even after he and his brother apostles are dead, those whom he addressed will feel secure that they “had not followed cunningly devised fables,” but the truth.

As an evidence, fulfilled prophecy is as satisfactory as anything can be, for who can know the future except the Ruler who disposes future events; and from whom can come prediction except from him who knows the future? After all that has been said and unsaid, prophecy and miracles, each resting on their own evidence, must always be the chief and direct evidences of the truth of the divine character of a religion. Where they exist, a divine power is proved. Nevertheless, they should never be rested on alone, but in combination with the general character of the whole scheme to which they belong. Its miracles, its prophecies, its morals, its propagation, and its adaptation to human needs, are the chief evidences of Christianity. None of these must be taken separately. The fact of their conspiring together is the strongest evidence of all. That one object with which predictions are delivered is to serve in an after-age as an evidence on which faith may reasonably rest is stated by our Lord himself: “And now I have told you before it come to pass, *that when it is come to pass, ye might believe*” (John 14:29). **SEE PROPHECY.**

As prophecy came πολυμερῶς καὶ πολυτρόπως, in many portions and in many modes (Hebrews 1:1), we need not be surprised to find a relative disregard of time in its announcements. The seers beheld things to come much as we look upon a starry sky. To the natural eye all the orbs that bespangle the firmament seem to be at the same distance from the

earth. Though the monarchies of Daniel are successive, yet in a certain way they are described as co-existent; for it is only on the establishment of the last that they seem to disappear. As the precise time of individual events is not revealed, prophecy describes them as continuous. The representation is rather in space than in time; the whole appears foreshortened; perspective is regarded rather than actual distance; as a common observer would describe the stars, grouping them as they appear, and not according to their true positions. Prof. Payne Smith well observes, "The prophets are called seers, and their writings visions. They describe events passing before their mental eye as simple facts, without the idea of time. A picture may represent the past, the present, or the future; this we may know from its accessories by the inference of the judgment, but not by the sight as such. If time is revealed, as in the seventy weeks of Daniel, time is the idea impressed upon the mind. But where time is not itself the thing revealed, the facts of revelation are not described as connected with or growing out of one another, as in the pages of history, but are narrated as facts merely, which future ages must arrange in their proper place, as one by one they are fulfilled." The first conquest and the complete destruction of Babylon are spoken of together (<sup>3008</sup>Jeremiah 1:41), though nearly a thousand years elapsed between them. Zechariah connects the spiritual salvation of the Church in the distant future with the temporal deliverance of the Jews under Alexander and the Maccabees. In the description which is given of the humiliation and glory of the Messiah, notice is seldom taken of the interval which is to elapse before the full and final establishment of his kingdom. So Paul in the fulness of his faith, which realized the object of his hope, and brought vividly before the eye of his mind the consummation of all things, has used language respecting the coming of Christ which some have misinterpreted as implying that he expected the day of Christ to arrive in his lifetime. Occasionally the precise time was revealed, as in the case of the sojourn of Abraham and his posterity in Egypt (<sup>0153</sup>Genesis 15:13); the disruption of Ephraim (<sup>2708</sup>Isaiah 7:8), and the captivity in Babylon (<sup>3290</sup>Jeremiah 29:10). But usually the prophets were entirely ignorant of the time, and only ascertained, after careful inquiry, that they spoke of the distant future (<sup>0110</sup>1 Peter 1:10-12). At evening-time it shall be light (<sup>3347</sup>Zechariah 14:7). The faithful in the land will discern the period when the events are upon the eve of fulfilment. *SEE ESCHATOLOGY.*

**IX. Development of Messianic Prophecy.** — Prediction, in the shape of promise and threatening, begins with the book of Genesis. Immediately

upon the fall, hopes of recovery and salvation are held out, but the manner in which this salvation is to be effected is left altogether indefinite. All that is at first declared is that it shall come through a child of woman (<sup><0085></sup>Genesis 3:15). By degrees the area is limited: it is to come through the family of Shem (<sup><0025></sup>Genesis 9:26), through the family of Abraham (<sup><0123></sup>Genesis 12:3), of Isaac (<sup><0228></sup>Genesis 22:18), of Jacob (<sup><0284></sup>Genesis 28:14), of Judah (<sup><0490></sup>Genesis 49:10). Balaam seems to say that it will be wrought by a warlike Israelitish King (<sup><0477></sup>Numbers 24:17); Jacob, by a peaceful Ruler of the earth (<sup><0490></sup>Genesis 49:10); Moses, by a Prophet like himself, i.e. a revealer of a new religious dispensation (<sup><0585></sup>Deuteronomy 18:15). Nathan's announcement (<sup><0716></sup>2 Samuel 7:16) determines further that the salvation is to come through the house of David, and through a descendant of David who shall be Himself a king. This promise is developed by David himself in the Messianic Psalms. Psalms 18 and 61 are founded on the promise communicated by Nathan, and do not go beyond the announcement made by Nathan. The same may be said of Psalm 89, Which was composed by a later writer. Psalms 2 and 110 rest upon the same promise as their foundation, but add new features to it. The Son of David is to be the Son of God (2:7), the anointed of the Lord (ver. 2), not only the King of Zion (ver. 6; 110:1), but the inheritor and lord or of the whole earth (2:8; 110:6), and, besides this, a Priest forever after the order of Melchizedek (110:4). At the same time he is, as typified by his progenitor, to be full of suffering and affliction (Psalm 22, 71, 102, 109): brought down to the grave, yet raised to life without seeing corruption (Psalm 16). In <sup><0572></sup>Psalm 45:72, the sons of Korah and Solomon describe his peaceful reign. Between Solomon and Hezekiah intervened some 200 years, during which the voice of prophecy was silent. The Messianic conception entertained at this time by the Jews might have been that of a King of the royal house of David who would arise, and gather under his peaceful sceptre his own people and strangers. Sufficient allusion to his prophetic and priestly offices had been made to create thoughtful consideration, but as yet there \was no clear delineation of him in these characters. It was reserved for the prophets to bring out these features more distinctly.

The sixteen prophets may be divided into four groups: the Prophets of the Northern Kingdom — Hosea, Amos, Joel, Jonah; the Prophets of the Southern Kingdom — Isaiah, Jeremiah, Obadiah, Micah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah; the Prophets of the Captivity — Ezekiel and Daniel;



the Prophets of the Return — Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi. In this great period of prophetism there is no longer any chronological development of Messianic prophecy, as in the earlier period previous to Solomon. Each prophet adds a feature, one more, another less clearly: combine the features, and we have the portrait; but it does not grow gradually and perceptibly under the hands of the several artists. Here, therefore, the task of tracing the chronological *progress* of the revelation of the Messiah comes to an end: its *culminating* point is found in the prophecy contained in <sup><2513></sup>Isaiah 52:13-15, and 53. We here read that there should be a Servant of God, lowly and despised, full of grief and suffering, oppressed, condemned as a malefactor, and put to death. But his sufferings, it is said, are not for his own sake, for he had never been guilty of fraud or violence: they are spontaneously taken, patiently borne, vicarious in their character; and, by God's appointment, they have an atoning, reconciling, and justifying efficacy. The result of his sacrificial offering is to be his exaltation and triumph. By the path of humiliation and expiatory suffering, he is to reach that state of glory foreshown by David and Solomon. The prophetic character of the Messiah is drawn out by Isaiah in other parts of his book as the atoning work here. By the time of Hezekiah therefore (for Hengstenberg, *Christology*, vol. 2, has satisfactorily disproved the theory of a Deutero-Isaiah of the days of the captivity) the portrait of the **θεάνθρωπος** — at once King, Priest, Prophet, and Redeemer — was drawn in all its essential features. The contemporary and later prophets (comp. <sup><3113></sup>Micah 5:2; <sup><2100></sup>Daniel 7:9; <sup><3013></sup>Zechariah 6:13; <sup><3012></sup>Malachi 4:2) added some particulars and details, and so the conception was left to await its realization after an interval of some 400 years from the date of the last Hebrew prophet.

The modern Jews, in opposition to their ancient exposition, have been driven to a non-Messianic interpretation of <sup><2513></sup>Isaiah 53. Among Christians the non-Messianic interpretation commenced with Grotius. He applies the chapter to Jeremiah. According to Doderlein, Schuster, Stephani, Eichhorn, Rosenmuller, Hitzig, Itandewerk, Kister (after the Jewish expositors Jarchi, Aben-Ezra, Kimchi, Abarbanel, Lipmann), the subject of the prophecy is the Israelitish people. According to Eckermann, Ewald, Bleek, it is the ideal Israelitish people. According to Paulus, Ammon, Maurer, Thenius, Knobel, it is the godly portion of the Israelitish people. According to De Wette, Gesenius, Schenkel, Umbreit, Hofmann, it is the prophetic body. Augusti refers it to king Uzziah; Konynenburg and

Bahrtdt to Hezekiah; Statudlin to Isaiah himself; Bolten to the house of David. Ewald thinks that no historical person was intended, but that the author of the chapter has misled his readers by inserting a passage from an older book, in which a martyr was spoken of. "This," he says, "quite spontaneously suggested itself, and has impressed itself on my mind more and more;" and he thinks that "controversy on ch. 53 will never cease until this truth is acknowledged" (*Propheten*, vol. 2, p. 407). Hengstenberg gives the following list of German commentators who have maintained the Messianic explanation: Dathe, Hensler, Kocher, Koppe, Michaelis, Schmieder, Storr, Hansi, Kruger, Jahn, Steudel, Sack, Reinke, Tholuck, Havernick, Stier. Hengstenberg's own exposition, and criticism of the expositions of others, is well worth consultation (*Christology*, vol. ii). Riehm has given a very good outline of these prophecies in their origin, historical character, and relation to New Test. fulfilment in the *Studien und Kritiken* for 1865 and 1869 (transl. by Jefferson, *Messianic Prophecy*, Edinb. 1876, 12mo). Drummond's work on *The Jewish Messiah* is a semi-rationalistic view drawn chiefly from apocryphal literature (Lond. 1877, 8vo). Prebendary Row has shown (*Bampton Lecture* for 1877, p. 234 sq.) the insufficiency of the Messianic elements of the Old Test. as an ideal model for the delineation of the Christ of the New Test. **SEE MESSIAH.**

**X. Prophets of the New Testament.** — So far as their predictive powers are concerned, the Old-Test. prophets find their New-Test. counterpart in the writer of the Apocalypse; but in their general character, as specially illumined revealers of God's will, their counterpart will rather be found, first in the Great Prophet of the Church, and his forerunner John the Baptist, and next in all those persons who were endowed with the extraordinary gifts of the Spirit in the apostolic age, the speakers with tongues and the interpreters of tongues, the prophets and the discerners of spirits, the teachers and workers of miracles (<sup><4620></sup>1 Corinthians 12:10, 28). The connecting link between the Old-Test. prophet and the speaker with tongues is the state of ecstasy in which the former at times received his visions and in which the latter uttered his words. The Old-Test. prophet, however, was his own interpreter: he did not speak in the state of ecstasy: he saw his visions in the ecstatic, and declared them in the ordinary state. The New-Test. discerners of spirits has his prototype in such as Micaiah, the son of Imlah (<sup><1222></sup>1 Kings 22:22), the worker of miracles in Elijah and Elisha, the teacher in each and all of the prophets. The prophets of the New

Test. represented their namesakes of the Old Test. as being expounders of divine truth and interpreters of the divine will to their auditors.

That predictive powers did occasionally exist in the New-Test. prophets is proved by the case of Agabus (~~411B~~ Acts 11:28), but this was not their characteristic. They were not an order, like apostles, bishops or presbyters, and deacons, but they were men or women (~~421B~~ Acts 21:9) who had the **χάρισμα προφητείας** vouchsafed them. If men, they might at the same time be apostles (1 Corinthians 14); and there was nothing to hinder the different **χαρίσματα** of wisdom, knowledge, faith, teaching, miracles, prophecy, discernment, tongues, and interpretation (ch. 12) being all accumulated on one person, and this person might or might not be a presbyter. Paul describes prophecy as being effective for the conversion, apparently the sudden and immediate conversion, of unbelievers (~~414B~~ Acts 14:24), and for the instruction and consolation of believers (ver. 31). This shows its nature. It was a spiritual gift which enabled men to understand and to teach the truths of Christianity, especially as veiled in the Old Test., and to exhort and warn with authority and effect greater than human (see Locke, *Paraphrase*. note on 1 Corinthians 12, and Conybeare and Howson, 1, 461). The prophets of the New Test. were supernaturally illuminated expounders and preachers.

**XI. Literature.** — On the general subject of prophecy no comprehensive or altogether satisfactory treatise has yet been produced. Among the old works we may mention Augustine, *De Civitate Dei*, lib. 18:cap. 27 sq. (*Op.* 7:508, Paris, 1685); Carpzov, *Introd. ad Libros Canonicos* (Lips. 1757). Some good remarks will be found in the essay of John Smith, *On Prophecy* (*Select Discourses*, disc. 6:p. 181, Loud. 1821, 8vo), which was translated into Latin and reprinted at the end of Le Clerc's *Commentary on the Prophets* (Amsterd. 1731). It contains interesting passages on the nature of the predictions in the Old Test., extracted from Jewish authors, of whom Maimonides is the most distinguished. Of less importance is the essay of Hermann Witsius, *De Prophetia et Prophetis* (in vol. 1 of his *Miscellan. Sacra* [Utrecht, 1692], p. 1-392): he digresses too much and needlessly from the main question, and says little applicable to the point; but he still supplies some useful materials. The same remark also applies in substance to Knibbe's *History of the Prophets*. Some valuable remarks, but much more that is arbitrary and untenable, will be found in Crusius's *Hypomnemata ad Theologiam Prophet.* (Lips. 1764, 3 vols.). In the *Treatise on Prophecy* inserted by Jahn in his *Introduction to the Old*

*Testament*, he endeavors to refute the views of the Rationalists, but does not sift the subject to the bottom. Kleuker's work, *De Nexu Proph. inter utrumque Foedus*, possesses more of a genuine theological character. The leader of the Rationalists is Eichhorn, *Die Hebraischen Propheten* (Getting. 1816); also in his *Introduction to the Old Testament*, and in his dissertation *De Prophet. Poes. Hebr.* Their views on this subject are most fully explained by Knobel in his *Prophetismus der Hebraer vollstündig dargestellt* (Breslau, 1837, 2 vols.): the work contains, however, little original research, and is valuable only as a compilation of what the Rationalists assert concerning prophecy. The work of Koster, *Die Propheten des A. und N.T.* (Leipsic, 1838), bears a higher character: on many points he approaches to sounder views; but he is inconsistent and wavering, and therefore cannot be said to have essentially advanced the knowledge of this subject. Of considerable eminence is the treatise by Ewald on prophecy, prefixed to his *Propheten des Alten Buzndes* (Stuttg. 1840; 1867, 3 vols.). But to the important question, whether the prophets enjoyed supernatural assistance or not, an explicit answer will there be sought for in vain. His view of the subject is in the main that of the Rationalists, though he endeavors to veil it: the Spirit of God influencing the prophets is, in fact, only their own mind worked up by circumstances; their enthusiasm and ecstasy are made to explain all. Finally, the work of Hoffmann, *Weissagun iq tnd Erfüllunq im A. und N.T.* (Nbrdlingen, 1841, vol. 1), is chargeable with spurious and affected originality: his views are often in their very details forced and strained, and it is to be regretted that the subject has by this work gained less than from the author's talent might have been expected. Many of the elements of prophecy have been very ably and a soundly discussed by Hengstenberg, *Christology of the Old Testament*, in T. T. Clark's transl. (Edinb. 1854). Other German works of importance on the subject are those of Umbreit, *Die Propheten des A. Test.* (in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1833, p. 1040 sq.); Tholuck, *Die Propheten und iahe Weissayungen* (1860; transl. in the *Bibliotheca Sacra*, 1833, p. 361 sq.). The subject is likewise discussed more or less fully in all the introductions (q.v.) to the Old Test. See also *Bible Educator* (Index, s.v.). One of the latest and most specious productions of the Rationalistic school is that of Prof. Kuenen (of the University of Leyden), *The Prophets and Prophecy in Israel* (transl. by Milroy, Lond. 1877, 8vo); it reiterates with ingenious array all the difficulties, contradictions, and failures alleged by hostile writers, and refuted or explained again and again by orthodox scholars.

**SEE SEER.**

Among writers in English we may especially name the following: Sherlock, *discourses on the Use and Intent of Prophecy* (1755, 8vo); Hurd, *Introd. to the Study of the Prophecies*, etc. (1772, 8vo); Apthorp, *Discourses on Prophecy* (1786, 2 vols. 8vo); Davison, *Discourses on Prophecy* (1821, 8vo); Smith (J. Pye), *Principles of Interpretation as applied to the Prophecies (of Holy Scripture)* (1829, 8vo); Brooks, *Elements of Prophetical Interpretation* (1837, 12mo); Alexander, *Connection of the Old and New Testaments* (1841, 8vo), lect. 4-7, p. 168-382; Lowth, *De Sacra Presi Hebrceorum* (Oxon. 1821, and transl. by Gregory, Lond. 1835); Horsley, *Biblical Criticism* (Lond. 1820); Horne, *Introduction to Holy Scripture* (Lond. 1828), ch. 4:§ 3; Van Mildert, *Boyle Lectures* (Lond. 1831), § 22; Fairbairn, *Prophecy: its nature, Functions, and Interpretation* (Edinb. 1856); M'Caul, *Aids to Faith* (Lond. 1861); Smith (K. Payne), *Messianic Interpretation of the Prophecies of Isaiah* (Oxf. 1862); Davidson, *Introduction to the Old Testament* (Lond. 1862), ii, 422; Stanley, *Lectures on the Jewish Church* (Lond. 1863); Maurice, *The Prophets and Kings of the Old Testament* (rep. Bost. 1853); Stuart, *Hints on the Interpretation of Prophecy* (Andover, 1844); Arnold, *On the Interpretation of Prophecy* (in his *Works*, Lond. 1845, i, 373 sq.); Taylor, *Spirit of Hebrew Poetry* (rep. N.Y. 1862). See also *Journ. Sacred Literature*, Oct. 1862; *Meth. Qaur. Rev.* April, 1862; Alford, *Greek Test.* (note on "Acts" 13:41); the monographs cited by Volbeding, *Index Programmatum*, p. 22, 43, 44; by Hase, *Leben Jesu*, p. 103; by Danz, *Worterb.* p. 793; by Darling, *Cyclopedia Bibliographica*, col. 1785 sq.; and under the art. **SEE PROPHETS, MAJOR AND MINOR.**

## Prophetess

(**haybat** *nebiah*, **προφήτις**, <sup><1253></sup>Exodus 15:20; <sup><1236></sup>Luke 2:36). Among the remarkable women who appear to have exercised the gift of prophecy, we find Miriam (<sup><1253></sup>Exodus 15:20); Deborah; Hannah (<sup><1111></sup>1 Samuel 2:1); Huldah (<sup><1224></sup>2 Kings 22:14); the wife of Isaiah (<sup><2388></sup>Isaiah 8:3); Anna (<sup><1236></sup>Luke 2:36); and the four daughters of Philip (<sup><4108></sup>Acts 21:8, 9). Miriam, Deborah, Huldah, and others were called prophetesses, not because they were supposed to be gifted with a knowledge of futurity, like the seers, but because they possessed a poetical inspiration; and inspired (especially sacred) poetry was always deemed of supernatural and divine origin. **SEE PROPHET.**

## Prophets, False

As Moses had foretold, a host of false prophets arose in later times among the Hebrews, who promised prosperity without repentance, and predicted after “the deceit of their own hearts” (<sup><5130></sup>Deuteronomy 13:1-5; <sup><3144></sup>Jeremiah 14:14-16; 23:9-27). According to <sup><5183></sup>Deuteronomy 18:20-22, a false prophet was punished capitally, being stoned to death. There were two cases in which a person was held convicted of the crime, and consequently liable to its punishment:

1. If a prophet spoke in the name of Jehovah, he was tolerated, so long as he remained unconvicted of imposture, even though he threatened calamity to the state. He might be imprisoned (<sup><2808></sup>Jeremiah 26:8-16; <sup><1120></sup>1 Kings 22:1-28), but could not legally be put to death, unless a prediction of his failed of accomplishment; then he was regarded as all impostor, and stoned.
2. If a person prophesied in the name of any other god, whether his prediction was accomplished or not, he was, at all events, considered a false prophet, and, as such, capitally punished. In the kingdom of Israel, Ahab could muster four hundred prophets of Baal at a time (<sup><1126></sup>1 Kings 22:6). In still later times false prophets, uttering the suggestions of their own imagination, abounded in the Church, and did much mischief (<sup><4075></sup>Matthew 7:15; 24:11; <sup><4132></sup>Mark 13:22; <sup><4036></sup>Luke 6:26; <sup><6001></sup>2 Peter 2:1; <sup><6011></sup>1 John 4:1). *SEE MESSIAHS, FALSE.*

## Prophets, French.

*SEE CAMISARD.*

## Prophets, Major And Minor.

We have in the Old Testament the writings of sixteen prophets; that is, of four greater and twelve lesser prophets. The four greater prophets are Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and Daniel. The Jews do not properly place Daniel among the prophets, because (they say) he lived in the splendor of temporal dignities, and led a kind of life different from other prophets. The twelve lesser prophets are Hosea, Joel, Amos, Obadiah, Jonah, Micah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi. The collectors of the canon arranged the prophets chronologically, but considered the whole of the twelve lesser prophets as one work, which

they placed after Jeremiah and Ezekiel, inasmuch as the last three lesser prophets lived later than they. Daniel, as above observed, was placed in the Hagiographa, because he had not filled the prophetic office. The collection of the lesser prophets themselves was again intended to be chronologically disposed; still Hosea is on account of the extent of his work, allowed precedence before those lesser prophets who, generally, were his contemporaries, and also before those who flourished at a somewhat earlier period. It is the opinion of Hengstenberg (*Christology*, 4:235) and of Pusey (*Minor Prophets*, pt. 1, introd.) that the writings of the Minor Prophets are actually placed chronologically. Accordingly, the former arranges the list of the prophets as follows: Hosea, Joel, Amos, Obadiah, Jonah, Micah, Isaiah (“the principal prophetic figure in the first or Assyrian period of canonical prophetism”), Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Jeremiah (“the principal prophetic figure in the second or Babylonian period of canonical prophetism”), Ezekiel, Daniel, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi. Calmet (*Dict. Bibl.* s.v. “Prophet”) as follows: Hosea, Amos, Isaiah, Jonah, Micah, Nahum, Jeremiah, Zephaniah, Joel, Daniel, Ezekiel, Habakkuk, Obadiah, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi. Stanley (*Lect.* 19) in the following order: Joel, Jonah, Hosea, Amos, Isaiah, Micah, Nahum, Zechariah, Zephaniah, Habakkuk, Obadiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Isaiah, Daniel, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi. Hence it appears that Stanley recognises two Isaiahs and two Zechariahs, unless “the author of Isaiah 40-66 is regarded as the older Isaiah transported into a style and position later than his own time” (p. 423). Obadiah is generally considered to have lived at a later date than is compatible with a chronological arrangement of the canon, in consequence of his reference to the capture of Jerusalem. But such an inference is not necessary, for the prophet might have thrown himself in imagination forward to the date of his prophecy (Hengstenberg), or the words which, as translated by the A.V., are a remonstrance as to the past, may be really but an imperative as to the future (Pusey). For the various questions relating to each person and book, see the several names in their alphabetical places. *SEE BIBLE.*

*Commentaries* — The following are the special exegetical helps on the prophets in general: Jerome, *Commetarii* (in *Opp.* vol. 5, ed. Basil.); Abrabanel, written in 1497, and frequently printed and translated in various forms and portions); Kimchi, David (first printed in the Rabbinical Bible, Yen. 1548, fol.); Ecolampadius, *Commentarii* (Basil. 1558, 2 vols. fol.); Peyron, *Commentaire* (Par. 1673, 12mo); Lowth, *Commentary*

(Lond. 1714, 4 vols. 4to; embraced in the commentary of Patrick, Lowth, etc.); Van Til, *Commentaria* (L. B. 1744, 3 vols. 4to); Vogel, *Unmschreibung* (Halle, 1771-73, 4 vols. 8vo); Weitenauer, *Metaphrasis* (Aug. Vind. 1768, 8vo); Dathe, *Notee* [on Maj. Proph. only] (Halle, 1779, 1785, 8vo); Smith (J.), *Explanation* [chiefly compiled] (Edinb. 1787, 1840, 12mo); Vaupel, *Erklaiung* (Dresd. 1798-80, 2 vols. 8vo); Eichhlorn, *Erklarung* (Gotting. 1816-19, 3 vols. 8vo); Agier, *Des Explications* (Par. 1820-22, 10 vols. 8vo); Cole, *Commentary* [includ. N.T.] (Lond. 1826, 2 vols. 8vo); Hengstenberg, *Christologie* (Berlin, 1829-35, 1854-57, 3 vols. 8vo; transl. N. Y. 1853-59, Edinb. 1854-58, 3 vols. 8vo; abridgm. Lond. 1847, 8vo); tiickert, *Erliiut.* [on certain parts] (Leips. 1831, 8vo); Tegg's ed. *Notes* [chiefly compiled] (Lond. 1836, 5 vols. 8vo); Hoffmann, *Auslegung* [on the Maj. Proph., compiled] (Stuttg. 1839, 8vo); Stephenson, *Christology* (Lond. 1839, 2 vols. 8vo); Ewald, *Erklrlung* (Stuttg. 1840-42, Gbtting. 1867-69, 2 vols. 8vo); Maurer, *Commentarius* (Lips. 1841, 8vo); Herxheimer, *vllr-P€* [includ. the Hagiog.] (Berl. 1841-44, in parts, 8vo); Delitzsch and Caspari, *Exeg. Hundb.* (Leips. 1842, 8vo); Umbreit, *Commentar* (Hamb. 184246, 5 vols. 8vo); Noyes, *Translation* (Bost. 1843, N. Y. 1849, 3 vols. 12mo); Hitzig, *Uebersetz.* (Leips. 1854, 8vo); Smith (G. V.), *Prophecies relating, to Assyria* (Lond. 1857, 12mo); Williams, *Prophets during the Assyrian Empire* (ibid. 1866, 8vo). **SEE OLD TESTAMENT.**

The following are exclusively on the Minor Prophets: Cyril of Alexandria, *Commentarii* (in *Opp.* 3, 1870; also Ingolst. 1607, fol.); Theodoret, *Interpretatio* (in *Opp.* II, ii); Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Commentarii* (in Mai's *Nov. Collectio*, 1, i, 41-104); Remigius Antissiod. *Einarrrationes* (in *Bibl. Max. Patr.* vol. 16); Rupertus Tuitiensis, *Commentarii* (in *Opp.* i, 651); Albertus Magnus, *Commentarii* (Basil. 1525, fol.); Tarnon, *Commentarius* (Rost. 1522, 4to; Lips. 1688, 1706, 4to); Lambert, *Commentarii* (Argent. 1525-26, 5 vols. 8vo; Francf. 1589, 1605, 3 vols. 8vo); Calvin, *Praelectiones* (Genev. 1559, 1581, 1612, fol.; in *Opp.* vol. ix; in French, ibid. 1560, etc., 4to; transl. by Owen, Edinb. 1846-49, 5 vols. 8vo); Forer, *Commentarii* (Ven. 1565, 8vo); Wigand, *Explicatio* (Francf. 1566, 8vo); Hemming, *Explanationes* (Lips. 1568, 4to); Strigel, *Scholia* (ibid. 1561, 1570, 1571, 8vo); Montanus [Rom. Cath.], *Commentarius* (Antw. 1571, fol., 1582, 4to); De Ribera [Rom. Cath.], *Commentarii* (ibid. 1511 and often, fol.); Gualter, *Commentarii* ('igur. 1572, fol.); P. de Palacio [Rom. Cath.], *Commenturius* (Colon. 1583, 1588, 8vo); Danaeus,



*Commentaria* (Genev. 1586, 1594, 8vo; transl. by Stockwood, Lond. 1594, 4to); Livelie, *Annotutiones* [on a part only] (Lond. 1587, 8vo; also in the *Critici Sacri*, vol. iv); Heilbrunn, *Loci communes* (Lauing. 1588, 8vo); M. de Palacio [Rom. Cath.], *Explanationes* (Salam. 1593, fol.); Alscheich, *t/arjñi* etc. (Venice, 1595 and later, fol.); A Messina [Rom. Cath.], *Paraphrasis* (Antw. 1597. 4to); Winckelmann, *Commentarius* (Francof. 1603.1620, 2 vols. 8vo); Thuan and Rittenhaus, *Metaphrasis* (Amberg. 1604, 8vo); Maldonatus, *Commentarius* (Colon. 1611, fol.); A Castro [Rom. Cath.], *Commentarii* (Lugd. 1615, Magunt. 1617, fol.); A Figeiro [Rom. Cath.], *Commentarii* (in his *Opp.* Lugd. 1615, fol.); Wolder, *Disputationes* (Wittemb. 1617, 4to); Sanctius [Rom. Cath.], *Commentarius* (Ligd. 1621, fol.); A Lapide, *Commentarius* (Antw. 1625, fol.); Drusius, *Commentarius* (Amst. 1627, 4to; also in the *Critici Sacri*); Philippaeus [Rom. Cath.], *Commentarii* (Par. 1633, 4 vols. fol.); Fabricins, *Conciones* (Bern. 1641, fol.); Lightfoot, *Versiones* (in *Works*, 10:453); Colona [Rom. Cath.], *Commentarii* (Panorm. 1644, fol.); Macorps [Rom. Cath.], *Paraphrase* (Par. 1644, 1645, 2 vols. 12mo); Cocceius, *Commentarius* (L. B. 1652. fol.); Hutcheson, *Exposition* (Lond. 1655, 3 vols. 8vo; 1657, fol.); Stokes, *Explication* (ibid. 1659, 8vo); Kunad, *Commentarius* (Dresd. 1677, 4to); De Veil, *Explicatio* (Lond. 1680, 8vo); Schmid and Baldwin, *Commentarius* (Lips. 1685, 1698, 4to); Pocock, *Commentaries* [on a part] (Oxf. 1685, fol.; also in *Works*); Mercer, *Commentarius* [on the first five only] (Giess. 1695, 4to); Marck, *Commentarius* (Amst. 1696-1701, 5 vols. 4to; Tubing. 1734, 2 vols. fol.); Tauler, *Predigten* (Ulm, 1699, 4to); Lyser, *Prcelectiones* (Goslar, 1709, 4to); Perterslen, *Erkla'iung* (F. ad NI. 1723, 4to); Gebhard, *Erklärung* (at various places, 1723-28, 10 pts. 4to; Brunsw. 1737, 4to); Almosino, *μυvθεπε* (in Frankfurter's Rabbin. Bible, Amst. 1724-27, fol.); Patronus [Rom. Cath.], *Commentarii* (Neap. 1743, fol.); Burke, *Gnomon* (Heidelb. 1753, 4to); Atschul, *tj Wxm* etc. [includ. the Hagiogr.] (Leghorn, 1753 and later, 8vo); Vogel, *Umschreib.* (Hal. 1773, 8vo); Struensee, *Uebersetz.* (Halberst. 1777, 8vo); Walther, *Uebersetz.* (Stead. 1777, 8vo); Vollborth, *Anmerk.* (Getting. 1783, 8vo); Newcome, *Notes* (Lond. 1785, 4to; 1836, 8vo); Bauer, *Erklar.* (Leips. 1786, 8vo); Staudling, *Eu laut.* [on parts] (Stuttg. 1786, 8vo); Heusler, *Animadversions* [on passages] (Kilon. 1786, 4to); Moldenhauer. *Erklr.* [includ. Dan.] (Quedl. 1787, 4to); Vampel, *Erkl'.* (Dresd. 1793, 8vo); Dahl, *Observations* [on passages] (Neostr. 1793, 8vo); Wolf (of Dessau), *hj ninae* etc. (Dessau, 1805, 8vo, and later);

Vater, *Observationes* [on passages] (Hal. 1815, 4to); Schrider, *Erlaut.* (Leips. 1823, 8vo); Rosenmueller, *Scholia* (Lips. 1827, 4 vols. 8vo); Ackerman, *Annotationes* (Viennase 1830, 8vo); Zadel, *Annotationes* (Hal. 1830, 8vo) Scholz, *Erkla'r.* (F. ad M. 1833, 8vo); Pick, *Translation* (2d ed. Lond. 1835, 12mo); Jeitteles, *vWrpQ* (Vienna, 1835, 8vo); Rieger, *Betrchtungen* (Stuttg. 1835, 8vo), Hesselberg, *Auslegung* (Konigsb. 1838, 8vo); Henderson, *Commentary* (Lond. 1845, Andover, 1866, 8vo); Hitzig, *Erklar.* (Leips. 1852, 8vo); Schregg [Rom Cath.], *Erklar.* (Regensb. 1854, 8vo); Pusey, *Commentary* (Lond. 1860, 4to); Kohler, *Die nachexil. Projheten* (Erlang. 1861, 8vo); Schlier, *Predigten* (Stuttg. 1861, 8vo); Whish, *Paraphrase* (Lond. 1864, 12mo); Shrewsbury, *Notes* (Edinb. 1865, 8vo); Cowles, *Notes* (N. Y. 1867, 12mo); Keif and Delitzsch, *Commentar* (Leips. 1866, 8vo; transl. Edinb. 1868, 2 vols. 8vo); Kelly, *Lectures* (Lond. 1871. 8vo). **SEE COMMENTARY.**

### Prophets, Schools Of The.

These were places where young men were educated under the care of a master, who was commonly, if not always, an inspired prophet. Godwin observes that for the propagation of learning colleges and schools were in divers places erected for the prophets. The first intimation we have in Scripture of these schools is in <sup><0105></sup>1 Samuel 10:5, where we read of “a company of prophets coming down from the high place with a psaltery, and a tabret, and a pipe, and a harp before them; and they shall prophesy.” They are supposed to be the students in a college of prophets at Gibeah of God, or, as we render it, “the hill of God,” which is another name for Gibeah of Benjamin (<sup><0135></sup>1 Samuel 13:15; 11:4). This place seems to have been reckoned among the ancient sanctuaries of Palestine. We afterwards read of such another company of the prophets at Naioth in Ramah “prophesying, and Samuel standing as appointed over them” (<sup><0199></sup>1 Samuel 19:19, 20). The students in these colleges were called “sons of the prophets.” We read of the “sons of the prophets that were at Bethel;” and of another school at Jericho; and of the sons of the prophets at Gilgal (<sup><1103></sup>2 Kings 2:3-5; 4:38). It appears that these sons of the prophets were very numerous; for of this sort were probably the prophets of the Lord whom Jezebel cut off; “but Obadiah took a hundred of them, and hid them by fifty in a cave” (<sup><1104></sup>1 Kings 18:4). In these schools young men were educated under a proper master in the knowledge of religion and sacred music (<sup><0105></sup>1 Samuel 10:5; 19:20), and were thereby qualified to be public preachers,

which seems to have been part of the business of the prophets on the Sabbath-days and festivals (<sup><11423></sup>2 Kings 4:23). It would seem that God generally chose the prophets whom he inspired out of these schools. Amos, therefore, speaks of it as an extraordinary case that though he was not one of the sons of the prophets, but a herdsman, “yet the Lord took him as he followed the flock, and said unto him, Go, prophesy unto my people Israel” (<sup><1074></sup>Amos 7:14, 15). That it was usual for some of these schools, or at least for their tutors, to be endued with a prophetic spirit, appears from the relation of the prophecies concerning the ascent of Elijah, delivered to Elisha by the sons of the prophets, both at Jericho and at Bethel (<sup><1118></sup>2 Kings 2:3, 5). See *Bible Educator*, 3, 64. **SEE PEDIAGOGICS; SEE SCHOOL.**

### Prophets, Sons Of The.

The disciples, or scholars, of the prophets were thus called, agreeably to the Hebrew idiom; they were instructed in the knowledge of religion and in sacred music, and were thus qualified to become public teachers (<sup><9011></sup>1 Samuel 10:11). **SEE PROPHET.**

### Prophets, Tombs Of The.

“The excavations commonly known under this name,” Professor Robinson observes, “are situated on the western declivity of the Mount of Olives, a little south of the footpath leading over from St. Stephen’s gate to Bethany. Pococke describes them as ‘very large, having many cells to deposit bodies in; the farther end of them they call the Labyrinth, which extends a great way; I could not find the end of it;’ this part seems to have been a quarry. Doiibdan compares them with the tombs of the judges and kings; but says the chambers are not square, as in these, but consist of two large and high galleries, cut strictly one within the other in a continued curve; the holes or niches for the bodies being on a level with the floor” (*Bibl. Res.* 1, 529; comp. *Latter Res.* p. 233). See De Saulley, *Dead Sea*, ii, 107; Williams, *Holy City*, 2, 215. **SEE OLIVET.** It is ordinarily supposed (but with no good reason) that it is of these tombs our Lord speaks when he says: “Woe unto you! for ye build the sepulchres of the prophets, and your fathers killed them” (<sup><12147></sup>Luke 11:47). **SEE TOMB.**

## Propitiation

The Greek word **ἱλαστήριον** (or **ἱλασμός**), rendered *propitiation* (<sup><R25></sup>Romans 3:25; <sup><R12></sup>1 John 2:2; 4:10) and *mercy seat* (<sup><R15></sup>Hebrews 9:5), is used in the Septuagint as the translation of the Hebrew word **trᵉḵi**, i.e. *covering*, properly the *lid* or *cover* of the ark of the covenant in the most holy place, which was overlaid with pure gold, over which the cherubim stretched out their wings, and where Jehovah communed with the representatives of his people (<sup><R217></sup>Exodus 25:17-22; 37; in the Sept. <sup><R316></sup>Exodus 38:6-9). Into the holy place the high-priest entered but once a year, when he sprinkled upon the mercy seat or *covering* of the ark the blood of an expiatory victim, in order to make propitiation for the sins of the people (<sup><R316></sup>Leviticus 16:11-15). In the common Greek idiom, **ἱλαστήριον** properly designates an *expiatory* or *propitiatory victim*, **SEE PROPITIATORY SACRIFICES**; and in <sup><R25></sup>Romans 3:25; <sup><R12></sup>1 John 2:2; 4:10, Christ is represented as the propitiatory sacrifice for the sin of the world. His blood alone atones for and *covers* our guilt. When faith is exercised in the blood of this sacrifice, its propitiatory effect is produced. In other words, Christ makes expiation which is effectual for such, and only such, as trust or put confidence in his atoning blood. The idea of the legal *reconciliation* of God and all sinners who cordially receive the Gospel plan of salvation is presented under two aspects. 1. *Expiation*: this denotes the doing of something which shall furnish a *just ground* or *reason* in a judicial administration for pardoning a convicted offender. 2. *Propitiation*: anything which shall have the property of disposing, inclining, or causing the judicial authority to *admit* the expiation — i.e. to assent to it as a valid reason for pardoning the offender. Expiation, therefore, regards the condition of the offender; propitiation, that of the judge or sovereign. “We can conceive cases,” says Dr. J. Pye Smith, “in which an expiation, good and reasonable in its kind, might be offered, and yet a wise and good government might not be willing to accept it — i.e. might not be *propitious* to the offender and to the proposal for his being forgiven. We call also conceive of a wise and good government being cordially disposed and greatly desirous to pardon an offender, but unable to gratify this gracious disposition because it can find *no just grounds* for such an act, and it is aware that a pardon arbitrary and destitute of unexceptionable reason would relax the obligations of law, bring dishonor upon public justice, and prove of pernicious example. It is also obvious that the same thing may be, and is most naturally fit and likely to be, both an expiation and a

propitiation i.e. both a valid *reason* for pardoning, and a determining *motive* to the will of the competent authority to admit and act upon that reason.” *SEE ATONEMENT*.

Now, in applying these terms to the great and awful case of ourselves, the whole world of justly condemned sinners, and our judge, the infinitely perfect God, there are some cautions of great importance to be observed. Nothing can be admitted that would contradict incontrovertible first principles. But there are two such principles which are often violated by inconsiderate advocates of the doctrine of salvation by the mediation of Christ; and the violation of them has afforded the advantage of all the plausible arguments urged against that doctrine by its adversaries. The first is the immutability of God. His moral principles — that is, his rectitude, wisdom, and goodness, as expressed by his blessed and holy *will* — can undergo no alteration; for to admit such a supposition would be destructive of the *absolute perfection* of the divine nature, as it would imply either an improvement or a deterioration in the subject of the supposed change. We cannot, therefore, hear or read without unspeakable disapprobation and regret representations of the Deity as first actuated by the passions of wrath and fury towards sinful men, and as afterwards turned, by the presentation of the Saviour’s sacrifice, into a different temper—a disposition of calmness, kindness, and grace. The second foundation principle is that the adorable God is, from eternity and in all the glorious constancy of his nature, gracious and merciful. He wants no extraneous motive to induce him to pity and relieve our miserable world. No change in God is necessary or desirable, even if it were possible. This is abundantly evident from many parts of the divine Word (<sup>1346</sup>Exodus 34:6, 7; John 3, 16; 6:39; 10:17; <sup>4008</sup>Ephesians 1:3-10; <sup>4708</sup>2 Corinthians 5:18, 19). The question whether sinners shall be pardoned is not one that can be referred to arbitrary will or absolute power. It is a question of law and government, and it is to be solved by the dictates of wisdom, goodness, justice, and consistency. God’s disposition to show mercy is original and unchangeable: in this sense nothing is needed to *render* him propitious. But the way and manner in which it will be suitable to all the other considerations proper to be taken into the account that he should show mercy, none but himself is qualified to determine. “God is the righteous judge, and God is angry [with the wicked] every day.” But this anger is not a commotion or a mutable passion: it is the calm, dignified, unchangeable, and eternal majesty of *the judge*; it is his *necessary* love of righteousness and hatred of iniquity.

Pardon, when on any consideration it takes place, brings the true and just idea of a *change*; but that change, in the great case before us, is not in the mind or character of the Supreme Ruler, but it is in the administration of his government, and in those outward acts by which that administration is indicated. This change is, in the order of moral right, the effect of an adequate *cause*. This cause lies in the whole mediatorial work of Christ, but most particularly and essentially in his sufferings and death, and these have constituted the expiation. *SEE ATONEMENT, DAY OF MEDIATION.*

The Romish Church believes the mass (q.v.) to be a sacrifice of propitiation for the living and dead; while the Reformed churches, justified by the express declarations of Scripture, allow of no propitiation but that one offered by Jesus on the cross, whereby divine justice is appeased and our sins atoned for (~~◀~~Romans 3:20; ~~◀~~1 John 2:2). *SEE SACRIFICE.*

### Propitiatory Sacrifices

include both trespass-offering and sin-offering. *SEE SACRIFICE.* In this place we are to examine the disputed question what the Israelites held before them as their object in offering their beasts of sacrifice; that is, whether they wished merely to offer a gift to the offended Deity (Welker, p. 288), or (as Michaelis. *los. Rit.* p. 64, urges) it was considered as a municipal penalty, a kind of fine; or, finally, as a substitute for the sinners presenting it, who had themselves properly deserved death. The last is the view of many rabbins (see Outram, *De Sacrific.* p. 251 sq.) and Church fathers (Theodor. *Quaest.* 61 *ad Exodus*; Euseb. *Delm. Ev.* i, 10, etc.), and lately of Bauer (*Theol. d. N.T.* 4:124 sq.), De Wette (*Bibl. Theol.* p. 98 sq.; comp. *Opusc.* p. 23 sq.), Gesenius (*Zu. Is.* ii, 189), Hengstenberg (*Christol.* i, 265), Scholl (in Klaiber's *Stud.* etc. V, ii, 143 sq.), and Tholuck (2. *Beit. z. Brief. c. d. Hebr.* p. 78 sq.; comp. Collul's *Bibl. Theol.* i, 270 sq., for many others). This meaning of the sin-offerings seems at first view the most natural, significant, and most accordant with ancient testimonies. Yet Klaiber (*Studien der Wurtemb. Geistl.* VIII, ii, 10 sq.) has recently combated it with acuteness, and Bohllr (*Symbol.* ii, 277 sq.) has offered several objections to it. Many other interpretations, some very monstrous, but offered with philosophical pretension, are referred to by Scholl (*op. cit.* p. 133 sq.). Early opposition to the usual view is found in Sykes (*Vebs. iub. die Opfer*, p. 128 sq.) and Steudel (*Glaubenslehre*, p. 256 sq.). Certainly some of the grounds on which it is often based are of no

weight. The formula in <sup><RB00></sup>Leviticus 4:20, “And the priest shall make an atonement for them, and it shall be forgiven them,” repeated in 26:5, 10, or that in <sup><RB13></sup>Leviticus 5:13, “And the priest shall make an atonement for him as touching his sin that he hath sinned in one of these, and it shall be forgiven him,” or the similar words in the 18th verse, do not make it certain that a substitution is to be thought of in the case of the sin-offering. The laying of the hand on the animal, too, though on the day of atonement (<sup><RB21></sup>Leviticus 16:21) it certainly implies the laying of guilt upon it, does not in general determine this point, since it was also customary in other sacrifices. Further, that the sin-offering was considered unclean, which would only be possible in case the uncleanness of sin were considered to have passed over to it, is not to be inferred from <sup><RB94></sup>Exodus 29:14; <sup><RB28></sup>Leviticus 16:28, etc. (as Klaiber has well shown), but would seem to contradict <sup><RB12></sup>Leviticus 4:12; 6:27 (see below). On the other hand,

(1.) <sup><RB71></sup>Leviticus 17:11, unless it be interpreted in a very forced manner, can scarcely be understood to mean anything else than that the life of the sacrifice, which is in the blood, and is poured out with the blood, was offered instead of the life of him who presented it. It is not necessary to lay stress upon the rendering of **רָפָא** (*kipper*, to expiate, to atone); but the parallelism between the *nephesh* or “life of the flesh” and the *nephesh* or soul for which it is given as an atonement is certainly not without force.

(2.) The sprinkling of the blood of the sin-offering shows that the mere death of the sacrifice, and the burning of pieces of its flesh on the altar, were not the object here as in other sacrifices. What other meaning could the sprinkling have than that in the blood the life is sprinkled, scattered, and so utterly destroyed? The pouring-out of the blood was not in this case, as elsewhere, merely a means of killing the animal, but was the real object in view. But it could only become an object when the sprinkling of the blood symbolizes the Substitution of the sacrifice for the offerer, who has forfeited his life by sin.

(3.) The idea that one man could suffer as a substitute for another (and hence, according to the Israelitish view, even be punished by God in his stead) is not only expressed by <sup><RB25></sup>2 Samuel 12:15 sq.; 24:10 sq.; <sup><RB34></sup>Isaiah 53:4 sq. (not <sup><RB18></sup>Proverbs 21:18), but the representation of a transmission of guilt appears in Deuteronomy 21, especially verse 8; in the symbolic meaning of the covenant-sacrifice (<sup><RB48></sup>Jeremiah 34:18 sq.; comp. <sup><RB57></sup>Genesis 15:17), and in the ritual service with the scapegoat

(<sup><B162></sup>Leviticus 16:21). See especially also (<sup><2362></sup>Isaiah 43:3, where, too, the word **rpK** (*kophesr, ransomo*), so common where the sin-offerings are mentioned, is used. (Klaiber is right in saying that **rPK** *kipper-*, from **rpK**; *kaphar*, properly means *cover*; and hence points out the removal of guilt, without determining the method. Yet it remains noteworthy that this word *kepher* [*covering over*], elsewhere only used in the sense of expiation, is used here when the subject is penal substitution. Was it so easy and natural for the Israelites to view expiation as an act of substitution?) Nor must we omit to remark that **aFē** *chitteh* [<sup><B139></sup>Genesis 31:39], meaning properly to *atone for*) is used for *making compensation*, and Klaiber's explanation of the passage is awkward.

(4.) There can be no doubt that the representation of expiatory substitution by sacrifices was prominent among other ancient nations (Herod. 2, 39; Caesar, *Bell.* (<sup><B165></sup>Galatians 6:16; Ovid, *Fast.* 6:160; Porphyry. *Abstin.* 4:15). The remark of De Wette, Tholuck, and Scholl that the remnants of the sin-offerings were accounted unclean seems to have no great weight, since the eating of pieces of flesh from most of sin-offerings might be urged for the contrary view; and certainly that idea did not appear in the case of the trespass-offerings (see Bahr, *op. cit.* p. 393 sq.).

On the offering of men for propitiation, in case of public misfortune (<sup><1002></sup>2 Kings 3:37) among the Greeks. comp. *Schol.* in Aristoph. *Plut.* 454; Wachsmuth, *Hele Aterth.* ii, 550 sq. The self-offerings of the Romans belong here too. Kindred is the illegal hanging of the children of Saul (<sup><1205></sup>2 Samuel 21:6 sq., comp. Lassaulx, *Die Siihnolfer der Griechen und Rbmer* [Wurzburg, 1841]).

(5.) Lastly, a circumstance which speaks strongly for the common explanation of these sin-offerings is that all others which have been suggested are far less natural, simple, and appropriate. We need not refer especially to the homely interpretation of Michaelis. The idea that blood passed for the principle of sensuality, and hence of sin, and that thus the shedding of blood became the symbol of the putting-away of sins, does not appear in the Old Test., nor, indeed, in the New. Steudel's supposition is that the gracious acceptance by God of the offering of reconciliation was the essential element, and that the various forms of sacrifice were only intended to impress on the mind the abominable nature of sin and to lead to a true repentance; but this view is strangely barren. Klaiber supposes that



clean animals without blemish were to awaken in the worshipper the sense of the law's requirement from him and of his imperfection. But this leaves out of sight all the peculiar forms appropriated to the sin-offering, and dwells on a single circumstance which was common to all the other sacrifices, and not even confined to sacrifices. It is impossible to sacrifice the common view, which is quite satisfactory, in favor of such schemes as these. The interpretation of Menken has been sufficiently answered by Bahr (*op. cit.* p. 292 sq.). *SEE PROPITIATION.*

### Proportion of Faith

*SEE ANALOGY (of Faith).*

### Propositiones Damnatae

is, in theological language. every thesis which contains either a dogmatical assertion or one intimately related to dogma. in the form of an authoritative reprobation, supported by the usual arguments afforded by Scripture, tradition, decisions of the Church, etc. The doctrinal opinions of those who diverge in any way from the belief of the Romish Church are also called propositions, and the degree of divergence is indicated by corresponding qualifications. If the authorities of the Church (general councils, or the pope himself) positively reject those propositions, they are condemned propositions, i.e. *propositiones damnatae*. The doctrines expounded, especially in writings, can be rejected summarily (*in globo*) without specification, or with special mention of each single proposition. In the latter case each condemned proposition is described by an adjective, which indicates its relation to the belief of the Church: heretical, bordering on heresy, erroneous, false, blasphemous, dangerous, immoral, etc. Such sentences have been pronounced, since the Reformation, among others, against the works of Luther, M. Bajus, Jansenius, Quesnel, etc. *SEE HERESY; SEE INDEX EXPUIGATORIUS.*

### Proproctors

are assistants of *proctors* (q.v.). Prorowit, a Slavic deity, was represented with four heads on a common trunk. He carried a fifth head on his chest, and held it in such a way that his eyes could see through the intervals of the fingers. Many explanations of this extraordinary figure have been proposed, but none that is at all concordant with the spirit of the Slavic

religions: all these surmises are based on the similitude of the image with that of *Janus Quadrifrons*.

## Prosar

is the service-book containing the form of the *prose* (q.v.).

## Prosbol Or Prozbul

(*l w b z w r p* or *l w b s w r p*) is the name of a legal enactment instituted by Hillel I, or the Great (q.v.). Whether the word is equivalent to the Greek *προβουλή* or *προσβολή*, or, as Sachs prefers, *πρὸς βουλῆ πρεσβευτῶν*, which latter is preferred by Jost and Gritz, cannot be decided. The reason for this curious legal provision, which, though contrary to the law of Moses, was necessitated by the time, and on the whole a very wholesome one, was that because, according to the law (Deuteronomy 15), the claiming of debts was unlawful during the Sabbatical year, the rich would not lend to the poor during that year, which seriously impeded commercial and social intercourse. Hillel found that under these circumstances the warning contained in <sup>(619)</sup>Deuteronomy 15:9 was disregarded, and in order to do away with this evil he introduced the *prosbol* or *prozbul*, i.e. a declaration made before the court of justice at the time of lending not to remit the debt in the Sabbatical year. The formula of this legal declaration was as follows: *b w j l k ç y n w l p m y q m b ç w y n y y d y n w l p m k l y n r s w m h x r a ç ^ m z l k w n k g a ç y n w l p l x a y l ç y ç* — i.e. “I, A B, deliver to you, the judges of the district C, the declaration that I may call in at any time I like all debts due to me;” and it was signed either by the judges or witnesses. Comp. Jost, *Geschichte d. Judenth.* 1. s. *Secten*, i, 265 sq.; Gratz, *Geschichte der Juden*, 3, 172; Edersheim, *Hist. of the Jewish Nation*, p. 395; Frankel, *Hodegetica in Mishnam* (Leips. 1859), p. 39; Weiss, *Zur Geschichte der jiid. Tradition* (Wien, 1872), i, 172; Sachs, *Beitrsae zur Sprach- u. Alterthums. frschungq* (Berlin, 1854), No. 2, p. 70; AMishna, *Shebiith*, 10:1-5; *Gittin*, 4:3; *Peah*, 3, 6; Schiirer, *Lehrbuch der neutestfmenflichen Zeitgeschichte* (Leips. 1874), p. 457 sq.; Buxtorfii *Lexicon Talmnudicum et Chaldaicum*, col. 1806 (revised edition by B. Fischer [Leips. 1869-74], col. 898); Derenbourg, *Essai sur l’Histoire et la Geographie de la Palestine* (Paris, 1867), p. 188 sq.; Low, *Beitriaqe zur jiidischen Alterthumskunde* (Leips. 1871), vol. i, pt. ii, p. 88 sq. (B. P.)

## Prose

(Lat. *Prosa*), the French name for the *Sequence*.

(1.) The prayer sung in the Mass after the Gradual and before the Gospel on great festivals. It required the license of the diocesan or the superior of a monastery before it could be used.

(2.) A canticle in which no metre is defined. An expression, in loose measure, of the principal circumstances of a festival to be added to the *pneuma* or adapted to its notes. St. Cmasarius of Aries required the laity in the diocese to sing proses and antiphons in church — some in Greek and some in Latin — aloud like the clergy, in order to introduce among the people a love of psalmody and hymns. These compositions, called *prose*, are in rhyme, but ignore the law of measure and quantity established by the ancient Greeks and Romans. As they were sung after the Gradual or Introits, they were likewise called *Sequatio* (q.v.). The use of prosing began near the close of the 9th century. Notker, abbot of St. Gall, cir. 880, composed and favored the use of proses, but certainly did not invent them. He says that he found one in an antiphonar brought from a Benedictine abbey near Rome, which had been burned by the Normans in 841. Pope Nicholas first authorized their use. Proses in the Middle Ages were written in the vulgar tongue for the edification of the people. These proses, having become exceedingly numerous, and in some places even ridiculous, were retrenched by the Council of Cologne in 1536, and of Rheims in 1564. The four proses used since the time of Pius V are *Victimae Paschali Laudes*, for Easter: *leni Creator Spiritus*, appointed by pope Innocent 3, at Whitsuntide; *Lautda Sion Staletoemn*, for Corpus Christi Day, writ ten either by Bonaventura or St. Thomas Aquinas; and the *Dies irae, Dies illa*, used in the commemorations of the dead, and attributed to Thomas de Cellano, or Salerno, a Franciscan, cir. 1230, cardinal Ursin (who died 1204), cardinal D'Aquasporta (who died 1302), Humbert, general of the Dominicans (who died 1277), Augustus Biuzellensis, or Bonaventura. The *Stabat Malter Dolorosa*, written by pope Innocent 3, or Giacomo da Toda, a Minorite, in the 14th century, is a prose. Possibly the chants used by St. Allhelm, bishop of Sherborne, sitting on the bridge of Malmesbury, to win the attention of the passers-by, were of the nature of proses. In the 12th, 13th, and 14th centuries rhythmical chants were sung at the end of a banquet which the pope gave to his clergy. At Sens, Lyons, Paris, and Rouen proses were in frequent use (unlike the Roman custom), but they

were mere rhapsodies, as we have in one instance preserved to us “Alle — necnon et perenne celeste — luia.” After the prose, the Mass-book is removed from the Epistle to the Gospel side, to represent the translation of authority from the Aaronitish to the apostolical priesthood. — Walcott, *Sacred Archceology*, s.v.; Burney, *Hist. of Music*, s.v.

## Proselyte

(προσήλυτος, one who has *joined* a new faith) occurs only in the A.V. of the New Test. (<sup><4235></sup>Matthew 23:15; <sup><4420></sup>Acts 2:10; 6:5; 13:43); but, the Greek word is occasionally used in the Sept. (<sup><1320></sup>1 Chronicles 22:22, etc.) as a rendering of the Heb. רֶגֶזֶר (a *stranger*, as usually rendered; sometimes Graecized in the Sept. γειώραξ [<sup><1129></sup>Exodus 2:19] from the Aramaic form ar/ḡæ) (The following article is substantially based upon Levrier’s treatment of the subject in Herzog’s *Real Encyklopadie*, with additions from other sources.) *SEE ALIEN*.

**I.** *Historical Development of this Class.* — The existence, through all stages of the history of the Israelites, of a body of men, not of the same race, but holding the same faith and adopting the same ritual, is a fact which, from its very nature, requires to be dealt with historically.

**1.** *During the Patriarchal Age.* — The position of the family of Israel as a distinct nation, with a special religious character, appears at a very early period to have exercised a power of attraction over neighboring races. The slaves and soldiers of the tribe of which Abraham was the head (<sup><1177></sup>Genesis 17:27), who were included with him in the covenant of circumcision, can hardly perhaps be classed as proselytes in the later sense. The case of the Shechemites, however (ch. 34), presents a more distinct instance. The converts were swayed partly by passion, partly by interest. The sons of Jacob then, as afterwards, required circumcision as an indispensable condition (<sup><1344></sup>Genesis 34:14). This, and apparently this only, was required of proselytes in the pre-Mosaic period.

**2.** *From the Exodus to the Monarchy.* — The life of Israel under the law, from the very first, presupposes and provides for the incorporation of men of other races. The “mixed multitude” of (<sup><1228></sup>Exodus 12:38) implies the presence of proselytes more or less complete. It is recognised in the earliest rules for the celebration of the Passover (<sup><1219></sup>Exodus 12:19). The “stranger” of this and other laws in the A.V. answers to the word which

distinctly means “proselyte,” and is so translated in the Sept, and the prominence of the class may be estimated by the frequency with which the word recurs: nine times in Exodus, twenty in Leviticus, eleven in Numbers, nineteen in Deuteronomy. The laws clearly point to the position of a convert. The “stranger” is bound by the law of the Sabbath (20:10; 23:12; <sup><B514></sup>Deuteronomy 5:14). Circumcision is the condition of any fellowship with him (<sup><D124></sup>Exodus 12:48; <sup><O194></sup>Numbers 9:14). He is to be present at the Passover (<sup><D129></sup>Exodus 12:19), the Feast of Weeks (<sup><B161></sup>Deuteronomy 16:11), the Feast of Tabernacles (ver. 14), the Day of Atonement (<sup><B162></sup>Leviticus 16:29). The laws of prohibited marriages (<sup><B183></sup>Leviticus 18:26) and abstinence from blood (<sup><B170></sup>Leviticus 17:10) are binding upon him. He is liable to the same punishment for Molech-worship (<sup><B102></sup>Leviticus 20:2) and for blasphemy (<sup><B116></sup>Leviticus 24:16); may claim the same right of asylum as the Israelites in the cities of refuge (<sup><O515></sup>Numbers 35:15; <sup><B10></sup>Joshua 20:9). On the other side he is subjected to some drawbacks. He cannot hold land (<sup><B190></sup>Leviticus 19:10). He has no *jus connubii* with the descendants of Aaron (<sup><B114></sup>Leviticus 21:14). His condition is assumed to be, for the most part, one of poverty (<sup><B22></sup>Leviticus 23:22), often of servitude (<sup><B11></sup>Deuteronomy 29:11). For this reason he is placed under the special protection of the law (10:18). He is to share in the right of gleaning (<sup><B190></sup>Leviticus 19:10), is placed in the same category as the fatherless and the widow (<sup><B117></sup>Deuteronomy 24:17,19; 26:12; 27:19), is joined with the Levite as entitled to the tithe of every third year’s produce (14:29; 26:12). Among the proselytes of this period the *Kenites* (q.v.), who under Hobab accompanied the Israelites in their wanderings, and ultimately settled in Canaan, were probably the most conspicuous (<sup><B116></sup>Judges 1:16). The presence of the class was recognised in the solemn declaration of blessings and curses from Ebal and Gerizim (<sup><B133></sup>Joshua 8:33).

The period after the conquest of Canaan was not favorable to the admission of proselytes. The people had no strong faith, no commanding position. The Gibeonites (ch. 9) furnish the only instance of a conversion, and their condition is rather that of slaves compelled to conform than that of free proselytes. *SEE NETHINIM.*

**3. The Period of the Monarchy.** — With the introduction of royalty, and the consequent fame and influence of the people, there was more to attract stragglers from the neighboring nations, and we meet accordingly with many names which suggest the presence of men of another race conforming to the faith of Israel. Doeg the Edomite (<sup><B207></sup>1 Samuel 21:7),

Uriah the Hittite (<sup><1018></sup>2 Samuel 11:3), Araunah the Jebusite (<sup><1023></sup>2 Samuel 22:23), Zelek the Ammonite (<sup><1037></sup>2 Samuel 23:37), Ithmah the Moabite (<sup><1314></sup>1 Chronicles 11:46) — these two in spite of an express law to the contrary (<sup><623></sup>Deuteronomy 23:3) — and at a later period Shebnah the scribe (probably; comp. Alexander on <sup><2215></sup>Isaiah 22:15), and Ebed-Melech the Ethiopian (<sup><2407></sup>Jeremiah 38:7), are examples that such proselytes might rise even to high offices about the person of the king. The *Cherethites* and *Pelethites* (q.v.) consisted probably of foreigners who had been attracted to the service of David, and were content for it to adopt the religion of their master (Ewald, *Gesch.* i, 330; 3, 183). The vision in Psalm 87 of a time in which men of Tyre, Egypt, Ethiopia, Philistia, should all be registered among the citizens of Zion can hardly fail to have had its starting-point in some admission of proselytes within the memory of the writer (Ewald and De Wette, *ad loc.*). A convert of another kind, the type, as it has been thought, of the later proselytes of the gate (see below), is found in Naaman the Syrian (<sup><1185></sup>2 Kings 5:15, 18) recognising Jehovah as his God, yet not binding himself to any rigorous observance of the law.

The position of the proselytes during this period appears to have undergone considerable changes. On the one hand, men rose, as we have seen, to power and fortune. The case for which the law provided (<sup><625></sup>Leviticus 25:47) might actually occur, and they might be the creditors of Israelites as debtors, the masters of Israelites as slaves. It might well be a sign of the times in the later days of the monarchy that they became “very high,” the “head” and not the “tail” of the people (<sup><638></sup>Deuteronomy 28:43, 44). The picture had, however, another side. They were treated by David and Solomon as a subject class, brought (like Periceci, almost like Helots) under a system of compulsory labor from which others were exempted (<sup><1212></sup>1 Chronicles 22:2; <sup><1417></sup>2 Chronicles 2:17, 18). The statistics of this period, taken probably for that purpose, give their number (i.e. apparently the number of adult working males) at 153,600 (*ibid.*). They were subject at other times to wanton insolence and outrage (<sup><6916></sup>Psalm 94:6). As some compensation for their sufferings they became the special objects of the care and sympathy of the prophets. One after another of the “goodly fellowship” pleads the cause of the proselytes as warmly as that of the widow and the fatherless (<sup><2406></sup>Jeremiah 7:6; 22:3; <sup><3217></sup>Ezekiel 22:7, 29; <sup><3070></sup>Zechariah 7:10; <sup><3085></sup>Malachi 3:5). A large accession of converts enters into all their hopes of the divine kingdom (<sup><2312></sup>Isaiah 2:2; 11:10; 56:3-6; <sup><3311></sup>Micah 4:1). The sympathy of one of them goes still further. He sees, in

the far future, the vision of a time when the last remnant of inferiority shall be removed, and the proselytes, completely emancipated, shall be able to hold and inherit land even as the Israelites (<sup><3672></sup>Ezekiel 47:22).

**4. *From the Babylonian Captivity to the Destruction of Jerusalem.*** — The proselytism of this period assumed a different character. It was for the most part the conformity, not of a subject race, but of willing adherents. Even as early as the return from Babylon we have traces of those who were drawn to a faith which they recognised as holier than their own, and had “separated themselves” unto the law of Jehovah (<sup><1608></sup>Nehemiah 10:28). The presence of many foreign names among the Nethinim (7:46-59) leads us to believe that many of the new converts dedicated themselves specially to the service of the new Temple. With the conquests of Alexander, the wars between Egypt and Syria, the struggle under the Maccabees, the expansion of the Roman empire, the Jews became more widely known, and their power to proselytize increased. They had suffered for their religion in the persecution of Antiochus, and the spirit of martyrdom was followed naturally by propagandism. Their monotheism was rigid and unbending. Scattered through the East and West, a marvel and a portent, wondered at and scorned, attracting and repelling, they presented, in an age of shattered creeds and corroding doubts, the spectacle of a faith, or at least a dogma, which remained unshaken. The influence was sometimes obtained well, and exercised for good. In most of the great cities of the empire there were men who had been rescued from idolatry and its attendant debasements, and brought under the power of a higher moral law. It is possible that in some cases the purity of Jewish life may have contributed to this result, and attracted men or women who shrank from the unutterable contamination in the midst of which they lived. The converts who were thus attracted joined, with varying strictness (see below), in the worship of the Jews. They were present in their synagogues (<sup><4132></sup>Acts 13:42, 43, 50; 17:4; 18:7). They came up as pilgrims to the great feasts at Jerusalem (<sup><4110></sup>Acts 2:10). In Palestine itself the influence was often stronger and better. Even Roman centurions learned to love the conquered nation, built synagogues for them (<sup><4075></sup>Luke 7:5), tasted and prayed, and gave alms, after the pattern of the strictest Jews (<sup><4112></sup>Acts 10:2, 30), and became preachers of the new faith to the soldiers under them (ver. 7). Such men, drawn by what was best in Judaism, were naturally among the readiest receivers of the new truth which rose out of it, and became in many cases the nucleus of a Gentile church.

Proselytism had, however, its darker side. The Jews of Palestine were eager to spread their faith by the same weapons as those with which they had defended it. Had not the power of the empire stood in the way, the religion of Moses, stripped of its higher elements, might have been propagated far and wide by force, as was afterwards the religion of Mohammed. As it was, the Idumeans had the alternative offered them by John Hyrcanus of death, exile, or circumcision (Josephus, *Ant.* 13:9, 3). The Itureans were converted in the same way by Aristobulus (*ibid.* 13:11, 3). In the more frenzied fanaticism of a later period, the Jews under Josephus could hardly be restrained from seizing and circumcising two chiefs of Trachonitis who had come as envoys (Josephus, *Life*, 23). They compelled a Roman centurion, whom they had taken prisoner, to purchase his life by accepting the sign of the covenant (Josephus, *War*, ii, 11, 10). Where force was not in their power (the “*veluti Judaei, cogemus*” of Horace, *Sat.* i, 4, 142, implies that they sometimes ventured on it even at Rome), they obtained their ends by the most unscrupulous fraud. They appeared as soothsayers, diviners, exorcists, and addressed themselves especially to the fears and superstitions of women. Their influence over these became the subject of indignant satire (Juvenal, *Sat.* 6:543-547). They persuaded noble matrons to send money and purple to the Temple (Josephus, *Ant.* 18:3, 5). At Damascus the wives of nearly half the population were supposed to be tainted with Judaism (Josephus, *War*, ii, 10, 2). At Rome they numbered in their ranks, in the person of Poppaea, even an imperial concubine (Josephus, *Ant.* 20:7, 11). The converts thus made cast off all ties of kindred and affection (Tacitus, *Hist.* v, 9). Those who were most active in proselytizing were precisely those from whose teaching all that was most true and living had departed. The vices of the Jew were ingrafted on the vices of the heathen. A repulsive casuistry released the convert from obligations which he had before recognised, while in other things he was bound hand and foot to an unhealthy superstition. The Law of the Corban may serve as one instance (<sup>4154</sup>Matthew 15:4-6). Another is found in the rabbinic teaching as to marriage. Circumcision, like a new birth, cancelled all previous relationships, and unions within the nearest degrees of blood were therefore no longer incestuous (Maimon. *ex Jeban.* p. 982; Selden, *De Jutre Nat. et Gent.* ii, 4; *Uxor Hebr.* ii, 18). It was no wonder that the proselyte became “twofold more the child of Gehenna” (<sup>4215</sup>Matthew 23:15) than the Pharisees themselves.



The position of such proselytes was indeed every way pitiable. At Rome, and in other large cities, they became the butts of popular scurrility. The words “curtus,” “verpes,” met them at every corner (Horace, *Sat.* i, 4, 142; Martial, 7:29, 34, 81; 11:95; 12:37). They had to share the fortunes of the people with whom they had cast, in their lot, might be banished from Italy (<sup>448D</sup>Acts 18:2; Suet. *Claud.* 25), or sent to die of malaria in the most unhealthy stations of the empire (Tacitus, *Ann.* ii, 85). At a later time, they were bound to make a public profession of their conversion, and to pay a special tax (Sueton. *Domit.* xii). If they failed to do this and were suspected, they might be subject to the most degrading examination to ascertain the fact of their being proselytes (*ibid.*) Among the Jews themselves their case was not much better. For the most part, the convert gained but little honor even from those who gloried in having brought him over to their sect and party. The popular Jewish feeling about them was like the popular Christian feeling about a converted Jew. ‘They were regarded (by a strange rabbinic perversion of <sup>234E</sup>Isaiah 14:1) as the leprosy of Israel, “cleaving” to the house of Jacob (*Jebam.* 47:4; *Kiddush.* 70:6). An opprobrious proverb coupled them with the vilest profligates (“proselyti et poederastae”) as hindering the coming of the Messiah (Lightfoot, *Hor. Heb.* in <sup>423B</sup>Matthew 23:5). It became a recognised maxim that no wise man would trust a proselyte even to the twenty-fourth generation (*Jalkuth Ruth*, f. 163 a).

The better rabbins did their best to guard against these evils. Anxious to exclude all unworthy converts, they grouped them, according to their motives, with a somewhat quaint classification:

- “1. Love-proselytes, where they were drawn by the hope of gaining the beloved one. (The story of Syllaeus and Salome [Josephus, *Ant.* 16:7, § 6]) is an example of a half-finished conversion of this kind.)
- “2. Man-for-woman, or Woman-for-man proselytes, where the husband followed the religion of the wife, or conversely.
- “3. Esther-proselytes, where conformity was assumed to escape danger, as in the original Purim (<sup>478B</sup>Esther 8:11).
- “4. King’s-table proselytes, who were led by the hope of court favor and promotion, like the converts under David and Solomon.

“5. Lion-proselytes, where the conversion originated in a superstitious dread of a divine judgment, as with the Samaritans of <sup><4272></sup>2 Kings 17:26”

(Gemara Hieros. *Kiddush*. 65:6; Jost, *Judenth.* i, 448). None of these were regarded as fit for admission within the covenant. When they met with one with whose motives they were satisfied, he was put to a yet further ordeal. He was warned that in becoming a Jew he was attaching himself to a persecuted people, that in this life he was to expect only suffering, and to look for his reward in the next. Sometimes these cautions were in their turn carried to an extreme and amounted to a policy of exclusion. A protest against them on the part of a disciple of the Great Hillel is recorded, which throws across the dreary rubbish of rabbinism the momentary gleam of a noble thought. “Our wise men teach,” said Simon ben-Gamaliel, “that when a heathen comes to enter into the covenant, our part is to stretch out our hand to him and to bring him under the wings of God” (Jost, *Judenth.* i, 447).

Another mode of meeting the difficulties of the case was characteristic of the period. Whether we may transfer to it the full formal distinction between proselytes of the gate and proselytes of righteousness (see below) may be doubtful enough, but we find two distinct modes of thought, two distinct policies in dealing with converts. The history of Helena, queen of Adiabene, and her son Izates, presents the two in collision with each other. They had been converted by a Jewish merchant, Ananias, but the queen feared lest the circumcision of her son should disquiet and alarm her subjects. Ananias assured her that it was not necessary. Her son might worship God, study the law, keep the commandments without it. Soon, however, a stricter teacher came—Eleazar of Galilee. Finding Izates reading the law, he told him sternly that it was of little use to study that which he disobeyed, and so worked upon his fears that the young devotee was eager to secure the safety of which his uncircumcision had deprived him (Josephus, *Ant.* 20:2, 5; comp. Jost, *Judenth.* i, 341). On the part of some, therefore, there was a disposition to dispense with what others looked upon as indispensable. The centurions of Luke 7 (probably) and Acts 10 — possibly the Hellenes of <sup><4322></sup>John 12:20 and <sup><4432></sup>Acts 13:42 — are instances of men admitted on the former footing. The phrases οἱ σεβόμενοι προσήλυτοι (<sup><443B></sup>Acts 13:43), οἱ σεβόμενοι (17, 4, 17; Josephus, *Ant.* 14:7, 2), ἄνδρες εὐλαβεῖς (<sup><441B></sup>Acts 2:5; 7:2), are often, but inaccurately, supposed to describe the same class — the proselytes of the gate (see

Cremer, *Worterb. der neutest. Gricitat*, ii, 476). The probability is either that the terms were used generally of all converts, or, if with a specific meaning, were applied to the full proselytes of righteousness (comp. a full examination of the passages in question by N. Lardner, *On the Decree of Acts 15*, in *Works*, 11:305). The two tendencies were, at all events, at work, and the battle between them was renewed afterwards on holier ground and on a wider scale. Ananias and Eleazar were represented in the two parties of the Council of Jerusalem. The germ of truth had been quickened into a new life, and was emancipating itself from the old thralldom. The decrees of the council were the solemn assertion of the principle that believers in Christ were to stand on the footing of proselytes of the gate, not of proselytes of righteousness. The teaching of St. Paul as to righteousness and its conditions, its dependence on faith, its independence of circumcision, stands out in sharp, clear contrast with the teachers who taught that that rite was necessary to salvation, and confined the term "righteousness" to the circumcised convert.

**5. From the Destruction of Jerusalem downwards.** — The teachers who carried on the rabbinical succession consoled themselves, as they saw the new order waxing and their own glory waning, by developing the decaying system with an almost microscopic minuteness. They would at least transmit to future generations the full measure of the religion of their fathers. In proportion as they ceased to have any power to proselytize, they dwelt with exhaustive fulness on the question how proselytes were to be made. To this period accordingly belong the rules and decisions which are often carried back to an earlier age, and which may now be conveniently discussed. The precepts of the Talmud may indicate the practices and opinions of the Jews from the second to the fifth century. They are very untrustworthy as to any earlier time.

**II. Debatable Questions.** — The points of interest which present themselves for inquiry are the following:

**1. The Classification of Proselytes.** — The whole Jewish state was considered as composed of the two classes — Jews, and strangers within their gates, or proselytes. In later years this distinction was observed even to the second generation; a child of pure Jewish descent on both sides being designated Ἑβραῖος ἐξ Ἑβραίων, a "Hebrew of the Hebrews" (Phil. 3, 5), while the son of a proselyte was denominated *yāḡā bēben-ger*, "son of a stranger;" and if both parents were proselytes, he was styled by

the rabbins **gḡgb**, a contraction for **rgAˆb hrgAˆbw** (*Pirke Aboth*, c. 5). Subordinate to this, however, was a division which has been in part anticipated, and was recognised by the Talmudic rabbins, but received its full expansion at the hands of Maimonides (*Hilc. Mel.* i, 6). They claimed for it a remote antiquity, a divine authority.

(1.) The term *Proselytes of the Gate* (**r[ḤhiyrḤ**) was derived from the frequently occurring description in the law, “the stranger (**rḤ**) that is within thy gates” (**<1270>** Exodus 20:10, etc.). They were known also as the sojourners (**bḥ/t yrḤ**), with a reference to **<1257>** Leviticus 25:47, etc. To them were referred the greater part of the precepts of the law as to the “stranger.” The Targums of Onkelos and Jonathan give this as the equivalent in **<1221>** Deuteronomy 24:21. Converts of this class were not bound by circumcision and the other special laws of the Mosaic code. It was enough for them to observe the seven precepts of Noah (Otho, *Lex. Rabb.* s.v. Noachida; Selden, *De fur. Nat. et Gent.* i, 10), i.e. the six supposed to have been given to Adam —

- (1) against idolatry,
- (2) against blaspheming,
- (3) against bloodshed,
- (4) against uncleanness,
- (5) against theft,
- (6) of obedience, with
- (7) the prohibition of “flesh with the blood thereof” given to Noah.

The proselyte was not to claim the privileges of an Israelite, might not redeem his first-born, or pay the half-shekel. He was forbidden to study the law under pain of death (Otho, *l.c.*) The later rabbins, when Jerusalem had passed into other hands, held that it was unlawful for him to reside within the holy city (Maimon. *Beth-haccher.* 7:14). In return they allowed him to offer whole burnt-offerings for the priest to sacrifice, and to contribute money to the Corban of the Temple. They held out to him the hope of a place in the paradise of the world to come (Leyrer). They insisted that the profession of his faith should be made solemnly in the presence of three witnesses (Maimon. *Hilc. Mel.* 8:10). The Jubilee was the proper season for his admission (Muller, *De Pros.* in Ugolino, 22:841).

All this seems so full and precise that we cannot wonder that it has led many writers to look on it as representing a reality, and most

commentators accordingly have seen these proselytes of the gate in the **σεβόμενοι, εὐλαβεῖς, φοβούμενοι τὸν θεόν** of the Acts. It remains doubtful, however, whether it was ever more than a paper scheme of what ought to be, disguising itself as having actually been. The writers who are most full, who claim for the distinction the highest antiquity, confess that there had been no proselytes of the gate since the two tribes and a half had been carried away into captivity (Maimonides, *Hilc. Mel.* i, 6). They could only be admitted at the jubilee, and there had since then been no jubilee celebrated (Muller, *l.c.*). All that can be said therefore is, that in the time of the New Test. we have independent evidence (*ut supra*) of the existence of converts of two degrees, and that the Talmudic division is the formal systematizing of an earlier fact. The words “proselytes” and **οἱ σεβόμενοι τὸν θεόν** were, however, in all probability limited to the circumcised.

(2.) In contrast with these were the *Proselytes of Righteousness* (**קדושי ירהו**), known also as Proselytes of the Covenant, perfect Israelites. By some writers the Talmudic phrase *proseltyti tracti* (**מירחע**) is applied to them as *drawn* to the covenant by spontaneous conviction (Buxtorf, *Lex.* s.v.), while others (Kimchi) refer it to those who were constrained to conformity, like the Gibeonites. Here also we must receive what we find with the same limitation as before. That there were, in later times especially, many among the Jews who had renounced the grosser parts of heathenism without having come over entirely to Judaism, is beyond all doubt; but that these were ever counted *proseltytes* admits of question. Certain it is that the proselytes mentioned in the New Test. were all persons who had received circumcision, and entered the pale of the Jewish community; they were persons who, according to the phraseology of the Old Test. had become Jews (**מגידים** *Magidim*, Esth. 8:17). It is probable that the distinction above mentioned was introduced by the later rabbins for the sake of including among the conquests of their religion those who, though indebted probably to the Jewish Scriptures for their improved faith, were yet not inclined to submit to the ritual of Judaism, or to become incorporated with the Jewish nation. That this, however, was not the ancient view is clearly apparent from a passage in the Babylonian Gemara, quoted by Lightfoot (*Hor. Heb. et Talmn. in* <sup>406</sup> *Matthew* 3:6), where it is said expressly that “no one is a proselyte until such time as he has been circumcised.” Furst, himself a Jew, confirms our suggestion; for in a note upon the word **רעה** in his *Concordantie Libb. V. T.*, he says: “The Jews, interpreting

dogmatically rather than historically, refer the word to him who has abandoned heathen superstitions." Maimonides, indeed, speaks of such a distinction, but the lateness of the period at which he flourished (A.D. 1160), and the absence of any scriptural authority, require us to consider his assertions as referring to a time much later than that of the apostles. "According to my idea," says bishop Tomline, "proselytes were those, and those only, who took upon themselves the obligation of the whole Mosaic law, but retained that name till they were admitted into the congregation of the Lord as adopted children. Gentiles were allowed to worship and offer sacrifices to the God of Israel in the outer court of the Temple; and some of them, persuaded of the sole and universal sovereignty of the Lord Jehovah, might renounce idolatry without embracing the Mosaic law; but such persons appear to me never to be called proselytes in Scripture, or in any ancient Christian writer" (*Elements of Christian Theology*, 1. 266, 267). Dr. Lardner has remarked that the notion of two sorts of proselytes is not to be found in any Christian writer before *the fourteenth century* (*Works*, 6. 522-533, 8vo. and 11:313-324; see also Jennings, *Jewish Antiquities*, bk. 1, ch. 3). The arguments on the other side are ably stated in Townsend, *Chronological Arrangements of the New Testament*, 2, 115, etc., Lond. ed.

**2. Ceremonies of Admission.** — Here all seems at first clear and definite enough. The proselyte was first catechised as to his motives (Maimonides, *ut sup.*). If these were satisfactory, he was first instructed as to the divine protection of the Jewish people, and then circumcised. In the case of a convert already circumcised (a Midianite, e.g., or an Egyptian), it was still necessary to draw a few drops of "the blood of the covenant" (Gem. Bab. *Shabb. f.* 135 a). A special prayer was appointed to accompany the act of circumcision. Often the proselyte took a new name, opening the Hebrew Bible and accepting the first that came (Leyrer, *ut sup.*).

All this, however, was not enough. The convert was still a "stranger." His children would be counted as bastards, i.e. aliens. Baptism was required to complete his admission. When the wound caused by circumcision was healed, he was stripped of all his clothes, in the presence of the three witnesses who had acted as his teachers, and who now acted as his sponsors, the "fathers" of the proselyte (*Ketubh.* 11; *Eruvh.* 15:1), and led into the tank or pool. As he stood there, up to his neck in water, they repeated the great commandments of the law. These he promised and vowed to keep, and then, with an accompanying benediction, he plunged

under the water. To leave one hand-breadth of his body unsubmerged would have vitiated the whole rite (Otho, *Lex. Rabb.* s.v. Baptismus; Keisk. *De Bapet. Pros.* in Ugolino, vol. 22). Strange as it seems, this part of the ceremony occupied, in the eyes of the later rabbins, a co-ordinate place with circumcision. The latter was incomplete without it, for baptism also was of the fathers (Gem. Bab. *Jebam.* f. 461, 2). One rabbin appears to have been bold enough to declare baptism to have been sufficient by itself (*ibid.*); but, for the most part, both were reckoned as alike indispensable. They carried back the origin of the baptism to a remote antiquity, finding it in the command of Jacob (<sup>(1312)</sup>Genesis 35:2) and of Moses (<sup>(1290)</sup>Exodus 19:10). The Targum of the pseudo-Jonathan inserts the word “Thou shalt circumcise and baptize” in <sup>(124)</sup>Exodus 12:44. Even in the Ethiopic version of <sup>(435)</sup>Matthew 23:15 we find “compass sea and land to baptize one proselyte.” Language foreshadowing, or caricaturing, a higher truth was used of this baptism. It was a new birth (*Jebam.* f. 62, 1; 92, 1; Maimonides, *Issur. Bich.* c. 14; Lightfoot, *Harm. of the Gospels*, 3:14; *Exerc. on John* 3). The proselyte became a little child. This thought probably had its starting-point in the language of Psalm 87. There also the proselytes of Babylon and Egypt are registered as “born” in Zioti. **SEE REGENERATION.** The new convert received the Holy Spirit (*Jebam.* f. 22 a, 48 b). All natural relationships, as we have seen, were cancelled.

The baptism was followed, as long as the Temple stood, by the offering or corban. It consisted, like the offerings after a birth (the analogy apparently being carried on), of two turtle-doves or pigeons (<sup>(1112)</sup>Leviticus 12:18). When the destruction of Jerusalem made the sacrifice impossible, a vow to offer it as soon as the Temple should be rebuilt was substituted. For women-proselytes, there were only baptism and the corban, or, in later times, baptism by itself. The Galilæan female proselytes were said to have objected to this, as causing barrenness.

**3. Antiquity of these Practices.** — Was this ritual observed as early as the commencement of the 1st century? If so, was the baptism of John or that of the Christian Church in any way derived from or connected with the baptism of proselytes? If not, was the latter in any way borrowed from the former? This point has been somewhat discussed above, but it will be enough to sum up the conclusions which seem fairly to be drawn from the extant information on the subject, especially the question of the baptism of proselytes.

- (1.) There is no *direct* evidence of the practice being in use before the destruction of Jerusalem. The statements of the Talmud as to its having come from the fathers, and their exegesis of the Old Test. in connection with it, are alike destitute of authority.
- (2.) The negative argument drawn from the silence of the Old Test., of the Apocrypha, of Philo, and of Josephus, is almost decisive against the belief that there was in their time a baptism of proselytes with *as much* importance attached to it as we find in the Talmudists.
- (3.) It remains probable, however, that there was *a* baptism in use at a period considerably earlier than that for which we have direct evidence. ‘The symbol was in itself natural and fit. It fell in with the disposition of the Pharisees and others to multiply and discuss “washings” (βαπτισμοί, ~~Mark~~ Mark 7:4) of all kinds. The tendency of the later rabbins was rather to heap together the customs and traditions of the past than to invent new ones. If there had not been a baptism, there would have been no initiatory rite at all for female proselytes. The custom of baptizing proselytes thus arose gradually out of the habit which the Jews had of purifying by ablution whatever they deemed unclean, and came to be raised for the first time to the importance of an initiatory ordinance after the destruction of the Temple service, and when, in consequence of imperial edicts, it became difficult to circumcise converts. This latter opinion is that of Schneckenburger (*Ueb. das Alter d. jud. Proselyten-Taufe* [Berlin, 1828]), and has been espoused by several eminent German scholars. To us, however, it appears exceedingly unsatisfactory. The single fact adduced in support of it, viz. the difficulty of circumcising converts in consequence of the imperial edicts against proselytism, is a singularly infelicitous piece of evidence; for, as the question to be solved is, How came the later rabbins to prescribe *both* baptism and circumcision as initiatory rites for proselytes? it is manifestly absurd to reply that it was because they could only baptize and could not circumcise: such an answer is a contradiction, not a solution of the question. Besides, this hypothesis suggests a source of proselyte baptism which is equally available for that which it is designed to supersede; for, if the practice of baptizing proselytes on their introduction into Judaism had its rise in the Jewish habit of ablution, why might not this have operated in the way suggested two hundred years before Christ as well as two hundred years after Christ.? In fine, this hypothesis still leaves unremoved the master difficulty of that side of the question which it is designed to support, viz. the great improbability of the Jews adopting for



the first time subsequently to the death of Christ a religious rite which was well known to be the initiatory rite of Christianity. Assuming that they practiced that rite before, we can account for their not giving it up simply because the Christians had adopted it; but, trace it as we please to Jewish customs and rites, it seems utterly incredible that *after* it had become the symbol and badge of the religious party which of all others, perhaps, the Jews most bitterly hated, any consideration whatever should have induced them to *begin* to practice it. On the other hand we have, in favor of the hypothesis that proselyte baptism was practiced anterior to the time of our Lord, some strongly corroborative evidence.

1. We have, in the first place, the unanimous tradition of the Jewish rabbins, who impute to the practice an antiquity commensurate almost with that of their nation.
2. We have the fact that the baptism of John the Baptist was not regarded by the people as aught of a novelty, nor was represented by him as resting for its authority upon any special divine revelation.
3. We have the fact that the Pharisees looked upon the baptism both of John and Jesus as a mode of proselytizing men to their religious views (~~400~~ John 4:1-3). and that the dispute between the Jews and some of John's disciples about purifying was apparently a dispute as to the competing claims of John and Jesus to make proselytes (3, 25 sq.).
4. We have the fact that on the day of Pentecost Peter addressed to a multitude of persons collected from several different and distant countries, Jews and proselytes, an exhortation to "repent and be baptized" (~~403~~ Acts 2:38), from which it may be fairly inferred that they all knew what baptism meant, and also its connection with repentance or a change of religious views.
5. We have the fact that, according to Josephus, the Essenes were accustomed, before admitting a new convert into their society, solemnly and ritually to purify him with waters of cleansing (War, 2, 8, 7), a statement which cannot be understood of their ordinary ablutions before meals (as Stuart proposes in his *Essay on the Mode of Baptism*, p. 67); for Josephus expressly adds that even after this lustration two years had to elapse before the neophyte enjoyed the privilege of living with the proficient.
6. We have the mode in which Josephus speaks of the baptism of John, when, after referring to John's having exhorted the people to

virtue, righteousness, and godliness, as preparatory to baptism, he adds, “For it appeared to him that baptism was admissible not when they used it for obtaining forgiveness of some sins, but for the purification of the body when the soul had been already cleansed by righteousness” (*Ant.* 18:5, 2); which seems to indicate the conviction of the historian that John did not *introduce* this rite, but only gave to it a peculiar meaning. Yet John’s proceeding was not an act of initiation into any new system of faith, much less comparable to a conversion from paganism; for the subjects were Jews already. It was rather a general ablution, in token of wiping off a long-accumulated score of offences. *SEE JOHN THE BAPTIST.*

(4.) The history of the New Test. itself suggests the existence of such a custom. A sign is seldom chosen unless it already has a meaning for those to whom it is addressed. The fitness of the sign in this case would be in proportion to the associations already connected with it. It would bear witness on the assumption of the previous existence of the proselyte-baptism that the change from the then condition of Judaism to the kingdom of God was as great as that from idolatry to Judaism. The question of the priests and Levites, “Why baptizest thou then?” (~~John~~ John 1:25), implies that they wondered, not at the thing itself, but at its being done for Israelites by one who disclaimed the names which, in their eyes, would have justified the introduction of a new order. In like manner the words of Christ to Nicodemus (3, 10) imply the existence of a teaching as to baptism like that above referred to. He, “the teacher of Israel,” had been familiar with “these things” — the new birth, the gift of the Spirit — as words and phrases applied to heathen proselytes. He failed to grasp the deeper truth which lay beneath them, and to see that they had a wider, a universal application. *SEE REGENERATION BY WATER.*

(5.) That the Jews directly borrowed this custom from the Christians is an opinion which, though supported by De Wette (in his *De Morte Christi expiatoria*), cannot be for a moment admitted by any who reflect on the implacable hatred with which the Jews for many centuries regarded Christianity, its ordinances, and its professors. It is, however, not improbable that there may have been a reflex action in this matter from the Christian upon the Jewish Church. The rabbins saw the new society, in proportion as the Gentile element in it became predominant, throwing off circumcision, relying on baptism only. They could not ignore the reverence which men had for the outward sign, their belief that it was all but identical with the thing signified. There was everything to lead them to give a fresh

prominence to what had been before subordinate. If the Nazarenes attracted men by their baptism, they would show that they had baptism as well as circumcision. The necessary absence of the corban after the destruction of the Temple would also tend to give more importance to the remaining rite. The reader will find the whole subject amply discussed in the following works: Selden, *De Jure Nat. et Gent.* 2, 2; Otho, *Lex. Rabb.* p. 65; Lightfoot, *Hor. Heb. et Talm. in Matt.* 3:6; Danz in Meuschenii *Nov. Test. ex Talm. Illust.* p. 233 sq., 287 sq.; Witsius, (*scon. Fed.* 4:15; Kuinll, *Comin. in Libros N.T. Histor.* ap. <sup><OR6</sup>Matthew 3:6; and Dr. Halley's recent volume on the *Sacraments* (Lond. 1844), p. 114 sq., all of whom contend for the antiquity of Jewish proselyte-baptism, while the following take the opposite side: Wernsdorff, *Controv. de Bapt. Recent.* § 18; Carpzov, *Apparat.* p. 47 sq.; Paulus, *Comment.* i, 279; Bauer, *Gottesdienstl. Velfitssung der Alien Heb.* ii, 392; Schneckenburger, *Lib. sub. cit.*; and Moses Stuart, in the *American Bib. Rep.* No. 10. See also *Bible Educator*, ii, 38 sq. **SEE BAPTISM.**

4. Two facts of some interest remain to be noticed in this connection.

(1.) It formed part of the rabbinic hopes of the kingdom of the Messiah that then there should be no more proselytes. The distinctive name, with its brand of inferiority, should be laid aside, and all, even the Nethinim and the Mamzerim (children of mixed marriages), should be counted pure (Schottgen, *Hor. Heb.* ii, 614).

(2.) Partly, perhaps, as connected with this feeling, partly in consequence of the ill-repute into which the word had fallen, there is, throughout the New Test., a sedulous avoidance of it. The Christian convert from heathenism is not a proselyte, but a **νεόφυτος** (<sup><OR6</sup>1 Timothy 3:6).

**III. Literature.** — In addition to the works cited above, see, in general, Buxtorf, *Lex. Talmn. et Rabb.* s.v. **rg**; Otho, *Lex. Rabb.* p. 65; Bodenschatz, *Kirchl. Verfaiss. der Juden*, 4:70 sq.; Schrider, *Satzungen untd Gebrauche des talm.-reabb. Judenth.*; the archeologies of Jahn (3, 215 sq.), De Wette (p. 348 sq.), Keil (i, 316 sq.), Carpzov, Lewis, and Bauer; Saalschiitz, *Mosaisches Recht*, ii, 690 sq., 704 sq., 730 sq.; Leusden, *Phil. Hebr. Misc.* p. 142 sq.; the monographs by Slevogt, Alting, and Muller, in Ugolini *Thesaur.*; those cited by Danz, *Worterb.* p. 797 sq.; append. p. 88; by Winer, *Renalworterb.* s.v.; by Filrst, *Biblioth. Jud.* i, 146; 3, 345, 392, 459, 471, 488, 555; and by Volbeding, *Index Programmatum*,

p. 22; and those written by Zorn (Lips. 1703) and Wihner (Gitting. 1743); also Lubkert in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1835, p. 681 sq.; and Schneckenburger. *Jiid. Proselyten-Taufe* (Berl. 1828).

### Proselytes.

This word is employed in modern language to designate such individuals as have abandoned their faith and embraced another, and who, in general, devote all their energy to the expansion of their new creed. The endeavor to gain others to one's own convictions, either by licit or illicit means, is called *proselytism*. Biblical representatives of this unfair system are the Pharisees, to whom Christ said, "Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye compass sea and land to make one proselyte; and when he is made, ye make him twofold more the child of hell than yourselves." Every religion that believes in itself must feel impelled to propagate its creed; the followers of a doctrine to whom it is indifferent whether the number of those who share it with them increases or decreases have no true faith. The Christians are especially active in winning converts to their religion, but this spirit is due entirely not to a selfish desire to enlarge their borders and increase their numbers, but to give to all the world the great truths to establish which Christ came into the world in the form of man and suffered death upon the cross. It is, moreover, because of the direct command given by the Saviour of mankind that Christians feel impelled to make converts of all non-believers. *SEE CHRISTIANITY; SEE MISSIONS.* A very different thing it is, however, for anybody, or for bodies of men, to *force* conversion upon their fellows. The Jews were the chosen people of God. They had a right to consider themselves the armor-bearers of divine truth, and if they felt impelled to carry "the law and the prophets" to the strangers ([μυρῶν](#)), it was only a reasonable consequence of the divine revelation which they had enjoyed. But it was by the fair means employed that they could best indicate the moral sublimity of divine teachings over philosophic schemes and heathenish systems of religion. When, therefore, the Jews, after the establishment of Maccaboean rule, compelled, under Hyrcanus, the Idumeans, and, under Aristobulus, the Iturians, to embrace the Jewish faith and to subject themselves to circumcision, there was an adoption of measures for which the Old-Test. dispensation furnished no warrant; and though it may be conceded that their object was probably to advance the interests of true religion, they yet, by the adoption of unauthorized measures, evinced an unrighteous zeal which must have been

underlaid by a selfish purpose. Thus the Roman Catholics have constantly striven for the propagation of the Christian faith by measures wholly unwarranted and not in uniformity with the lofty state of its ethics.

The Jesuit Sambuga says, in defence of the Jesuitic proselytism: “The mania of proselytism in priests is no mania, but a holy zeal.” The prince-cardinal von Hohenlohe approves of this defence in his *Lichtblicke und E’rlebnisse aus der Welt und desm Priester-leben* (Ratisbon, 1836, 8vo), p. 39. But this defence is, after all, a simple Jesuitic sophism. The mania of proselytism *is* a mania, and because priests are subject to it, it does not become therefore a *holy zeal*; or else we must admit that anything done by avaricious and ambitious priests of all persuasions (Christians and pagans) was holy, or was the result of a holy zeal, and therefore not blameworthy, but, on the contrary, praiseworthy and commendable. When proselytes are gained in such a wily or violent manner as that resorted to by Jesuits; when the means employed are money and promotions on one side, threats and persecutions on the other, we perceive in it the evidence of a most, unholy zeal, against which the founder of Christianity pronounced his anathema in his condemnation of the priests of his time, the doctors of the law, and Pharisees. For this very reason Christ called them “children of hell.” **SEE ROMANISM**. It is a curious fact worth remembering that one of the main features of the times of the Messiah was to be, according to Jewish tradition, the utter abolition of proselytism, and the entire ceasing of all distinctions of an opprobrious nature among men. The evil repute into which the term *proselyte* had fallen in the times of Christ also caused the early converts to Christianity to adopt the name of Neophytes (*newly planted*) instead. **SEE NEOPHYTE**. (J. H. W.)

## Proseucha

(προσευχή), a word signifying “*prayer*,” and always so translated in the A.V. It is, however, applied, *per meton.*, to a place of prayer—a place where assemblies for prayer were held, whether a building or not. In this sense some hold it to be mentioned in ~~1~~ Luke 6:12, where it is said that our Savior went up into a mountain to pray *and* continued all night *in the proseucha of God* (ἐν τῇ προσευχῇ τοῦ θεοῦ), which can very well bear the sense our translators have put upon it — “in prayer to God.” Yet Whitby and others infer, from the use of parallel phrases, such as “the mount of God,” “the bread of (God),” “the altar of God,” “the lamp of God,” etc., which were all things consecrated or appropriated to the

service of God, that this phrase might here signify “an oratory of God,” or a place that was devoted to his service, especially for prayer. In this sense the word must certainly be understood in ~~ἡ~~ Acts 16:13, where we are informed that Paul and his companions, on the Sabbath day, went out of the city, by the river side, **οὐ ἐνομίζετο προσευχὴ εἶναι**, which the A.V. renders “where prayer was wont to be made.” But the Syriac here has, “because there was perceived to be *a house of prayer*;” and the Arabic, “a certain place which was supposed to be *a place of prayer*.” In both these versions due stress is laid upon **οὐ ἐνομίζετο**, where there was taken, or supposed to be — or where, according to received custom, there was, or where there was allowed by law — a *proseucha*, oratory, or chapel; and where, therefore, they expected to meet an assembly of people. Bos contends (*Lxercit. Ithiol.* ad loc.), however, that the word **ἐνομίζετο** is redundant, and that the passage ought simply to be, “where there was a *proseucha*;” but in this he is ably opposed by Elsner (*Observ. Sacr.* ad loc.). **SEE PHILIPPI.**

That there really were such places of devotion among the Jews is unquestionable. They were mostly outside those towns in which there were no synagogues, because the laws or their administrators would not admit any. This was, perhaps, particularly the case in Roman cities and colonies (and Philippi, where this circumstance occurred, was a colony); for Juvenal (*Sat.* 3, 296) speaks of *proseuchae*. not synagogues. at Rome. They appear to have been usually situated near a river or the seashore, for the convenience of ablution (Josephus, *Ant.* 14:10, 23). Josephus repeatedly mentions *proseuchoe* in his *Life*, and speaks of the people being gathered into the *proseucha* (44, 46). Sometimes the *proseucha* was a large building, as that at Tiberias (*l.c.* 54), so that the name was sometimes applied even to synagogues (Vitringa, *Synmag. Ver.* p. 119). *Proseuchae* are frequently mentioned as buildings by Philo, particularly in his oration against Flaccus, where he complains that the *proseuchae* of the Jews were pulled down, and that no place was left them in which to worship God and pray for Caesar (Philo, *ie Flacc. in Op.* p. 752). But, for the most part, the *proseuchae* appear to have been places in the open air, in a grove, or in shrubberies, or even under a tree, although always, as we may presume, near water, for the convenience of those ablutions which with the Jews always preceded prayer, as, indeed, they did among the pagans, and as they do among the Moslems at the present day. The usages of the latter exhibit something answering to the Jewish *proseuchae* in the shape of small oratories, with a

niche indicating the direction of Mecca, which is often seen in Moslem countries by the side of a spring, a reservoir, or a large water-jar, which is daily replenished for the use of travellers (Whitby, De Dieu, Wetstein, Kuinil, on <sup><44G3></sup>Acts 16:13; Jennings, *Jewish Antiquities*, p. 379382; Prideaux, *Connection*, ii, 556). — Kitto.

“Questions have been raised,” says the late Dr. M’Farlan, of Renfrew, “as to the origin of these, and their being or not being the same with the synagogue. Philo and Josephus certainly speak of them and the synagogues as if they were substantially one. The former expressly declares that they were places of instruction. ‘The places dedicated to devotion,’ says he, ‘and which are commonly called proseuchae, what are they but schools in which prudence, fortitude, temperance, righteousness, piety, holiness. and every virtue are talight everything necessary for the discharge of duty, whether human or divine?’ As the writer’s observations were chiefly confined to the Jews of Alexandria and other parts of Egypt, this description will chiefly apply to these. But there is no doubt, on the other hand. that where synagogues existed, and especially in Judea, they did to some extent differ. We are therefore very much disposed to concur in the opinion that the oratory was substantially and in effect a synagogue. But the latter was the more perfect form, and required, for its erection and support, special means. There was in every synagogue a local court, deriving its authority, at least in Judea, from the Sanhedrim; and there were office-bearers to be maintained; whereas in the oratory there does not seem to have been any very fixed or necessary form of procedure. These might, for aught that appears, have been all or substantially all which belonged to the synagogue, or it might be little more than what we would call a prayermeeting. Hence, perhaps, the reason of the prevalence of the one — the synagogue — in Judaea, and of the other in Egypt and other countries not subject to Jewish laws.”

It is highly probable that *proseuchce* existed long before synagogues. “It is remarkable,” continues Dr. M’Farlan, “that the only places where Daniel is said to have been favored with visions, during the day, were by the sides of rivers (<sup><270D></sup>Daniel 8:2, 16; also 10:4; 12:5, 7; and 9:21), the very places where oratories were wont to be. Ezekiel also received his commission by one of the rivers of Babylon, and when ‘among the captives’ of Israel (<sup><200D></sup>Ezekiel 1:1). And he afterwards mentions his having received visions in the same circumstances (<sup><24B5></sup>Ezekiel 3:15, 16). And Ezra, also, when leading back Israel to the land of their fathers, proclaimed and observed a

fast with them by the way; and, as if to keep up the same tender associations, he assembled them by the river Ahaya, where they remained three days (<sup>4885</sup>Ezra 8:15, 32). But the very finest illustration which occurs is that contained in the 137th Psalm — ‘By the rivers of Babylon, there we sat down; yea, we wept, when we remembered Zion. We hanged our harps upon the willows in the midst thereof. For there they that carried us away captive required of us a song; and they that wasted us required of us mirth, saying, Sing us one of the songs of Zion’ (1-3). The people of Israel were accustomed, in after-times, to make choice of the banks of rivers for their oratories, and this point of agreement is one of the grounds on which we are proceeding. But it will hold equally good, whether the Israelitish captives followed, in this, the example of their fathers, or whether, as is more probable, their circumstances in Babylon led to this choice. It is not unlikely that this led to a similar choice in aftertimes, and particularly in foreign countries. The poor captives of Babylon had perhaps no other covering or even enclosure than the willows of the brook; and thus may they have been driven, when seeking to worship the God of their fathers, into the woody margins of Babylon’s many rivers. Meeting in such places, as they had been accustomed to do in the oratories of their native land, it is not wonderful that many tender associations should be renewed.”

After the return of the Jews from the Babylonian captivity, synagogue worship was much enlarged and improved, while oratories gradually diminished in number and importance. Hence, in later times, oratories were chiefly found in countries beyond the land of Israel. Under the Roman government synagogues were discountenanced, but oratories, or places of meeting for devotional exercises, were generally permitted all over the empire. Dr. Lardner thinks that the synagogue mentioned in <sup>4460</sup>Acts 6:9 was really an oratory; and Josephus speaks of a very large one in the city of Tiberias. But it was chiefly in foreign parts that *proseuchoe* in later times were found. Josephus, in detailing the decree passed in favor of the Jews at ‘Halicarnassus, says, “We have decreed that as many men and women of the Jews as are willing so to do may celebrate their Sabbaths and perform their holy offices according to the Jewish laws; and may make *their proseuchoe* at the sea-side, according to the custom of their forefathers.” See Riddle, *Christian Antiquities* (see Index): Stillingfleet, *Works*, vol. i; and the monographs cited by Volbeding. *Index Programmatum*, p. 76. **SEE CHAPEL; SEE ORATORY.**



## Prosper

ST., surnamed *Aquitanus* or *Aquitanius*, from the country of his nativity, was a distinguished theologian of Gaul, and flourished in the first half of the 5th century. He settled as a young man in Provence, and there became the intimate companion of a certain Hilary, who on this account is called Hilarius Prosperianus. The two friends studied and wrote together in defence of orthodox Christianity in general, and of Augustinianism in particular. Yet, although a staunch defender of the doctrines and person of St. Augustine, he was no priest, still less a bishop. as has been frequently asserted since the 7th century, but a married layman, pious and well versed in divine lore, who had been impelled by the miseries of his time to devote himself to an austere way of life (see Sirmondi, not. ad 8, ep. 15; Sidon. Apol. and Bolland. ad 25 Jun. in comment. præv. § 1, ad vit. s. Prosperi episc. in AEmilia). Constant readers and zealous disciples of St. Augustine, especially in the doctrine of grace, Prosper and Hilary displayed great zeal in defending his doctrines against the attacks of the Semi-Pelagians, *SEE PELAGIANISM*; but finding that they were making very little headway against the heretics, who had largely weakened orthodoxy in Southern Gaul, Prosper wrote, about 427 or 428, a letter entitled *Epistola ad Augustinum de Reliquiis Pelagianæ Hæreseos in Gallia* (considered of importance in affording material for the history of Semi-Pelagianism), in which he informed the illustrious bishop of Hippo that a number of priests and monks at Marseilles asserted, contrary to the Augustinian theory, that man must himself take the first step towards his justification and salvation (ep. 225 and 226 inter *Ep. Aug.*). Thus Prosper not only himself acted as defender of the catholic doctrine against the Semi-Pelagians, but gave occasion to St. Augustine to write his two works on the predestination of the saints and on the gift of constancy (*De Predestinatione Sanctorum*, and *De Dono Perseverantice*). But not all those whom Prosper names as adversaries of St. Augustine were, like Cassian, Semi-Pelagians. The heresies of this Cassian Prosper exposed in a work which he subsequently (about A.D. 430) composed: *De Gratia Dei et Libero Arbitrio contra Collaforem*. Prosper, still before St. Augustine's death, wrote several works against the Pelagians, and especially the Semi-Pelagians. To these works of controversy belong his poem *De Ingratis*, so highly admired by the Jansenists, and a letter to a certain Rufinus. After the death of St. Augustine, his master and friend, Prosper resumed with increased ardor his struggle against the Semi-Pelagians and the defence of Augustine. For this

purpose he wrote *Responsiones ad capitula calumniantium* (i.e. *Augustinum Gallorum*; *Responsiones ad capitula objectionum Tinentianarum*, and *Pro Augustino Responsiones ad Ercerpta quae de Genuensi Civitate sunt missa*. In 431 Prosper, with his friend Hilary, made a journey to Rome, where they saw pope Celestine I, and complained that several priests at Marseilles taught erroneous doctrines without being rebuked by the Gallican bishops, whereupon the pontiff addressed his well-known letter of censure to those dignitaries (*Epistola ad Episcopos Gallorum*), praising highly the doctrine of St. Augustine, and denouncing the heresy of Cassian, as well as those who should either favor it by adoption or by suffering its propagation. Armed with this authority, Prosper and Hilary returned home, and from the numerous controversial tracts which they issued about this time, it appears that they must have been constantly watchful and active in defence of orthodoxy. Nothing very definite is known of Prosper after his return from Rome with Hilary, except that we encounter controversial tracts of which he was the author. Among these are *De Gratia Dei et Libero Arbitrio Liber*. in reply to the doctrines of Cassian respecting free-will, as laid down in the thirteenth of his *Collationes Patrum*, whence the piece is frequently entitled *De Gratia Dei adversus Collatorem*, written about A.D. 432: — *Psalmorum a Cusque ad CL Expositio*, assigned by the Benedictine editors to A.D. 433, but placed by Schloinemann and others before A.D. 424: — *Sententia unum ex Operibus S. Augustini deditur Liber unus*, compiled about A.D. 451. He is commemorated by the Church of Rome on June 25. The whole of the above will be found in the Benedictine edition of the works of Augustine; the epistle is numbered 225, and is placed immediately before another upon the same subject by Hilary; the remaining tracts are all included in the appendix to vol. 10. If we believe Gelnnadius (*De Vir. Illust.* c. 84), Prosper was, after 440, called to Rome by pope Leo I, and became the secretary of that pontiff. We have no positive knowledge of the year of his death: it falls between 455 and 463. There are other writings of Prosper, among which we mention 106 small poems (*epigrammata*), in which an equal number of moral and other passages of St. Augustine are poetically developed; a universal history, which teaches to the year 455, and of which we find the best and most complete reproduction and explanation in *lect. Antiq. Basnag. Cunis.* vol. i, etc. 'The treatise *De vocatione Gentilium* belongs probably to those *Maiks* which have been erroneously attributed to Prosper: it gives a milder color to the hard assertions of Augustine and Prosper. For a list and description of the

character of these spurious writings, see Smith, *Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog. and Mythol.* s.v. The best edition of Prosper's works is the Benedictine by Lebrun de Murette and Manugeamnt (Par. 1711, fol.). For a record of the time when Prosper's different monographs first appeared in print, see also Smith's *Dictionary*. Full information with regard to the interminable controversies arising out of the works of Prosper is contained in the notes and dissertations of the Benedictines, in the dissertations of Quesnel and the Ballerini in their respective editions of the works of Leo the Great, and in a rare volume, *De Viris Operibus SS. Patrum Leonis Magni et Prosperi Aquitani Dissertationes criticae*, etc. (Par. 1689, 4to), by Josephus Antelmus, to which Quesnel put forth a reply in the *hphemeriides Parisienses*, vol. 8 and 15 (August, 1639), and Antelmus a reply in two *Epistoloe Duabus Epistolce P. Quesnelli Partibus Responsorim* (Par. 1690, 4to). See Tillemont, *Melnm.* vol. 16; Oudin, *De Script. Eccl.*; Schrockh, *Kirchengesch.* vol. 15-18; Fleury, *Hist. Eccl.*; Dollinger, *Lehr buch der Kirchengeschichte*; Hagenbach, *Hist. of Doctrines* (see Index); Neander, *Ch. Hist.* ii, 630 sq.; *Hist. of Dogmas*, ii, 375 sq.; Gieseler, *Ch. Hist.* i, 226 sq.; Schaff, *Ch. Hist.* 3, 859 sq.; Baihr, *Die christl.-romische Theol.* p. 366 sq.; Wiggers, *Aug. et Pelag.* ii, 136 sq. (J. H. W.)

## Prosperity

the state wherein things succeed according to our wishes, and are productive of affluence and ease. However desirable prosperity be, it has its manifest disadvantages. It too often alienates the soul from God, excites pride, exposes to temptation, hardens the heart. occasions idleness, promotes effeminacy, laments zeal and energy, and in general has a baneful relative influence. It is no wonder, therefore, that the Almighty in general withholds it from his children, and that adversity should be their lot rather than prosperity. Indeed, adversity seems more beneficial on the whole, although it be so unpleasant to our feelings. "The advantages of prosperity," says Bacon, "are to be wished, but the advantages of adversity are to be admired. The principal virtue of prosperity is temperance; the principal virtue of adversity is fortitude, which in morality is allowed to be the most heroic virtue. Prosperity best discovers vice; adversity best discovers virtue, which is like those perfumes which are most fragrant when burned or bruised." It is not, however, to be understood that prosperity in itself is unlawful. The world, with all its various productions, was formed by the Almighty, for the happiness of

man, and designed to endear him to us, and to lead our minds up to him. What, however, God often gives us as a blessing, by our own folly we pervert and turn into a curse. Where prosperity is given, there religion is absolutely necessary to enable us to act under it as we ought. Where this divine principle influences the mind, prosperity may be enjoyed and become a blessing; for “while bad men snatch the pleasures of the world as by stealth, without countenance from God, the proprietor of the world, the righteous sit openly down to the feast of life, under the smile of heaven. No guilty fears damp their joys. The blessing of God rests upon all they possess. Their piety reflects sunshine from heaven upon the prosperity of the world; unites in one point of view the smiling aspect both of the powers above and of the objects below. Not only have they as full a relish as others of the innocent pleasures of life, but, moreover, in them they hold communion with God. In all that is good or fair they trace his hand. From the beauties of nature, from the improvements of art, from the enjoyments of social life, they raise their affections to the source of all the happiness which surrounds them, and thus identify the sphere of their pleasures by adding intellectual and spiritual to earthly joys.”

*Spiritual prosperity* consists in the continual progress of the mind in knowledge, purity, and joy. It arises from the participation of the divine blessing; and evidences itself by frequency in prayer, love to God’s Word, delight in his people, attendance on his ordinances, zeal in his cause, submission to his will, usefulness in his Church, and increasing abhorrence of everything that is derogatory to his glory (<sup>GRK</sup>3 John 2). See Blair, *Sermons*, vol. i, ser. 3; Bates, *Works*, i. 297.

## Prosphora

(Gr. **προσφορά**, i.e. *on oblation*), one of the words by which some of the early ecclesiastical writers designate the Lord’s Supper. The literal meaning of the word is a sacrificial offering, and especially the matter for a sacrifice: it has this signification in the Epistle to the Hebrews. In Christian antiquity it is used principally for the elements or “species” in the Lord’s Supper. Later Greek writers use the word **ἀναφορά** as synonymous with **προσφορά**, and rather in a moral and spiritual than in a physical sense, and with allusion to the exhortation, “Lift up your hearts.” The Latin word *offertorium*, which means a gift brought as an offering, was formerly applied to the consecrated bread. The words **ἀναφορά** and **προσφορά** were introduced by Justin Martyr, and brought into common use by

Irenaeus. Irenaeus contends that the Eucharist should be regarded as a sacrifice; he did, however, distinguish it from the Mosaic sacrifices, and speaks of a symbolical presence of Christ in the elements. See Coleman, *Primitive Christianity*. p. 414; Riddle, *Christian Antiquities*, p. 546.

### Prosser, Lorenzo D.,

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was a native of New York State, and was born in 1805. He was early converted, and joined the Church as a mere youth. In 1827 he was received into the Pittsburgh Conference, and successively appointed to the following circuits, namely: Butler, Grand River, Mercer, Hartford, Twinsburg, Windsor, and Columbiana. In 1836, when the Erie Conference was formed, he fell into its bounds, and received from it his appointment to the following fields of labor, namely: Ellsworth, Cleveland, Harmonsburg. M'Kean, Wesleyville, Chardon, Chagrin Falls, Wesleyville, Edinborough Mission, M'Kean, Albion, and Springfield. This last appointment he held in 1862. The next year he became superannuated, and continued in that relation until his death, April 13, 1869. He was of a nervous temperament, and his burning zeal led him often to exert himself beyond his strength. His preaching was with power, and at times his exhortations were overwhelming. See *Minutes of Annual Conferences*, 1869.

### Prostitute

(a) female, in Hebrew **hn/z hrz**; **hYrkj**; **hvdæ** (on the last see Gesen. *Thes.* 3, 1197);

(b) male, in Hebrew **vdeq**; While all sexual intercourse between others than married persons was forbidden by the Mosaic law, especial prohibition was laid upon Israelitish women from hiring themselves as prostitutes (<sup>(-R219)</sup>Leviticus 19:29; comp. 21:9); and, with special reference to the Phoenicians, they were forbidden to abandon themselves to the use of men (<sup>(-R217)</sup>Deuteronomy 23:17). The "hire of a whore" (**hn/z nit a**; comp. also <sup>(-R163)</sup>Ezekiel 16:33, and Rosenmuller, *ad loc.*) must not be accepted by the priests as the subject of a vow, or a gift of devotion in the Temple (<sup>(-R218)</sup>Deuteronomy 23:18); this hire, consisting in a piece of money or a kid (<sup>(-R317)</sup>Genesis 38:17), if presented at the Temple for a sacrifice, and received as among other ancient nations, would have seemed to allow prostitution (comp. Mishna, *Terumoth*, 6:2; Movers, *Phonic.* i, 680). In Paphos, a kid

was offered to the goddess of love (Tacitus, *Hist.* ii, 3). The Hetaerae used to bring to Aphrodite Pandemos the sacrifice of a goat (Lucian, *Dial. Meret.* 7:1). The trade of prostitution was sometimes very profitable among the ancients (Herod. i, 93). In spite of all prohibitions, there were always public prostitutes among the Hebrews who, probably, as among the Arabs and Persians, practiced dancing and music (Baruch 6:8, 43; Wisd. 9:4; <sup><1086></sup>1 Kings 3:16; <sup><1085></sup>Proverbs 6:26 sq.; 7:10 sq., 23, 27; Amos ii, 7; 7:17; Hosea i, 2), and may have been in part foreigners (Movers, *Phonic.* i, 53), as Phoenicians and Syrians (Judg. 16:1). Syrian harlots travelled in the time of the Roman empire. and were called *Ambubajoe* (Suteton. Nero, 27; Horace, *Sat.* i, 2, 1), because they were sometimes skilled in playing on the harp (see Heindorf, on *Horace*, *l.c.*; comp. Apuleieus, *letam.* 8:p. 182, ed. Bip.). But the Hebrew name <sup><1084></sup>*byrd*; perhaps means, not a stranger, but *the strange women*, like <sup><1083></sup>*hrz*; hence, *adulteress*.

The harlots walked in public, adorned and veiled (<sup><1084></sup>Genesis 38:14; Petron. *Satyr.* 16; but see Pococke, *East*, 1, 76), or seated themselves by the wayside, and, with seductive gestures, strove to lead aside travellers (<sup><1084></sup>Genesis 38:14; Baruch 6:43; comp. Doughtnei *Analect.* i, p. 42 sq.). We may well suppose that the harlots could be in some way recognised in dress, gait, etc.. even when they put on a show of modest behavior (comp. Hartmann, *Hebr.* ii, 495 sq.). It is not probable that the *veiling* ever distinguished the harlots from chaste women. **SEE VEIL.** (Comp. Buckingham, *Mesop.* p. 55.) In the brothels the girls bore peculiar names which had become by some chance attached to them (Senec. *Controv.* i, 2, p. 84, ed. Bip.). Some would interpret in allusion to this the words in <sup><1084></sup>Revelation 17:5, but see Ewald, *ad loc.* At the time of the division of the Hebrew kingdom, whoredom was practiced, especially among the ten tribes, under the Syrian influences then pouring in (comp. <sup><1081></sup>Numbers 25:1 sq.), often even in service of the gods, especially of Astarte (<sup><1084></sup>Hosea 4:14; <sup><1142></sup>1 Kings 14:24; 15:12; 22:47; <sup><1237></sup>2 Kings 23:7; comp. Baruch 6:43; Herod. 1, 199; Justin, 18:5; Strabo, 8:378; 12:559; Val. Max. ii, 6, 15; Augustine, *Civ. Dei.* 4:10; Heyne, in *Commentat. Soc. Goetting.* 16, and see Gesen. on *Isaiah* 2, 339 sq.). The law did not establish municipal and police penalties against notorious harlots, and the toleration of those from abroad (which certainly was not the design of the law-giver, though it is easily explicable among an Oriental people when polygamy was allowed) seems to have been unconditional (see Porter, *Greek Antiquities*, i, 354; Wachsmulth, *Hellen. Alterth.* II, ii, 48). The existence of companies of

prostitutes in the sacred groves and high-places of the ancient Jews may serve to account for the rendering which the Sept. gives to the expression “high-places” in <sup><4163></sup>Ezekiel 16:39, by a term which in Greek denotes a place of indecent resort. The *Sukkoth benoth*, literally “tabernacles of daughters,” which the men of Babylon are mentioned in <sup><4273></sup>2 Kings 17:30 as having made, are probably places of the same kind, being haunts of wickedness. According to Josephus (*Ant.* 4:8, 23), all intercourse with a prostitute was illegal, which is natural, since even the sons of public harlots could never attain citizen’s rights among the Jews (<sup><4633></sup>Deuteronomy 23:2), and had no claim to share in their father’s inheritance (comp. <sup><4710></sup>Judges 11:1).

Among the Greeks and Romans, at the time of the appearance of Christianity, prostitution had become a great public evil. The cause of this lay by no means alone in the excessive worship of certain divinities (Wisdom of Solomon 14:26 sq.), but in the frivolity of the times and the general decay of morals. In Rome harlots were legally tolerated (Zimmerm. *Rom. Rechtsalterth.* I, ii, 489 comp. Schuttgen, *Hor. Hebr.* i, 468 sq.). The laxer the principles of men in general were on this subject in its various forms, and the more boldly they avowed it (comp. Terence, *Adelph.* i, 2, 21 sq.; *Eunuch.* 3, 5, 35 sq.), the more vigorously were the apostles compelled to oppose unchastity where it had entered the Christian Church (<sup><4481></sup>1 Corinthians 5:1 sq.; <sup><4722></sup>2 Corinthians 12:21; <sup><4943></sup>1 Thessalonians 4:3; <sup><5010></sup>1 Timothy 1:10). The apostolic decree in <sup><4453></sup>Acts 15:20, 29 (comp. 21:25), which has often been denounced as not genuine (Deyling, *Observ.* ii, 469 sq.; Kuinol, *Comment.* p. 521 sq.), was sufficiently called for by the character of the times (comp. Tholuck, in Neander’s *Denkwürd.* i, 143 sq.). The practice of prostitution was then prevalent, too, among the Jews, especially the higher classes (<sup><4622></sup>Romans 2:22; <sup><4807></sup>John 8:7; see in general Michaelis, *Iuos. Recht*, v, 281 sq.). Among the Romans, the abominable practice of combining immorality with the worship of the gods appears to have continued down to the days of Constantine, as is evident from a passage in his life, written by Eusebius, where he mentions it in connection with the temple of Venus at Apeca on Mount Libanus. Sacred prostitution forms a part in the religious rites of heathen nations both in ancient and modern times. Among the Phoenician Babylonians, and other Eastern nations, it was the custom to erect adjoining the temples of their gods residences for courtesans, who were supposed to be pleasing to the deities. Strabo says that no fewer than 1000 of these abandoned females

were attached to the temple of Aphrodite in Corinth, and were considered as an indispensable part of the retinue of the goddess. Among the Hindus we have the Linga worship (q.v.). *SEE ADULTERY; SEE FORNICATION; SEE HARLOT; SEE SODOMITE.*

## Prostration

*SEE ATTITUDE.*

## Prostration In Prayer.

*SEE POSTURE.*

## Protagoras

(*Πρωταγόρας*), the first of that class of Greek philosophers who took the name of *Sophists* (q.v.), flourished near the opening of the 5th century B.C. He was a native of Abdera, according to the concurrent testimony of Plato and several other writers (*Protag.* p. 309, c; *De Rtep.* 10:p. 606, c; Heraclides Pont. *ap.* Diog. Laert. 9:55; Cicero, *De Nat. Deor.* i, 23, etc.). There seems to be no ground for the story that he was in early life employed in manual labor, nor for the supposition that he was a disciple of Democritus, with whom in point of doctrine he had absolutely nothing in common. Protagoras must have been older than Democritus, as it is certain that Protagoras was older than Socrates, who was born B.C. 468 (Plato, *Protag.* p. 317, c; 314, b; 361, e; comp. Diog. Laert. 9:42, 56), and died before him at the age of nearly seventy (Plato, *Meno*, p. 91, e; comp. *Thecet.* p. 171, d; 164, e; *Euthyd.* p. 286, c), after he had practiced the sophistic art for forty years in various Greek cities, especially at Athens. Frei places the death of Protagoras in B.C. 411, assuming that Pythodorus accused him of teaching atheism during the government of the Four Hundred (*Quest. Protag.* p. 64), and accordingly assigns about B.C. 480 as the date of his birth.

That Protagoras had already acquired fame during his residence in Abdera cannot be inferred from the doubtful statement that he was termed by the Abderites *λόγος*, and by Democritus *φιλοσοφία* or *σοφία* (\_Elian. *etsr.* *Hist.* 4:20; comp. Suid. s. vv. *Πρωταγ. Δημόκρ.*, etc. Phavorinus, in Diog. Laert. 9:50, gives to Protagoras the designation of *σοφία*). He was the first who called himself a sophist and taught for pay (Plato, *Protag.* p. 349. a; Diog. Laert. 9:52). He must have come to Athens before B.C. 445,



since, according to the statement of Heraclides Ponticus (Diog. Laert. 9:50), he gave laws to the Thurians, or, what is more probable, adapted for the use of the new colonists, who left Athens for the first time in that year, the laws which had been drawn up at an earlier period by Charondas for the use of the Chalcidic colonies (for, according to Diod. 12:11, 3 and others, these laws were in force at Thurii likewise). Whether he himself removed to Thurii, we do not learn, but at the time of the plague we find him again in Athens, as he could scarcely have mentioned the strength of mind displayed by Pericles at the death of his sons in the way he does (in a fragment still extant, Plutarch, *De Consol. ad Apoll.c.* 33. p. 118, d) had he not been an eye-witness. He had also, as it appears, returned to Athens, after a long absence (Plato, *Protag.* p. 301, c), at a time when the sons of Pericles were still alive (*ibid.* p. 314, e; 329, a). A somewhat intimate relation between Protagoras and Pericles is intimated also elsewhere (Plut. *Pericles*, c. 36 p. 172, a). His activity, however, was by no means restricted to Athens. He had spent some time in Sicily, and acquired fame there (Plato, *Hipp. Maj.* p. 282, d), and brought with him to Athens many admirers out of other Greek cities through which he had passed (Plato, *Protag.* p. 315, a). He was accused of atheism by one of his scholars, and was consequently impeached for what he had written in his book *On the Gods*, which began with the statement, "Respecting the gods, I am unable to know whether they exist or do not exist" (Diog. Laert. 9:51, etc.). The impeachment was followed by his banishment (*ibid.* 9:52; Cicero, *De Nut. Deolr.* i, 23; Euseb. *Praep. Evang.* 14:19, etc.), or, as others affirm, only by the burning of his book (Philost. *Vif. Soph. l.c.*; Josephus, *C. Apion.* ii, 37; Sext. *Emnp. Adv. Math.* 9:56; Cicero, *Diog. Laert.* 11. cc.). Uelerweg says that it would seem Protagoras left for Sicily after his condemnation and was lost at sea (*Hist. of Philos.* i, 74).

*Writings.* — From the list of the writings of Protagoras, which Diogenes Laertius (9:55) doubtless borrowed from one of his Alexandrine authorities (he describes them as still extant, ἐστὶ τὰ σωζόμενα αὐτοῦ βιβλία ταῦτα: comp. Welcker's account of Prodicus, in his *Kleine Sch7 iffen.* ii, 447, 465), and which he gives probably with his accustomed negligence, one may see that they comprised very different subjects: *ethics* (Περὶ ἀρετῶν and Περὶ τῶν οὐκ ὀρθῶς τοῖς ἀνθρώποις πρασσομένων, Περὶ φιλοτιμίας); *politics* (Περὶ πολιτείας, Περὶ τῆς ἐν ἀρχῇ καταστάσεως: comp. Frei, p. 182, etc.); *o heforic* (Ἀντιλογιῶν δύο, τέχνη ἐριστικῶν), and other subjects of different kinds (Προστακτικὸς,

Περὶ μαθημάτων, Περὶ πάλης, Περὶ τῶν ἐν Αἴδου). The works which, in all probability, were the most important of those which Protagoras composed Truth (Ἀλήθεια), and *On the Gods* (Περὶ θεῶν) — are omitted in that list, although in another passage (ix, 51) Diogenes Laertius refers to them. The first contained the theory refuted by Plato in the *Theætetus* (p. 161, c; 162, a; 166, c; 170, e), and was probably identical with the work on the Existent (Περὶ τοῦ ὄντος), attributed to Protagoras by Porphyry (in Euseb. *Praep. Evang.* 10:3, p. 468, Viger). This work was directed against the Eleatics (Πρὸς τοὺς ἐν τῷ λέγοντας), and was still extant in the time of Porphyry, who describes the argumentation of the book as similar to that of Plato, though without adding any more exact statements.

*Doctrines.* — With the peculiar philosophical opinions of Protagoras we obtain the most complete acquaintance from the *Theoetetus* of Plato, which was designed to refute it, and the fidelity of the quotations in which is confirmed by the much more scanty notices of Sextus Empiricus and others. The sophist started from the fundamental presupposition of Heraclitus that everything is motion, and nothing besides or beyond it, and that out of it everything comes into existence; that nothing at any time *exists*, but that everything is perpetually *becoming* (Plato, *Theoet.* p. 156, 152; Sextus Empiricus inaccurately attributes to him matter in a perpetual state of flux, ὕλη ῥευστή, *Pyrrhonm. Iyp.* i, 217, 218). He then distinguished two principal kinds of the infinitely manifold motions, an active and a passive; but premised that the motion which in one concurrence manifested itself actively will in another appear as passive, so that the difference is, as it were, a fluctuating, not a permanent one (*Theoet.* p. 156, 157). From the concurrence of two such motions arise sensation or perception, and that which is felt or perceived, according to the different velocity of the motion; and that in such a way that where there is homogeneity in what thus meets, as between seeing and color, hearing and sound (*ibid.* p. 156), the definiteness of the color and the seeing, of the perception and that which is perceived, is produced by the concurrence of corresponding motions (*ibid.* 156, d; comp. 159, c). Consequently, we can never speak of Being and Becoming in themselves, but only for something (τινί), or of something (τινός), or to something (πρός, p. 160, b; 156, c; 152, d; Arist. *Metaph.* 9:3; Sext. Emp. *Hyp.* i, 216, 218). Therefore there *is* or *exists* for each only that of which he has a sensation, and only that which he perceives is true for him (*Theoet.* p. 152, a; comp. *Cratyl.* p.

386; Aristocles, in *Euseb. Praep. Evang.* 14:20; Cicero, *Acad.* ii, 46; Sext. Emp. *l.c.* and *Adv. Month.* 7:63, 369, 388, etc.); so that as sensation, like its objects, is engaged in a perpetual change of motion (*Theoet.* p. 152, b; Sext. Emp. *Hyp.* i, p. 217, fol.), opposite assertions might exist, according to the difference of the perception respecting each several object (Aristletaph. 4:5; Diog. Laert. 9:5; Clem. Alex. *Stron.* v, 674, a; Senec. *Epist.* 88). The conclusions hitherto discussed, which he drew from the Heraclitean doctrine of eternal *becoming*, Protagoras summed up in the well-known proposition: ‘The man is the measure of all things; of the existent, that they exist; of the non-existent, that they do not exist (*Theoet.* p. 152, a; 160, d; *Cratyl.* p. 385. e; Arist. *Metaph.* 10:1; 11:6; Sext. Emp. *Adv. Math.* 7:60; *Pyrrhon. Hyp.* i, 216; Aristocles, in *Euseb. Price. Evanq.* 14:20; Diog. Laert. 9:51); and understood by the man, the perceiving or sensation-receiving subject. He was compelled, therefore, likewise to admit that confutation was impossible, since every affirmation, if resting upon sensation or perception, is equally justifiable (Plato, *Euthyd.* p. 185, d, etc.; Isocr. *Helene Enc.* p. 231, Bekk.; Diog. Laert. 9:53); but, notwithstanding the equal truth and justifiableness of opposite affirmations, he endeavored to establish a distinction of better and worse, referring them to the better or worse condition of the percipient subject, and promised to give directions for improving this condition, i.e. for attaining to higher activity (*Theoet.* p. 167; comp. Sext. Emp. *Hyp.* i, 218). Already, before Plato and Aristotle (*Metaph.* 4:4; comp. the previously quoted passages), Democritus had applied himself to the confutation of this sensualism of Protagoras, which annihilated existence, knowledge, and all understanding (Plutarch, *Adv. Colot.* p. 1109, a; Sext. Emp. *Adv. Math.* 7:389).

It is not every pleasure, but only pleasure in the beautiful, to which Protagoras, in the dialogue which bears his name (p. 351, b), allows moral worth; and he refers virtue to a certain sense of shame (*αἰδώς*) implanted in man by nature, and a certain conscious feeling of justice (*δίκη*), which are to serve the purpose of securing the bonds of connection in private and political life (*ibid.* p. 322, c, etc.); and, accordingly, explains how they are developed by means of education, instruction, and laws (p. 325, c, etc.; comp. 340, c). He is not able, however, to define more exactly the difference between the beautiful and the pleasant, and at last again contents himself with affirming that pleasure or enjoyment is the proper aim of *the good* (p. 354, etc.). In just as confused a manner does he express himself with respect to the virtues, of which he admits five (holiness, *ἁγιότης* —

and four others), and with regard to which he maintains that they are distinguished from each other in the same way as the parts of the countenance (*ibid.* p. 349, b; 329, c, etc.). As in these ethical opinions of Protagoras we see a want of scientific perception, so do we perceive in his conception of the Heraclitean doctrine of the eternal flow of all things, and the way in which he carries it out, a sophistical endeavor to establish, freed from the fetters of science, his subjective notions, setting aside the Heraclitean assumption of a higher cognition and a community of rational activity (ξυνὸς λόγος) by means of rhetorical art. That he was master of this in a high degree, the testimonies of the ancients leave indubitable. His endeavors, moreover, were mainly directed to the communication of this art by means of instruction (Plato, *Protag.* p. 312, c), to render men capable of acting and speaking with readiness in domestic and political affairs (*ibid.* p. 318, e). He would teach how to make the weaker cause the stronger (τὸν ἥττω λόγον κρείττω ποιεῖν, Aristot. *Rhet.* ii, 24; A. Gellius, V. A. v, 3; Eudoxus, in *Steph. Byz.* s.v. "Ἀβδηρα: comp. Aristoph. *Nub.* 113, etc., 245, etc., 873, 874, 879, etc.). By way of practice in the art he was accustomed to make his pupils discuss theses (*communes loci*) on opposite sides (antinomically) (Diog. Laert. 9:52, etc.; comp. Suid. s.v.; Dionys. of Halic., Isocr., Timon, in Diog. Laert. 9:52; Sext. Emp. *Adv. Math.* 9:57; Cicero, *Brut.* 12); an exercise which is also recommended by Cicero (*Ad Afft.* 9:4), and Quintilian (x, 5, § 10). The method of doing so was probably unfolded in his *Art of Dispute τέχνη ἐριστικῶν*; see above). But he also directed his attention to language, endeavored to explain difficult passages in the poets, though not always with the best success (Plato, *Protag.* p. 388, c, etc.; comp. respecting his and the opposed Platonic exposition of the wellknown lines of Simonides, Frei, p. 122, etc.). See Plato, *Hipp. Haj.* p. 282, c; *Meno*, p. 91, d; *Theoet.* p. 161, a; 179, a; Quintilian, 3, 1, § 10; Diogenes Laertius, 9:52, 50, etc.; Zeller, *Philos. der Griechen*, i, 244 sq.; Fisher, *Begginnings of Christianity*, p. 117; Butler, *Hist. of Ancient Philos.* (see Index in vol. ii); Smith, *Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog. and Mythol.* s.v., which we have principally used; Ueberweg, *Hist. of Philos.* i, 73 sq.; Geist, *De Protatgora Sophista* (Giessen, 1827); Sprengel, in his *Συναγωγὴ τεχνῶν* (Stuttg. 1828), p. 152 sq.; Herbst, *Protagoras* in "Philos.-hist. Studien" (Hamb. 1832), p. 88 sq.; Krische, *Forschungen*, i, 130 sq.; Frei, *Qucestiones Protagorece* (Bonn, 1845); Weber, *Qucest. Prot.* (Marb. 1850); Bernays, in *Rhein. Muts. f. Phil.* 1850 (7), p. 464 sq.; Vitranga, *De Prot. Vita et Phil.* (Gron. 1853); Grote, *Plato* (Lond. 1865, 3 vols.); and his *Hist. of*

*Greece*, ch. 67; Mallet, *Etudes Philosophiques*, vol. ii; and the literature under *Sophists*, especially Schanz, *Vorsokratische Philosophie* (Gotting. 1867).

### Protais And Gervais, Sts.,

flourished in the first century of the Christian era, and were martyred at Milan towards the year 68. These two brothers were sons of St. Vital and St. Valeria, and their martyrdom appears to have taken place in the last years of the reign of Nero. Their memory was forgotten, until a vision revealed the place of their sepulture to St. Ambrose, when about to dedicate the Cathedral of Milan. The two martyrs were buried in the Church of St. Nabor and St. Felix, and upon the representations of St. Ambrose their coffins were discovered. Their names were plainly inscribed upon them, as St. Ambrose announced only what he had learned by revelation. The bones were transferred to the Basilica, and legends report many miracles done by them during their transfer, which from the 5th century was celebrated at Milan and in the African Church. The worship of these two saints spread rapidly, and in the 6th century a church was built and dedicated to them at Paris. This church has been several times restored, and exists yet in that city. The feast of St. Gervais and of St. Protais is celebrated on the 19th of June. — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, s.v. See Bollandus, *Acta Sanctorum*, Jun.; Tillemont, *Memoires Ecclesiastiques*; Baillet, *Vies des Saints*, 19 Juin. **SEE GERVAISE.**

### Protasof, Ambrose,

a Russian prelate, distinguished by a talent of oratory unusual in the Russian Church, was born in 1769 at Moscow. He became a monastic at twenty-five, and was made archimandrite of a monastery near St. Petersburg; subsequently rector of the seminary of that capital, and in 1804 was elevated to the episcopal see of Seula, from whence he was transferred in 1807 to Kazan and Smirsk. He died in 1830 in Tver. His sermons evince a tolerant spirit. Some have been published in *Le Messager de l'Europe*, others in *Le Fils de la Patrie*, but have never been collected in separate form. — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, s.v. See Otto, *Hist. of Russian Literature*, s.v.

## Protection of the Church

a sort of right of asylum within or near sacred precincts, which prevailed in 1064 in England from Advent to the octave of Epiphany, from Septuagesima to the octave of Easter, from Ascension to the octave of Pentecost, in Ember weeks, throughout Sunday, on the vigils and feasts of apostles and saints which were bidden on the previous Sunday, All-Saints', the dedication-day of a church, in going to synods, chapters, on pilgrimage, to a consecration, or to church.

### Protectores, Cardinales.

Every Roman Catholic state of first rank enjoys the right of being represented in the College of Cardinals at Rome by one or several members who have been exalted to that high dignity as natives or naturalized citizens of that state. At the time of the universal domination of the popes, when the Roman see was mixed in all the political concerns of the European states, and before the permanent office of the nuncio had become the regular channel of communication between Rome and the Catholic rulers, the cardinals were the natural representatives of the ecclesiastical and political interests of their respective countries, and their position was, of course, one of considerable importance. But even in recent times their influence has not entirely vanished; for as they are supposed to be best acquainted with the institutions, manners, customs, and language of the nations they represent, and therefore more capable of giving the necessary information about the ecclesiastical situation of those nations, they are still, in the different congregations of which they are members, intrusted with the revision of all accounts and reports on the religious affairs of their provinces, but especially of the references about the worthiness of the elected or nominated archbishops and bishops. Hence their name *protectores nationum*. With these must not be confounded the *clerici mationales*, or prelates, who occupy in the College of Cardinals the situation of secretaries, and must be alternately French, Spaniards, Germans; nor the *crown-cardinals*, i.e. the archbishops and bishops who are proposed for the cardinalate by the ruler of their country, nominated by the pope, and who received the red baret from the hand of their Catholic sovereign, but must go to Rome to receive the red hat out of the pope's own hands. The *cardinal protectors* reside in their metropolitanate, but have a right, on the decease of the pope, to give their vote in the election of his successor, and are themselves eligible to the papacy. As not every

country has one of its natives in the College, one cardinal frequently unites in his hands the protectorate of several countries. — Wetzler u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lex. s.v.*

## Proterius

(also called *Bertares-probably* his name, but euphonized into the name by which he is better known), an Eastern prelate of some note because he provoked a schism which continues to the present day in the sects known as the *Jacobites* (q.v.) and *Melchites* (q.v.). He flourished about the middle of the 6th century, and suffered martyrdom for the Church. He had been made a priest by Cyril, bishop of Alexandria, who was well acquainted with his virtues. On the death of Cyril, the see of Alexandria was filled by Dioscorus knowing the reputation of Proterius, did all in his power to gain his confidence and interest, that he might, through him, accomplish his designs. But Proterius was not to be corrupted; the welfare of the Church was next his heart, and no worldly preferment could bribe him to forego his duty. Dioscorus, being condemned by the Council of Chalcedon for having embraced the errors of Eutyches, was deposed, and Proterius was chosen to fill the vacant see. and approved by the emperor. This occasioned a dangerous insurrection, and the city was divided into two factions. Much mischief was done on both sides, and Proterius was brought into the most imminent danger. The civil authority was set at naught, violence was resorted to, nor was peace restored until a detachment of two thousand men was despatched by the emperor to quell the sedition. The discontented party, however, still beheld Proterius with an eye of resentment; the attendance of a guard became necessary; and, although of a mild temper, he was compelled to procure the banishment of several from the city. Upon the emperor Marcian's death, the exiles returned to Alexandria, and seemed resolved to be revenged for what they had suffered in the last reign. Timothy, the head of the conspirators against him, in the absence of Dionysius, seized on the great Church, and was uncanonically consecrated to the see by two bishops of his faction, who had been deposed for heresy. On the return of Dionysius, the incendiary Timothy was driven from the city, which so enraged the Eutychians that they assaulted the house of Proterius, who fled to the neighboring church and took refuge in the baptistery, thinking that the holiness of the place and of the season (for it was Good-Friday) would protect him. But he was pursued to the church, treated with every indignity, murdered in cold blood, and his body was dragged about the city, torn in pieces, burned, and the ashes scattered in

the sea. Proterius was so highly esteemed that his writings were collected at once and recommended as profitable for study to the clergy. His memory is celebrated on Feb. 28; possibly on that day, says Neale, because his name was then restored to the diptychs. See Neale, *Hist. of the East. Ch. (Patriarchate of Alex.)*, ii, 5-13; Fox, *Book (of Martyrs)*, p. 77. (J. H. W.)

## Protestant Church of Jerusalem

*SEE JERUSALEM.*

## Protestant Confessions

*SEE CONFESSIONS.*

## Protestant Episcopal Church

This is the legal title of one portion of the Church of Christ which has its local habitation in the United States of America. The first part indicates its position relatively to the Roman Catholic Church, as protesting against the errors and repudiating the claims of that Church to supremacy in doctrine, discipline, and worship; the second part of the title expresses its attitude towards other Christian bodies who have rejected episcopacy on the ground that it is not of divine origin, and, therefore, not of universal and permanent obligation. The history of the Protestant Episcopal Church is consequently of more than ordinary interest, since, on the one hand, it has been compelled to resist the Roman Catholics and their progress, and, on the other, has been forced to maintain its position among Protestants, without being able to form any union or engage in any concert of action with them. In the present article it will be the writer's aim to give a tolerably full account of the history and progress of this Church, together with some supplementary statements and remarks in regard to its peculiar claims and adaptedness for the great work of evangelizing our country and helping to make the Gospel known throughout the dark places of the earth where heathenism prevails.

**I. History.** — Here a natural division suggests itself at once, viz.:

**(1.)** History of the period during colonial times to the close of the Revolutionary war. This period covers rather more than a century and a half, and during it Church people looked directly to the mother country for ministerial supply and religious privileges in general.



(2.) The period after the Revolution, when efforts were successfully made to obtain the episcopal succession from England, the Protestant Episcopal Church was duly organized, its liturgy, articles, constitution, etc., were adopted, and its bishops and clergy in different parts of the country were brought into union as one body, with the General Convention as its central legislative power. This period covers the years 1783 to about 1808.

(3.) The later history of the Church, marking its growth, increase in wealth and numbers, educational efforts, missionary labors, and the like, with as full and accurate statistics as call be obtained of its present position and work.

1. *Early and Colonial History.* — In the latter part of the 16th century, Sir Humphrey Gilbert left England to endeavor to form a settlement in America. Among the motives avowed as influencing him were “the honor of God, compassion of poor infidels captivated by the devil (it seeming probable that God hath reserved these Gentiles to be reduced into Christian civility by the English nation), advancement of his honest and well-disposed countrymen willing to accompany him in such honorable actions, and reliefe of sundry people within this realme distressed.” Though Gilbert met with no success and was lost at sea, other efforts were made by his half-brother, Sir Walter Raleigh, in 1584, in Carolina and Virginia. These too, though in the main unsuccessful, were not wholly without fruit. In 1606 the Virginia Company obtained its charter, and in 1607 the settlement at Jamestown was begun. Among the articles and order of the charter it was expressly required that “the presidents, councils, and ministers should provide that the true word and service of God be preached, planted, and used, according to the rites and doctrine of the Church of England, not only in the said colonies, but also as much as might be among the savages bordering upon them.” A clergyman of the English Church, Rev. R. Hunt, accompanied the expedition, and with unwearied zeal, and with piety and devotion worthy the highest praise, labored in his vocation to the end of his life. Other godly men followed, especially Rev. A. Whitaker. who has been honored with the title “Apostle of Virginia.” Through his agency the Indian maiden Pocahontas was converted and baptized. and proved herself of great service to the colony. “As the first colonists of Virginia were exclusively members of the Church of England, the legislature of the colony decreed a provision for the clergy, at the rate of fifteen hundred pounds of tobacco and sixteen barrels of flour annually for each clergyman.

As each new borough was formed, it was ordered that a portion of glebe land should be set apart for the use of the incumbent. Tithes were afterwards instituted. Discipline was enforced by laws which, it must be admitted, were unjustifiably severe; and a peremptory enactment was passed that none but ministers episcopally ordained should be allowed to officiate in the colony” (Hawkins). Early efforts were made to provide for the education of English and Indian youth by founding a college, and ten thousand acres of land were set apart, and large sums of money collected. In 1619, when Sir Thomas Yeardley became governor of Virginia, the legislature manifested commendable zeal in the same direction. The officers and agents of the Company were urged to train up the people in true religion and virtue, and also “to employ their utmost care to advance all things appertaining to the order and administration of divine service according to the form and discipline of the Church of England, carefully avoiding all factious and needless novelties, which only tend to the disturbance of peace and unity.” The most earnest desire was shown to convert the Indians to the faith of Christ, and to educate them in accordance with this faith. Mr. G. Thorpe, a man of good parts and breeding, was appointed head of the new institution, and it was confidently hoped and expected that the red men would ere long become Christians and members of a civilized community; but a rude shock was given to this hope by the Indians, who, hating and fearing the intruders, as they considered the whites to be, resorted, in 1622, to a bloody massacre; this, it may be noted, would have been complete extermination, had not a Christian Indian disclosed the plot the night before, and thus prevented its entire fulfilment. The deplorable result was, the embittering the feelings of all towards the Indians and a fierce war of retaliation; so that, for the time, the college, missionary labors, and Christian education were abandoned. In 1625 Virginia became a royal colony, and though its religious concerns were not so zealously looked after as under the charter, yet the people as a whole remained steadfast in their attachment to the Church of England, and their determination to sustain it in every way in their power. Virginia, too, where many cavaliers sought refuge, was loyal to the exiled monarchy when Cromwell came into power, while New England, on the other hand, sympathized heartily with the “lord protector” and his work. After the Restoration, in 1660, the colonial legislature, under Berkeley, the royal governor, gave early attention to the repairs and building of churches, the canonical performance of the liturgy, the ministration of God’s word, the baptizing and Christian education of the young, etc. It is, however, sadly

true that religion had greatly declined among the people; violent contests occurred between the governors and the assembly of the people; the ruling party was intolerant; popular discontent increased; and rebellion actually broke out. So injurious were these disturbances and the wicked passions to which they gave rise that almost of necessity piety and godly life and conversation declined; and the Church became weakened to such an extent that, it is recorded, out of fifty parishes, nearly all were destitute of glebe, parsonage, church, and minister, and there were not more than ten in holy orders left. In 1685 Rev. James Blair came as missionary to Virginia. Four years later he was appointed commissary of the bishop of London, a position of great responsibility and trust, especially with regard to discipline of both clergy and laity. He also held a seat in the council, and continued at his post as commissary for more than half a century, exercising a most beneficial influence in every way, and particularly in restoring and enlarging the good work of the Church. It was through his energetic efforts and well-directed zeal that the College of William and Mary was chartered in 1692. Its design was "that the Church in Virginia may be furnished with a seminary of ministers of the Gospel; that the youth may be piously educated in good letters and manners; and that the Christian faith may be propagated among the Western Indians, to the glory of Almighty God." Blair became president of this the second college founded in America, and lived to a very advanced age.

The neighboring colony of Maryland, founded in 1633 by lord Baltimore, a Roman Catholic, with some two hundred families and two or more priests of that Church, was noted for freely opening its doors to "every person professing to believe in Jesus Christ." The colonial assembly in 1639 declared, in the words of Magna Charta, that "Holy Church within this province shall have all her rights and privileges." Whether by this term was meant the Church of England or not, it is certain that the influence and membership of that Church were largely extended. The general progress of the colony was so successful that at lord Baltimore's death, in 1676, there were in Maryland ten counties and about sixteen thousand inhabitants, the largest part of whom were Protestants. At this date a letter was addressed to the archbishop of Canterbury by a clergyman named Yeo, complaining of the low state of morals in the colony, and of the fact that the clergy of the Church of England had no settled incomes like their brethren in Virginia, and that consequently their position was neither so respectable nor so well calculated to effect good as it ought to be. Efforts were made

to induce the proprietary to provide maintenance for the Church; this, however, he wholly refused. Seditious movements thereupon were set on foot against him as being a “papist,” and it was maliciously rumored that the Roman Catholics, in complicity with the Indians, were purposing to massacre the Protestants. On the accession of William of Orange in 1688, a so-called “Protestant revolution” took place, and for three years the government was in the hands of the insurgents. Lord Baltimore having been deprived of his rights as proprietary, a royal governor was sent into Maryland, and in 1692 the Church of England was established by law; the province was divided into thirty parishes, and tithes were imposed for support of the clergy upon every inhabitant, no matter what might be his religious opinions. The Roman Catholics and Quakers opposed this with all their might, and with more or less success. In 1696 new laws were made, which still, however, recognised the Church of England as by law established as entitled to all its rights, privileges. and freedom. The clergy, feeling the need of aid from home, begged the bishop of London to send them a commissary at least (since they were not allowed to have a bishop), “to redress what was amiss and supply what was wanting in the Church.” Dr. Thomas Bray, a very estimable and truly godly man, was the one chosen to fill this important position. At great personal sacrifice he accepted it. He secured as many pious and devoted clergymen as he could to go with him to America, and was soon enabled to increase the number of those laboring in Maryland from three to sixteen. He began the formation of colonial libraries, and as one step led to another, and as he perceived how great was the need and how important was the result of combined action on the part of the members of the Church, he conceived the noble idea of founding the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, and that for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts. The latter was chartered in June, 1701, the former in 1698. Early in March, 1700, Dr. Bray arrived in Maryland, and entered at once with zeal and diligence upon his work. He assembled the clergy, delivered charges, administered discipline, and was active in having a bill passed by the legislature for the settlement and maintenance of the parochial clergy. By this bill it was provided “that the Book of Common Prayer and administration of the sacraments, with the rites and ceremonies of the Church, according to the use of the Church of England, the Psalter and Psalms of David, and morning and evening prayer, therein contained, be solemnly read by all and every minister or reader in every church or other place of public worship within this province.” Despite some opposition, the king gave the

enactment his consent, and it became law. Although Dr. Bray's stay in Maryland was terminated in 1701, he never ceased his efforts in behalf of the Church there; and it is on record that out of some thirty thousand inhabitants in Maryland at this date, the majority were in communion with the Church of England.

The Carolinas and Georgia were among the later colonies in the southern part of America. Several ineffectual efforts had been made from 1630-60 to found settlements in the region of Albemarle Sound; but it was not till after the restoration of Charles II that a body of noblemen (Clarendon, Albemarle, etc.) undertook the task, and met with success. "Being excited," as they declared, "by a laudable and pious zeal for the propagation of the Gospel, they begged a certain country in the parts of America not yet cultivated and planted, and only inhabited by some barbarous people who have no knowledge of God." The charter allowed entire freedom of religious opinion, and no one was to be disturbed on these matters by the public authorities. We are sorry to say, however, that, notwithstanding the pious and proper language quoted above, the noble proprietaries made no provision for the spiritual interests of the colonists or for the conversion of the Indians. The famous John Locke's "grand model" of government (1670) turned out to be a grand failure, and was abolished in 1693. George Fox, the founder of the Quaker denomination, visited Carolina and gave quite an impulse to the peculiar notions in religion which he entertained. The religious condition of the colony at the close of the century was on the whole very unsatisfactory, and ungodliness prevailed to a lamentable extent. Early in the 18th century the majority of the colonists were dissenters, yet acts were passed in 1704-6, establishing the Church of England as the religion of the province. This produced trouble and resistance of course, and was of no real advantage to the Church. The Society for Propagating the Gospel sent missionaries into the Carolinas, and some, though mostly ineffectual, struggles were made to stay the floods of ungodliness, fanaticism, and semi-heathenism; it was a hard and almost hopeless contest during the greater part of the century. Georgia owed its origin to Oglethorpe's benevolent designs and efforts from 1732 onward. Religious privileges were freely accorded. The German Lutherans and Moravians were early in the field. A small company of Jews came also; and a body of Scotch Highlanders founded New Inverness in 1736. At this date, too, John and Charles Wesley were in Georgia. John Wesley was parish minister in Savannah, and for a while matters went on

very well and satisfactorily; but ere long the strictness of Wesley in enforcing the rubrics, and the dissatisfaction of the colonists who were very restive under Church discipline, led to dissension and irreconcilable differences; so that Wesley “shook off the dust of his feet,” as he phrases it, and left Georgia in disgust. George Whitefield soon after came to Georgia, and though he was continually itinerating to and from England and through the northern colonies, stirring up great excitement by his fiery zeal and energy, yet his labors in Georgia as a clergyman of the Church of England met with fair success. The same statement may here be made as in the case of the Carolinas, that missionaries of the Society for Propagating the Gospel did what they could in behalf of religion and the Church; but they were far too few and ill-supported to accomplish much.

Turning our attention from the southern colonies where, as in Virginia, the Church of England was planted at the date of the earliest settlement in America, and where it flourished despite the fact of being deprived of an essential element in the life and growth of the Church, viz. episcopal presence and supervision, we may next glance at the more northerly portion of the continent. New York (formerly New Netherland) was first colonized by the Dutch in 1615 onward, and of course was in its religious character presbyterian, like the Hollanders at home. In 1664 it was seized by the English, and became a part of the colonial empire of England. After a time the Church of England obtained precedence, and for a while was supported by public tax. Trinity Church was founded in New York city in 1696; the Rev. W. Vesey was its first rector, and was also for fifty years commissary of the bishop of London; it is probably the wealthiest church corporation in the United States. New Jersey (New Sweden), in like manner, and the banks of the Delaware from the mouth inland, were settled by Swedes in 1638. Later (1676), the Quakers came in as colonists, and though in religious profession the inhabitants were principally Presbyterians and Quakers, yet there was open toleration to all other Christian believers. Missionaries of the Society for Propagating the Gospel were at an early day earnestly and zealously at work, at several points in New Jersey, and besides the names of Talbot, Beach, and others, that of Dr. T. B. Chandler, of Elizabethtown, must ever be held in grateful memory by churchmen. The Protestant Episcopal Church has always been comparatively strong in New Jersey Pennsylvania was founded by William Penn in 1681, and, so far as religion was concerned, was tolerant to all of every name. It deserves to be mentioned, too, that, as in the early history

of Virginia, kindness and gentleness were displayed towards the native tribes, and no Quaker blood was ever shed by the Indians. ‘The first Episcopal Church founded in Pennsylvania was Christ’s Church, Philadelphia, in 1695; and at various points the missionaries of the Society for Propagating the Gospel were, during the early part of the 18th century, actively engaged in preaching the Gospel. Great ungodliness prevailed in all directions. and fanaticism, in its most offensive, hurtful form, displayed itself; but the clergy labored on, amid every discouragement, and their labors were blessed to a large extent.

In all the colonial enterprises thus far, as we have seen, the Church of England was allowed a reasonably fair and just privilege of ministering to the wants of its own people, and extending its boundaries and influence, as best it could in accordance with the rights of others. But when we look at New England, and see what treatment the Church met with there, the contrast is striking indeed. Here, as is well known, the first settlers were those called in the ecclesiastical history of the time Puritans. They were men who had been engaged in long and fierce contentions with the established Church in England. They were men also of stern and unyielding natures, and among them, the leading ones at least, for good reasons, as they held, hated the Church with as nearly a perfect hatred as is possible for man to attain. There was no term in the vocabulary of reproach which they did not heap upon the Church and its clergy and members, as well as its liturgy and services. They refused to allow two clergymen of the Church, who were in New England in 1623-24, to preach and labor in any way in their vocation; and the brothers Browne, two of the original patentees of the Massachusetts Bay Company, who desired to enjoy the services of the Church of England, and that too only in a private dwelling, were shipped off in 1629, without ceremony, by Endicott, the governor, on the ground that they were “factious and evil- conditioned.” Thus was begun that series of oppressive actions and intolerant disregard of the rights of others which resulted later in the judicial murder of the Quakers. In a letter, dated April 7, 1630, when a large body of Puritans were embarking from England under Winthrop and Saltonstall, they spoke of themselves as men “who esteem it an honor to call the Church of England, whence we rise, our dear mother; and we cannot part from our native country, where she specially resideth, without much sadness of heart, and many tears in our eyes; ever acknowledging that such hope and part as we have obtained in the common salvation we have received in her bosom, and

sucked it from her breasts.” Yet these same men and their successors, with strange and painful disregard of the plain meaning of their words, resolved upon and put in practice intolerance in its most vengeful form. They had suffered, as they averred, bitter persecution and grievous wrong in England from the “lord bishops” in authority there, who gave no heed to their conscientious scruples in Church matters; but, so far from showing forth love and gentleness and kindness and liberality as regards other people’s consciences, they seem, when the power fell into their hands, to have become, in all matters relating to religion, harder than the granite rock; and, with a spirit as unpitying and hateful as that of the Inquisition itself, they determined that no man, woman, or child, where they had strength to stop it, should ever hold any opinion or have any religious faith which they, the “lord brethren” of New England, did not approve. They fined, imprisoned, or banished recusants of all sorts. “God forbid,” said they, through Endicott, an impersonation of bigotry, “that our love of truth should be so cold that we should tolerate errors!” They allowed no one who differed from them to live among them. Convicted Anabaptists were “whipped unmercifully.” Quakers, who with fanatical violence defied the magistrates and ministers, were sentenced, after the first conviction, to lose one ear; after the second, another; after the third, to have the tongue bored through with a red-hot iron; and several of them were put to death; but in 1661 Charles II, by a peremptory order, forbade further outrage of this kind. As to the Indians, though the colonists were under chartered obligation to treat them well and endeavor to convert them to Christianity. these were looked upon as having no rights to be respected, as wolves, savages, heathen. and doomed, like the Canaanites of old, to utter excision as speedily as possible. It was only such men as Roger Williams in Rhode Island, and the estimable John Eliot, the Apostle to the Indians, and the comparatively few who sympathized with them, that helped to relieve New England bigotry and intolerance from being denounced as utterly detestable. The Puritans, in carrying out their principles, organized what they called churches on the same plan of independency as that employed in civil matters. They looked upon themselves as under no restraint. and as owing no obligation or courtesy to their “dear mother, the Church of England,” and they thought and acted as if they could just as readily have — to use a pet phrase of later days — a church without a bishop as a state without a king. Of course, under such a condition of affairs, and with such antagonism and prejudice against the Church and all appertaining to it. it could make little or no progress in New England; and it is a fact to be



noted that for some sixty years after the landing on Plymouth rock there was not a single Episcopal church in all that part of the country. It was not till the year 1679 that Charles II, on the earnest representation of some of the inhabitants through the bishop of London, caused a church to be built in Boston. William of Orange subsequently settled an annual bounty of £100 for endowment.

From this time onward, however, owing to the unwearied and judicious efforts of the Society for Propagating the Gospel, something began to be accomplished, in despite of penal enactments and bitter, uncompromising hatred. Missionaries were sent out to various points in New England, as well as the other colonies (except Virginia and Maryland); and as they were honest, faithful men, abounding in labors, travelling over large districts, and ministering the Gospel to all whom they met with, they deserve all honor, and their labors were not without fruit. Had the Church of England listened to that supplication for bishops which went up continually and earnestly, and had she been permitted to send out worthy men for the episcopal office, the growth and prosperity of the Church in America would have been vastly greater and more secure; but the ungodliness of men in power, the hampered condition of the Established Church, and the active opposition of the Puritans in New England and of the dissenters in England as well as their special friends in America, always succeeded in overpowering the cry of the destitute and the numerous and powerful remonstrances of the Society for Propagating the Gospel. At one time there were two nonjurist bishops in America, viz. Dr. R. Welton and Dr. J. Talbot (1722), the former in Philadelphia, the latter in Burlington, N. J.; but they were not allowed to exercise episcopal functions except by stealth, and the government soon after interfered and put an entire stop to all action on their part. As early as 1704, a missionary of the society took up his residence in Newport, R. I., and continued there nearly half a century. During his ministry, and that of several helpers in the work, he could not but note the depressing effects of schism and heresy, there being then quite as many denominations in Rhode Island as there have been in subsequent days. Bishop Berkeley deserves to be named in this connection for his noble disinterestedness and zeal. In 1725 he entered upon his great philanthropic and Christian enterprise of erecting a college at Bermuda, to serve as an institution for educating the children of the planters, and suitable ones from among the natives as missionaries in order to convert the savages to Christianity. In 1728 Berkeley was in Rhode Island, and had

not the government of Walpole kept him out of the £20,000 voted, he would probably have accomplished his benevolent design. The next year he returned to England, and reluctantly gave up his cherished plan. Some eighteen years later lie caused to be sent as a gift to the library of Harvard College a very valuable collection of books, containing such authors as Hooker, Pearson, Barrow, Hammond, Clarendon, etc., and these no doubt helped to leaven the minds of some in New England, who, weary of the despotism of independency, and grieved and distressed at there being multitudinous sects of all kinds and characters, were disposed to seek, and did seek, refuge in the sober, staid, and godly ways of the Church of England. It is also worthy of note here that early in the 18th century, about thirty-five years before Berkeley's donation to Harvard College, a library of books. similar in character and value to those just named, had been sent to Yale College, which was now established in New Haven. At this date there was not a single Episcopal Church in Connecticut, and very few families of Church people. There were, however, in this region, several earnest seekers after truth, dissatisfied and cheerless in their then position, among whom may be named especially Timothy Cutler, an accomplished scholar, and president of Yale College; Daniel Brown, one of the tutors; and Samuel Johnson, a Congregational preacher at West Haven. These, in company with others in like condition of mind, set to work to examine into the important subject of the ministry and doctrines of the apostolic and early Church. The result was, rather to the astonishment and alarm of most of their associates, a thorough conviction on their part that there was no valid ministry except through the laying-on of the hands of a bishop, and that the doctrines set forth in the Prayer-book are the true and full expression of the truth of the Gospel. Of course, Messrs. Cutler and Brown could not stay any longer in Yale College, which neither recognised nor tolerated the Church of England in any shape, but, in common with Congregationalists generally, as we are gravely told, "entertained fears lest the introduction of Episcopal worship into the colony should have a tendency gradually to undermine the foundations of civil and religious liberty." Accordingly these gentlemen resigned their positions, and, accompanied by Mr. Johnson, they sailed for England in November. 1722, were ordained to the ministry, and (except Mr. Brown, who died of smallpox) returned to America as missionaries of the society the following year. Dr. Cutler became rector of Christ's Church, Boston, and Dr. Johnson was settled at Stratford, Conn. Both of them were among the foremost men in the colonial Church, and were of especial service in

defending its claims, warding off attacks, and promoting its growth and welfare. Both, too, lived till nearly the close of the colonial period, Dr. Cutler dying in 1765, Dr. Johnson in 1772. In fact, the Church in Connecticut was more than ordinarily blessed, and we find that, prior to the Revolution, it was comparatively vigorous and zealous in good works. The names of Beach, Seabury, Jarvis, Hubbard, and others abundantly evince this. Without attempting to go into details, it may here be stated that down to the outbreak of the Revolution, the Society for Propagating the Gospel maintained, on an average, thirty clergymen in the New England states, and about fifty in the other colonies. One list of churches which was sent home by a missionary in 1748 makes the number in New Hampshire two, in Rhode Island five, in Massachusetts twelve, in Connecticut seventeen-total, thirty-six. It must be borne in mind, too, that each missionary was placed in the centre of an extensive district, and supplied as far as possible the spiritual wants of the people, whom oftentimes he could reach only by long and even dangerous journeys to and from distant settlements. The Society did all that its means allowed in sending missionaries in all practicable directions, and it may justly and properly be noted of its work that when it began its operations in the colonies, it found but five churches; and when compelled by the revolt of the colonies to close its labors, it left the country with some two hundred and fifty churches.

The Church of England in America was peculiarly unhappy in its position just before and at the period of the revolution. It had no popular favor to fall back upon in those days of trial. It was small in proportion to other Christian bodies, especially in the north, and it was hated and despised by the ill-informed multitude, who regarded it as virtually identical with priestcraft and tyranny. A considerable number of its clergy, particularly those who were English-born, felt compelled by their ordination vows to adhere to the cause of the king. This was sure to bring distress and trouble upon them and the Church likewise; for when the disputes with the mother country reached that crisis which culminated in the war of the revolution, there could be no longer any hesitation as to the side which every man must take. Then it became a necessity for a man to side with his country or with the king's party; he must be a patriot, heart and soul, or he must be ranked with and suffer with the odious Tories. The result was the abandonment of their fields of labor by most of the clergy in the employ of the Society for Propagating the Gospel, who found their only safety in

flight to England or the British provinces; the closing of nearly all the churches; and, worse than all, the disgraceful ruin and defilement heaped upon many church edifices. It was none the less hard and unjust to American churchmen to be forced to bear all this in addition to the trials of war, inasmuch as it is only simple justice to put it on record, to the perpetual honor of the Church and the vindication of its members against the freely circulated charge of lack of patriotism in the great struggle against the tyranny of the English government, that the commander-in-chief of our army was a churchman, and the first chaplain of Congress was William White, a clergyman of the Protestant Episcopal Church.

**2. *History subsequent to the Revolution***, including the full organization and entrance on its work of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States. — When, at last, the war was over, and the independence of the United States was acknowledged (1783), it became a matter of immediate concern to those who had heretofore been dependent on England for ordination of clergy, and for efficient and steady help from the Society for Propagating the Gospel, to ascertain what was now to be done. Here they were, few in numbers comparatively; cut off from all direct connection with the English Church; having not even the small comfort of being considered as any longer in the diocese of London; with no means of helping themselves; no bishops, few clergy, and these scattered over a large surface of country; in great perplexity as to the proper course to be pursued; and reduced pretty nearly to the condition of hopeless uncertainty.; In Virginia, for instance, at the beginning of the Revolution, there were 164 churches and chapels and 91 clergymen; at the close of the great struggle a large number of these churches had been destroyed; 95 parishes were extinct or forsaken; of the remaining 72, there were 34 without ministerial services; while of the 91 clergy only 28 remained. But, bad and distressing as was the state of affairs, it was not altogether desperate. The great Head of the Church did not abandon his people in their trouble.

Those brave and honest men who had tried for years and years to induce the government and Church of England to allow them to have a bishop — were thoroughly conscious that they must not now give up in despair. The mean and paltry reasons of state, and the venomous prejudice that had been stirred up from this side of the water against the continuous supplication for a bishop during nearly a century just past — these could certainly no longer have any force; for now there was a new nation in the

world, in no wise hampered by any union of Church and State; now it could not be pretended that there was any danger to public liberty from the Episcopal Church having and enjoying what it regards as essential to its very life and growth. To us, at this day, when a century of existence has been granted to the United States, and the Protestant Episcopal Church has proved its right to be what it has now become, it seems almost incredible that it could ever have been seriously urged against that Church that its having bishops of its own was (in some strange, unaccountable way) hurtful and dangerous to liberty and true patriotism. However singular it may appear that such an opinion should prevail among fair-minded, intelligent persons, the fact is indisputable; this opinion did prevail, and did cause great trial and suffering to the Church in America. All that can be said is, that as prejudice is usually utterly unreasoning, and will listen to nothing which militates against its preconceived conclusions, so we have no alternative but to attribute some, at least, of the opposition to the Episcopal Church to this hard, stony prejudice; while it is almost certain that a large part of the opposition arose from settled hatred towards the Church and a determination to prevent its growth and influence. Bishop White's testimony is instructive in this connection. Writing in 1836, he says, "What a wonderful change has the author lived to witness in reference to American episcopacy! He remembers the ante-revolutionary times, when the presses profusely emitted pamphlets and newspaper disquisitions on the question whether an American bishop were to be endured; and when threats were thrown out of throwing such a person, if sent among us, into the river, although his agency was advocated for the sole purpose of a communion submitting itself to his spiritual jurisdiction.... The order has existed among us for nearly the half of a century, and not a single complaint has been heard, either of usurpation to the injury of any other denomination, or of arbitrary government within our own." Organization and union, as far as practicable, were now of first importance. It was no new thing for the clergy to meet in their several districts from year to year. This had been done at intervals all through the 18th century, up to the end of the colonial period. In Virginia and Maryland, where the Church of England was established by law, meetings, consisting of a large number of the clergy and laity, were held in the spring of 1784-85. In Virginia, the chief effort was to rid the Church of State control, to obtain liberty to act freely in ecclesiastical matters, and to have the Episcopal Church incorporated in accordance with the laws of the state, so as to hold and retain its rights of property in churches, glebe lands, etc. A general

willingness was expressed of uniting with Episcopal churches in other states; but ground was taken in regard to bishops and their office and position which alarmed the Northern churches. The Virginia notion was to reduce a bishop to the lowest possible point, to use him simply for ordaining and confirming, to make him serve as a parish minister, and be amenable to the convention, etc. In Maryland, a special effort was made to secure a bill of rights for the Episcopal Church, for objects similar to those just named in the case of Virginia; “a declaration of certain fundamental rights and liberties of the Protestant Episcopal Church of Maryland” was set forth; and Dr. William Smith was chosen to go to England for the purpose of obtaining episcopal orders. It may be mentioned here that, for various and sufficient reasons, Dr. Smith did not obtain the proper papers, and was never consecrated. Farther south, a convention, consisting of a small number of clergy and laity, was held in Charleston, S. C., in 1785-86. The feeling against the Church of England was very bitter in that part of the country, which had suffered greatly from the ravages of the British armies. This convention, acknowledging the need of the three orders in the ministry, was willing to go so far as a general approval of union, but stipulated that there was to be no bishop settled in that state without the consent of the Church there. In January, 1784, Dr. Beach, of New Brunswick, N. J., made a suggestion to Dr. White, of Philadelphia, and Dr. Provoost, of New York, that a conference of as many of the clergy as could be conveniently got together be held, to take into consideration the condition of Church affairs. Previously to this, in August, 1782, before the recognition of American independence, and when it seemed as if the ministry of the Church were almost annihilated, Dr. White had issued a pamphlet, entitled “The Case of the Episcopal Churches in the United States Considered.” In this pamphlet, which excited considerable attention, the writer, apprehending the possibility of the Church being compelled to go forward without obtaining the succession from England, advocated the formation of a new body, without bishops in the regular line — in fact, a new presbyterian denomination. This, however, was only in case absolute necessity required such a course, and, as bishop White himself subsequently stated, it was suggested only for such a possible state of affairs. The writer was, in reality, too good a churchman not to embrace joyfully the opportunity which was offered three years later of obtaining the succession in the English line. A meeting of several clergymen from New York, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey, members of the Corporation for the Relief of Widows and Children of Clergymen, was held in New

Brunswick, May 11, 1784. At this meeting a number of laymen were also present, and another meeting was appointed for October in the same year in New York. Accordingly, Oct. 6. 1784, some fifteen clergymen from New England, New York, New Jersey, Delaware, and Maryland, and eleven laymen from the same states, assembled in New York. The principal result was the making of several important recommendations, such as, that there be a General Convention of the Episcopal Church; that each state send clerical and lay deputies; that the doctrines held by the Church of England be adhered to; that the Prayer-book be altered only in so far as civil changes demand: that in any state having a bishop, he be, *ex officio*, a member of the convention; that the clergy and laity deliberate together, but vote separately; that the first meeting of a general convention be held in Philadelphia on Tuesday before the Feast of St. Michael, in 1785, etc. Probably the most important benefit secured by the action of this body was a recognition of the value and need of lay representation as not only right in itself, but also in admirable harmony with the constitution of a republican form of government. The New England feeling was quite strong against the having a lay element in Church councils, and for a few years it appeared as if serious discord might arise, and hinder the union of the churches in the several states; but, happily the point was conceded, though with some reluctance, by the Connecticut bishop and clergy in 1789. One other point of difference existed at the time. The Connecticut sentiment was decidedly in favor of securing a bishop first, and then proceeding to act as a fully organized Church, in passing laws, revising the liturgy, etc., and such was the course adopted in that state. Dr. Samuel Seabury, bishop-elect, meeting with annoying difficulties and delays in England, was consecrated by Scotch bishops, in November, 1784, and, on his return home early in the summer of 1785, entered at once upon his duties as bishop of Connecticut. The churches in the middle and more southerly portions of the country held an opposite opinion to that entertained in Connecticut and Massachusetts, and in accordance therewith went forward, and took various steps antecedent to the obtaining of the succession from England.

The first meeting of clergy and laity which can properly be considered as approaching to a general convention was held in Philadelphia in September and October, 1785. Seven states were represented by 16 clergymen and 26 laymen. It was hoped that bishop Seabury and some of the New England clergy might be present; but, as they were not satisfied as yet on several points, they declined attending. Dr. White was chosen president, and Dr.

Griffith, of Virginia, secretary, and the convention proceeded promptly to the work of organization and revision. A plan for obtaining the episcopal succession, and an address to the archbishops and bishops of the Church of England were discussed and agreed upon. These papers were mainly the production of Dr. White, and were manly and dignified in tone and statement. A draft of alterations of the liturgy, in order to adapt it to the existing condition of civil affairs, and to get rid of certain offensive features, was submitted, as was also an "Ecclesiastical Constitution;" and the work went on vigorously till the close of the session, Oct. 7. The committee on altering and improving the Prayer-book were Drs. White, W. Smith, and Wharton. They were authorized to make changes of various kinds, "but in such a manner that nothing in form or substance be altered;" to accompany the volume with "a proper preface or address. setting forth the reason and expediency of the alterations;" and to publish the work for the use of Episcopal churches. The result of their labors was the "Proposed Book," as it is known in Church history. The major part of the alterations were made by Dr. Smith; and these alterations, both as to matter and spirit, deserve the attention of every student of our history. Besides a large number of verbal changes, the article "He descended into hell," in the Apostles' Creed, and the Nicene and Athanasian Creeds, were ejected; the "Articles of Religion" were reduced to twenty; a calendar and table of holydays were set forth; a long preface (the basis of the preface to the Book of Common Prayer as it now is) was added, etc. The volume proved to be quite unsatisfactory. Its changes were looked upon as too radical by many of the clergy and conventions; and hardly had the book been issued before it became evident that the Church was not ready or willing to accept it. From every quarter, when state conventions met, amendments were proposed and urged upon the attention of the Church; and nowhere was the book adopted, except in a few churches for temporary use. Bishop White says it was "a great error" to print the book at all in its then condition, and still more to print a large edition in hope of getting, by its sale, pecuniary returns to be used for charitable purposes. It was a crude and ill-digested affair, and it never received the first sanction of the Church. Subsequent general conventions ignored it altogether, and it will ever remain as the "Proposed Book," not the Book of Common Prayer which was later adopted, and is the Church's permanent heritage.

At the meeting of the next convention in Philadelphia, June 20, 1786, ten clergy and eleven laymen were present. The prospect was by no means



encouraging. Indeed, as bishop White states, “the convention assembled under circumstances which bore strong appearances of a dissolution of the union in this early stage of it.” The correspondence with the archbishops and bishops in England made it evident that there was an apprehension existing in their minds that the American Episcopal Church was scarcely sound in the faith, and they answered cautiously and with reserve in regard to the application for the episcopate. This was quite natural, and it need occasion no surprise that they objected to many of the alterations in the Prayer-book and to various features in the “Ecclesiastical Constitution,” as it was then arranged. Renewed and distinct assurances were expected from the American Church that there was no intention whatever on its part of departing from the Church of England in doctrine or in discipline and worship, except in so far as changed civil relations made it necessary, before the venerable prelates were willing to act as they were asked to do. There was also considerable unpleasant feeling excited by an expressed determination of several members of the convention (Provoost and R. Smith especially) to throw doubt upon the validity of bishop Seabury’s orders, obtained from the line of the Scotch nonjuring bishops. The convention showed its good sense and discretion by refusing to take any action inimical to the bishop of Connecticut or his position; a resolution simply was passed advising the churches then represented in convention not to receive ministers ordained by any bishop in America, during the application pending to the English bishops for episcopal consecration. “A General Constitution of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States,” freed from some serious former objections, was agreed upon, as also an answer to the letter from the archbishops and bishops of the Church of England. This latter, with the constitution, it was hoped and expected would give entire satisfaction. At an adjourned meeting held in Wilmington, Del., in October, 1786, the letter just before received from the archbishops and bishops, with forms of testimonials and the act of parliament authorizing the consecration of bishops for foreign countries, were read, and appropriate action was taken. A declaratory “Act of the General Convention of Clerical and Lay Deputies of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the States of New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, and South Carolina” was passed; and it was determined, in accordance with the earnest recommendation of the archbishops and bishops, to restore the omitted article (descent into hell) in the Apostles’ Creed, and to put back in its proper place in the Prayer-book the Nicene Creed. At the same time it was resolved that the Athanasian Creed be

omitted altogether, only one clergyman voting in its favor. Testimonials were signed in behalf of Dr. White, Dr. Provoost, and Dr. Griffith, bishops elect respectively of Pennsylvania, New York, and Virginia. The convention refused to give a like testimonial in favor of Dr. W. Smith, bishop elect of Maryland. On Nov. 2, 1786, Drs. White and Provoost embarked for England, and arrived on the 20th; Dr. Griffith, for personal reasons, was unable to accompany them. When they reached London, they were introduced to the archbishop by the American minister, John Adams, who, as bishop White says, in his *Memoirs*, “in this particular, and in every instance in which his personal attentions could be either of use or as an evidence of his respect and kindness, continued to manifest his concern for the interests of a Church of which he was not a member.” After some little delay, owing to Parliament not being in session, the consecration took place, Sunday, Feb. 4, 1787, in Lambeth chapel. The two archbishops, and the bishops of Bath and Wells and of Peterborough, united in the solemn act of giving the apostolic succession to the American Church.\* The new bishops very soon left England for home, and, after a long voyage of some seven weeks, arrived in New York on the afternoon of Easter-day, April 7. Thus, at last, was secured for the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States the long and earnestly sought-for privilege of having its organization rendered complete; thus, too, from this date it took its place as a distinct national branch of the Church of Christ, with all the privileges and duties and responsibilities thereunto attached.

\*This was certainly a connection by ordination with the Established Church of England, but whether it was truly an “*apostolic* succession,” is a very different question, which we do not think this the proper place to discuss. — ED.

The General Convention of 1789 assembled, July 28, in Philadelphia, bishop White presiding; bishop Provoost was absent. There were seventeen clergymen and sixteen laymen present from seven states, including South Carolina; but none came from New England. An application was made by the clergy of Massachusetts and New Hampshire, asking for the consecration of the Rev. Edward Bass as bishop. This application was placed on the ground that there were now three bishops (the proper canonical number) in America, and that consequently they were fully able to act in the premises. A resolution was unanimously passed “that, in the opinion of this convention, the consecration of the Right Rev. Dr. Seabury to the episcopal office is valid,” and the general sentiment was strongly in

favor of compliance with the request of the Massachusetts clergy. There was, however, an obstacle which hindered this compliance at this time, viz., the obligation which bishops White and Provoost felt themselves to lie under to the English bishops, not to consecrate any to the episcopal office until there were three in the English line in the United States. Dr. Griffith, in May, 1789, relinquished his appointment as bishop elect of Virginia, and died in Philadelphia during the session. Hence, it was thought best not to act at present upon the application from Massachusetts. A body of canons, ten in number, was adopted; a General Constitution of the Church was agreed upon in substance; an appropriate address was prepared, thanking the archbishops of Canterbury and York for their good offices in regard to the episcopate; also, an address was sent to the President of the United States, which was courteously answered by Washington; and the convention adjourned. August 8, to meet again in the same place, Sept. 29. An important part of the object of this adjourned session was to secure the union of the churches in New England with those already joined together. This was now happily accomplished. Bishop Seabury appeared, and took his place as a member of the convention, as did also deputies from Connecticut, Massachusetts, and New Hampshire. The third article of the constitution was modified so as to secure to the bishops the right to assemble and act as a separate house, in originating measures, etc.; they also were to have from this time a negative on the action of the lower house, unless adhered to by a four-fifths vote. The bishops then withdrew and organized as a house. Bishop Provoost being absent on account of illness, bishop Seabury took the chair. From this date there have been two houses, whose concurrent action is necessary to the adoption of any legislation, the bishops also (since 1808) having the full negative on the action of the other house. The convention now entered upon its most important work, which was to provide and place on a firm foundation the Book of Common Prayer for the American Church. The English liturgy was made the basis, and though entire independence of action was claimed by the House of Deputies, as if there were no book of any authority or obligation now in existence, yet there was, after all, a sense of the propriety and fitness of varying as little as possible from the Book of Common Prayer of the Church of England. Five committees were appointed, to whom were assigned different portions of the work, and they discharged their duties with as much expedition as was practicable. The result, as soon as agreed upon by the house, was sent to the bishops for their action. The alterations were principally verbal, and for the purpose of adapting the

services to the needs and uses of a Church situate as the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States was and is. An office of Visitation of Prisoners, a service for Thanksgiving Day, and an order of Family Prayer were added, as also Selections of Psalms to be used instead of those for the day, Tate and Brady's version of the Psalms, and some hymns in metre. One noticeable change was made in the Communion Office, i.e. putting in their proper place the oblation and the invocation of the Holy Spirit, as found in the first Prayerbook of Edward VI. and also in the Scotch Communion Service. This was due mainly to bishop Seabury, who was under something of a pledge to the Scottish bishops to secure this change, if possible. The meekness and wisdom of bishop White were clearly evident in this matter, as in everything. He was always ready to yield where principle was not violated, and he puts it on record that his discussions with bishop Seabury were entirely amicable and satisfactory to both parties. "To this day," he says, "there are recollected with satisfaction the hours which were spent with bishop Seabury on the important subjects which came before them, and especially the Christian temper which he manifested all along." The Apostles' and Nicene Creeds were adopted with hearty assent by the convention. A rubric was prefixed to the former, as follows: "And any churches may omit the words 'he descended into hell,' or may, instead of them, use the words 'he went into the place of departed spirits,' which are considered as words of the same meaning in the Creed." Bishop Seabury desired much to have the Athanasian Creed inserted not as obligatory on all, as in the Church of England, but as permissory for those wishing to use it; but, as bishop White states, the House of Deputies "would not allow of the creed in any shape." The consideration of the "Articles of Religion" was postponed to a subsequent convention. The Book of Common Prayer was formally ratified by the bishops, clergy, and laity in convention, Oct. 16, 1789: "This Convention having, in their present session, set forth *A Book of Common Prayer, and Administration of the Sacraments, and other Rites and Ceremonies of the Church*, do hereby establish the said Book; and they declare it to be the Liturgy of this Church, and require that it be received as such by all the members of the same; and this Book shall be in use from and after the first day of October, in the year of our Lord one thousand seven hundred and ninety." A number of canons were passed in regard to episcopal visitations, publishing a list of the clergy, observance of the Lord's day, etc. The consecration of Dr. Bass was deferred. Dr. Madison, of Virginia, was consecrated bishop in England, Sept. 19, 1790; and thus the full number of bishops was secured

through the English line. Two years later the consecration of Dr. Claggett as bishop of Maryland united both lines in the American episcopate, bishop Seabury being present and joining in the solemn act.

The convention of 1792 met in New York Sept. 11. There were five bishops, nineteen clerical and fourteen lay deputies in attendance, and the session lasted seven days. The Ordinal was revised and set forth, the alterations being few. An alternate form at the ordination of priests was furnished; instead of "Receive the Holy (host for the office and work of a priest in the Church of God, now committed unto thee by the imposition of our hands; whose sins thou dost forgive, they are forgiven; and whose sins thou dost retain, they are retained. And be thou," etc.; the bishop ordering is allowed to say, "Take thou authority to execute the office of a priest in the Church of God, now committed to thee by the imposition of our hands. And be thou," etc. The consideration of the Articles was further postponed. An act was passed "for supporting missionaries to preach the Gospel on the frontiers of the United States," in which it was recommended that annual sermons be preached in all the churches, that collections be made, and missionaries be sent out as soon as may be, these being under the canonical jurisdiction of the bishop of Pennsylvania. "Agreeably to the requirement of a canon adopted at the last convention, a list of the clergy of the Church is printed in the appendix to the journal. Including the bishops, the number given is one hundred and eighty-four, no lists having been handed in from New Hampshire and Massachusetts, and there being no mention of the number of clergymen at that time in North Carolina and on the Western frontiers. With every allowance there could not have been more than two hundred, the representatives of nearly two thousand who, with English orders, had labored on the American continent since its earliest attempted settlement, two hundred and fifty years before" (Perry). One other matter deserves to be put on record here, not only because of the importance of the object had in view both as regards one of the most influential denominations in the United States and the Protestant Episcopal Church, but also because of the entire failure at that date of so earnest and truly catholic a movement. We give it in the language of bishop White: "Bishop Madison had communicated to the author, on their journey from Philadelphia to New York, a design which he had much at heart—that of effecting a reunion with the Methodists; and he was so sanguine as to believe that by an accommodation to them in a few instances, they would be induced to give up their peculiar discipline, and conform to the leading

parts of the doctrine, the worship, and the discipline of the Episcopal Church. It is to be noted that he had no idea of comprehending them, on the condition of their continuing embodied, as at present. On this there was communicated to him an intercourse held with Dr. Coke, one of the superintendents of that society which might have shown to bishop Madison how hopeless all endeavors for such a junction must prove. Nevertheless, he persisted in his well-meant design. The result of this was his introducing into the House of Bishops a proposition, which his brethren, after some modifications, approving of the motive, but expecting little as the result of it, consented to send to the other house." The proposition (as given by bishop White) was placed on a broad and liberal basis, leaving most of matters to future discussion and settlement at a subsequent convention. "On the reading of this in the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies, they were astonished, and considered it as altogether preposterous; tending to produce distrust of the stability of the system of the Episcopal Church, without the least prospect of embracing any other religious body. The members generally stated, as a matter of indulgence, that they would permit the withdrawing of the paper, and no notice to be taken of it. A few gentlemen, however, who had got some slight intimations of the correspondence between Dr. Coke and the author, who would have been gratified by an accommodation with the Methodists, and who thought that the paper sent was a step in measures to be taken to that effect, spoke in favor of the proposition. But it was not to be endured; and the bishops silently withdrew it, agreeably to leave given." Bishop White gives, in addition, the letter of Dr. Coke, and an account of several interviews had with him. The letter is an instructive one in many respects, and shows what Dr. Coke thought of his supposed "episcopal" character, derived from John Wesley; bishop White's remarks and statements also are worthy of grave consideration. The subject has been more than once agitated, and sometimes men have become sanguine of being able to effect the end desired; but as the question of ordination still holds the place which it did in Dr. Coke's day, and the Methodist ministers almost certainly cannot be brought to acknowledge the obligation of being ordained by our bishops in order to officiate in our churches, we apprehend that there never has been any real probability of bringing the Methodists to a sense of the duty and propriety of becoming reunited to the Church at whose altars John Wesley always ministered, and which he at least was never willing to abandon.

Owing to the prevalence of epidemic disease in Philadelphia and its vicinity, the convention of 1795 was but thinly attended, and from the same cause no convention was held in 1798. A special convention, however, met in Philadelphia, June 11, 1799. Eight states were represented, nineteen clerical and ten lay deputies being present. Bishop Seabury, who had died in 1796, was succeeded by bishop Jarvis, consecrated Sept. 18, 1797. Dr. R. Smith was made bishop of South Carolina in 1795, and Dr. Bass of Massachusetts in 1797. At this convention an attempt was made to obtain its approval of Dr. U. Ogden, bishop elect of New Jersey; but it failed entirely, and Dr. Ogden a few years later joined the Presbyterians. A proposition was made to hold General Convention every five years; a form of consecration of a church or chapel was set forth; and seventeen articles were reported and read. These were ordered to be laid over, and printed in the journal. The clergy-list gives seven bishops and two hundred and twelve clergymen. At the convention of 1801, held at Trenton, N. J., Sept. 8, it was announced that bishop Provoost had resigned his jurisdiction as bishop of New York. Under the circumstances it was deemed right to consecrate Dr. Benjamin Moore as his assistant, the principle being distinctly stated that bishop Provoost was bishop during his life, and that bishop Moore was simply assistant or coadjutor, competent to all episcopal duty, but still to act in concurrence with bishop Provoost. The principal work of the convention was the final settlement of the question as to articles of religion. The printing of the seventeen articles, in the journal of 1799, produced one good result, viz., showing how difficult it was and would be to agree upon a new set of articles for the Protestant Episcopal Church, and leading the minds of the convention to a ready acceptance of the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England. It was bishop White's view that these articles were really "the acknowledged faith of the Church" all along, and that the safest and most satisfactory course was to make certain necessary changes, arising out of the actual condition of affairs, and then to adopt the Thirty-nine entire. This was accordingly done, and, as bishop White states, the articles "were adopted by the two houses of convention, without their altering even the obsolete diction in them; but with notices of such changes as change of situation had rendered necessary." Article VIII was amended by leaving out the Athanasian Creed. Article XXI, on general councils, was omitted, the reason being given in a note, "because it is partly of a local and civil nature, and is provided for, as to the remaining parts of it, in other articles." The XXXVth Article, on the homilies, was retained, with a note added suspending "the order for the

reading of said homilies in churches until revision of them may conveniently be made, for the clearing of them, as well from obsolete words and phrases as from the local references.” Article XXXVI was altered in so far as to set forth that the ordinal of 1792 contained the Church’s views and principles on this important point. Article XXXVII in the English Prayer-book was omitted, and a new one substituted, “Of the Power of the Civil Magistrate.” The articles as a whole were then ratified by both houses of convention, and they have ever since held their place in the Prayer-book and standards of the Church. Bishop White’s remarks, in this connection, deserve to be quoted: “The object kept in view, in all the consultations held, and the determinations formed, was the perpetuating of the Episcopal Church on the ground of the general principles which she had inherited from the Church of England; and of not separating from them, except so far as either local circumstances required, or some very important cause rendered proper. To those acquainted with the system of the Church of England, it must be evident that the object here stated was accomplished on the ratification of the Articles.”

**3. *History of the Protestant Episcopal Church since the beginning of the century.***— The standards of the Church having thus been adopted and secured, in the final setting-forth of the Book of Common Prayer, its history and progress since that date are those of a completely organized branch of the Catholic Church. That it did not at once expand itself and cover the land is sadly true, and that it has had in later years its times of sore trial and despondency is equally true. There was unhappily in the early part of the century a lack of thorough education in Church principles; there were the prevalence of sectarianism, jealousy felt by the various Protestant denominations, the sleepless enmity of the Roman Church towards the Protestant Episcopal Church, and wide-spread ungodliness on every hand, resulting in spiritual torpor and almost death. For a time it seemed (as Dr. Hawks says of Virginia) as if naught but “gloomy darkness” enveloped the Church. By a strange combination of circumstances, the act of the legislature of Virginia confiscating the glebes and Church property, which was resisted on the ground of being clearly illegal, became law by the death of the presiding judge in the court of appeals the night before he was to deliver the decision, all written out, securing to the Church its just rights. The effect upon the Church in Virginia was fearful and well-nigh disastrous, especially in the ruin and utter abandonment of church edifices and the dyingout of religion in every shape among the people. Even when,



in 1814, a brighter day began to dawn, “the journals of the convention by which bishop R. C. Moore was elected show the presence of but seven clergymen and seventeen laymen. We look back upon the past, and are struck with the contrast. Seven clergymen were all that could be convened to transact the most important measure which our conventions are ever called upon to perform, and this in a territory where once more than ten times seven regularly served at the altar. We look back still farther, and find the Church, after the lapse of two hundred years, numbering about as many ministers as she possessed at the close of the first eight years of her existence” (Hawks). In Maryland and its neighbor Delaware, matters were hardly any better. “In 1803 there was a spirit of indifference to religion and the Church too extensively prevalent in the parishes; nearly one half of them were vacant; in some, all ministerial support had ceased. Some few of the clergy had deserted their stations; and of the residue, several, disheartened and embarrassed by inadequate means of living, had sought subsistence in other states. Infidelity and fanaticism were increasing; and, on the whole, there never was a time when ministers were more needed, or when it was more difficult to obtain them” (Hawks). Such was the state of things in general at the South in the early part of the 19th century. Further North, in New York, New Jersey, Connecticut, and much of New England, the prospects were more cheering. The consecration of John Henry Hobart as assistant to bishop B. Moore of New York, May 29, 1811, and of Alexander Viets Griswold for the eastern diocese (i.e. Massachusetts, Rhode Island, New Hampshire, and Vermont) at the same date, were indications of healthy growth. The former became especially prominent, during his episcopate of nearly twenty years, as the representative of what are called “High-Churchmen”\* in the Protestant Episcopal Church, and his influence on the character, claims, and position of the Church in the United States, in the estimate of his own people as well as the various Christian bodies among whom he lived, can hardly be overvalued. No one could possibly, or did, misunderstand him, and he was so resolute withal in the open avowal of his principles and convictions, and so ready to defend them on all occasions, even that “unchurching” dogma, as many like to call it, that it may be doubted if any bishop or clergyman of the Protestant Episcopal Church has ever done so much as John Henry Hobart in defining the position and claims, and educating, so to speak, the whole Church to the adoption of fixed and settled views on this important subject. Bishop Hobart’s personal character and devotion to his work, his unquestioned purity of purpose in all that he did, his lifelong free and cordial

correspondence with bishop White (whom no one ever charged with being a High-Churchman), strengthened, undoubtedly, his influence; and even those who differed with him, and represented what are called “Low-Church” views and principles, could not but respect a high-toned, conscientious advocate of principles to which they were, with equal conscientiousness, totally opposed. It is not, probably, too much to affirm that the steadfast adherence of the Protestant Episcopal Church to its standards of doctrine, discipline, and worship, and its fixed and often expressed determination (through the General Convention and its action), never to recede from its attitude towards either Rome or Protestants of various names, are due in great measure to the labors, teaching, and publications of bishop Hobart, and the large number of clergymen and laymen who have been educated in the Church principles with which his name is associated.

\* Perhaps it may be well to say here that the terms or appellations “High-Churchman,” “Low-Churchman,” “evangelical,” “ritualist or ritualistic,” etc., are used simply for convenience, and to save repeated periphrases. The writer of these pages neither affirms nor denies the applicability of the words to or about those specially concerned. No disrespect is meant to any one, on the one hand, by the use of terms, and, on the other, is any claim of superiority made in behalf of those to whom the word is applied.  
— ED.

The action of the General Convention, from this time onward, has been devoted to legislating for the best interests of the Church, and as far as possible to taking such steps as are calculated, under God’s blessing, to promote the increase of faith and holy obedience, to guard against the intrusion of error and unsound doctrine, and to place various matters of doubt or difference of opinion on such a footing that the largest toleration be allowed, in these respects, consistent with preserving the faith once delivered to the saints and the maintenance of apostolic truth and order. In 1804 a “Course of Ecclesiastical Studies” was set forth by the bishops, and it still remains in its original shape, notwithstanding that many and valuable works, in the several departments of theology, have since been published, and are in use in our seminaries and schools of divinity. The General Convention of 1871, in its canon on examinations for orders, says: “In all these examinations reference shall be had, as closely as possible, to the course of study established by the House of Bishops, and to the books therein recommended, or equivalent works of more recent date.” In 1808

the bishops, in a message to the House of Deputies, who had asked for the enactment of the English canon concerning marriages, expressed their doubts as to the propriety of entering upon the question: and at a later date (1841) there were two reports of committees presented on this subject, the majority adverse to legislation, the minority in favor of enacting the canon. Thus the matter stands, the civil law being supreme, except in regard to marriage of divorced persons, which is as follows: "No minister of this Church shall knowingly, after due inquiry, solemnize the marriage of any person who has a divorced husband or wife still living, if such husband or wife has been put away for any cause arising after marriage; but this canon shall not be held to apply to the innocent party in a divorce for the cause of adultery, or to parties once divorced seeking to be united again" (see Hoffman, *Law of the Protestant Episcopal Church*, p. 71-84). The words of bishop White ought to be quoted in this connection: ' On a retrospect of the transactions of this convention there is entertained the trust that it did not end without a general tendency to consolidate the communion; although, in the course of the business, there had been displayed, more than in any other convention, the influence of some notions leadling far wide of that rational devotion which this Church has inherited from the Church of England. The spirit here complained of was rather moderated than raised higher during the session. But it being liable to be combined with schemes of personal consequence, there is no foreseeing to what lengths it may extend in future.'" In 1814 the subject of a theological seminary was discussed, and the need of such an institution began to be evident. Three years later its organization was resolved upon, and initiatory measures were adopted. Its officers, course of study, etc., were finally agreed upon in 1820, and it began its work. The seminary was removed from New Haven to New York, and the next year it was finally established as "The General Theological Seminary of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States." By this action, however, it was distinctly understood that there was to be no hindrance to any state or diocese establishing a seminary of its own. Time has shown the wisdom of this policy of non-interference; for, in consequence of the vast extent of territory of the United States, it is found to be simply impossible to gather all the candidates for orders in the Church within the walls of the seminary in New York. We may mention here that there are divinity schools or seminaries in Massachusetts, Connecticut, Pennsylvania, Virginia, Ohio, Wisconsin, and other Western states and dioceses. — At this convention the identity of the Protestant Episcopal Church with the Church of England was declared in the

following terms: "It having been credibly stated to the House of Bishops that on questions in reference to property devised, before the Revolution, to congregations belonging to the 'Church of England,' and to uses connected with that name, some doubts have been entertained in regard to the identity of the body to which the two names have been applied, the House think it expedient to make the declaration, and to request the concurrence of the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies therein, that 'The Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America' is the same body heretofore known in these states by the name of 'The Church of England;' the change of name, although not of religious principle in doctrine, or in worship, or in discipline, being induced by a characteristic of the Church of England, supposing the independence of Christian churches, under the different sovereignties to which, respectively, their allegiance in civil concerns belongs. But that, when the severance alluded to took place, and ever since, the Church conceives of herself as professing and acting on the principles of the Church of England is evident from the organizations of our conventions, and from their subsequent proceedings as recorded in the journals, to which, accordingly, this convention refer for satisfaction in the premises. But it would be contrary to fact were any one to infer that the discipline exercised in this Church, or that any proceedings therein, are at all dependent on the will of the civil or of the ecclesiastical authority of any foreign country." The result of this declaration was, some twelve years later in Vermont, where the Society for Propagating the Gospel had formerly owned lands, "that all the material points of law were settled in favor of the Church." — At this session also the constitution of the Domestic and Foreign Missionary Society of the Church was perfected, and the American Church has since done much — though not so much as it might and ought to have done — in preaching the Gospel in the waste places in our own land, and in sending the light of Christian truth and power to heathen lands and peoples. From this date the Church seems to have experienced more fully than before the goodness and mercy of God in sending his grace upon it, and to have given plain indications of healthy increase in the various parts of our country.— Following the uniform plan, adopted under bishop White's gentle but firm guidance and influence, of keeping clear of entanglements, the convention, in 1820, refused to allow the officiating of persons not regularly ordained; and such is the law at the present day: "No minister in charge of any congregation of this Church, or, in case of vacancy or absence, no churchwardens, vestrymen, or trustees of the congregation, shall permit any person to officiate therein without

sufficient evidence of his being duly licensed or ordained to minister in this Church." Hence, whatever individual clergymen may venture to do in such cases in the way of inviting ministers of various sorts into their churches, it is always to be borne in mind that they do it of their own will and pleasure, and in violation of the canon which they have promised to obey. As a further illustration of the Church's policy, it may be noted that, in 1823, an offer was made by the Colonization Society that the Episcopal Church should send a delegate to act with that society in its benevolent plans. It was deemed inexpedient to accept the offer, the bishops holding that the objects of this society were "more of a political than religious nature." — At the convention of 1826 bishop Hobart presented a plan for shortening the morning service, in respect to the Psalter, the Lessons, Litany, etc., and also for improving and rendering more effective the confirmation service in the Prayerbook. Quite unexpectedly, considerable excitement followed this proposal, and three years later, when the sense of the state conventions became known as adverse to any changes in the services, the plan was quietly dismissed from all further consideration. So strong is the conservative element in the councils of the Church, and so great is the unwillingness to make any — even the least-changes in the Prayer-book, that daily morning and evening prayer, with all that belong to them, have continued to be, and are, obligatory in their entire fulness. It is tolerably certain, however, that some, if not many, of the wisest and most devoted among the clergy *would* gladly welcome a permissory use of a shorter form of daily service for certain occasions, and under certain circumstances, where it would tend to greater edification and obviate some of the vulgar objections against liturgical forms and services. Something looking to this result was accomplished by an expression of the views of the bishops, at the General Convention of 1856; but at the next convention (1859) it was evident, from the course of debate on the "Memorial," as it was called, and the general sense of the House of Deputies, that the Church was not then, nor has it since been, ready to make any ventures in the direction of liturgical relaxation and Church comprehension.

In the "Great West," as it used to be called, it became plain at this date that the Protestant Episcopal Church had a work of no ordinary interest and importance to perform. The rapid filling-up of the states west of the Alleghanies, and the sad fact that, in the race for life and increase of wealth and power, religion, in any and every form, was almost wholly ignored. caused no little anxiety and concern to thoughtful men in the older states;

for it was too certain not to be clearly seen that if the West were to be abandoned to chance efforts and the zeal of a few religious men here and there, the result would be that that portion of the country would grow up into might and wealth virtually heathen or infidel, and would be without the restraining bonds of Christian faith and morals, and the civilizing and elevating influences of the Gospel of Christ. In the good providence of God, there was a man, named Philander Chase, whose heart was turned in this direction. After considerable experience in missionary labors in various quarters, Chase set out for Ohio in 1817, determined to give himself to the work of an evangelist in that part of the United States. His labors were blessed, and he seemed to be the very man for the work to be (lone; hence, in 1819 he was consecrated bishop of Ohio. Every kind of labor and toil came upon him, but he bore tip under it all. Yet the deep consciousness that, if the Gospel was to be preached, there must be men to do it — men, too, educated and trained for this special work, in a new country and among new settlers — pressed heavily upon his mind, and caused him to revolve anxiously what he was to do in such a state of affairs. He concluded to visit England, and to beg for means to found a college and seminary in Ohio for the education of young men for the ministry. The voyage was undertaken (though its expediency was doubted by many), and bishop Chase obtained in all some thirty to forty thousand dollars in aid of his much-cherished object. He returned home in July, 1824, and during the next two years was busily engaged in laying the foundation of Kenyon College and the Theological Seminary at Gambier (both names being derived from prominent donors to the cause). In due time the college went into operation, bishop Chase assuming the presidency. Not long after, however, there arose differences of opinion between him and the professors as to the extent of the bishop's powers in this office. The convention of the diocese sustained the professors, which led to an immediate resignation by the sturdy old man, not, only as president of the college, but also as bishop of Ohio. This was in September, 1831, and the case of his resignation of the diocese came before the General Convention of 1832. The House of Bishops pointedly censured abandonment of the diocese under such circumstances; but, in order that the Church should not suffer harm, the bishops united with the other House in approving the election of Dr. C. P. McIlvaine, who was consecrated bishop of Ohio, Oct. 31, 1832. Bishop Chase, we may mention here, continued his course westward, and was elected to the episcopate of Illinois in 1835. He visited England again, received further liberal donations in aid of the cause of

Christian education, and founded another institution, which he called Jubilee College. For this he obtained, in 1847, a charter to his mind on the point of the bishop's control in its affairs. Since those days, headed by the venerable Jackson Kemper, missionary bishop of the North-west, sent out in 1835, the Protestant Episcopal Church has not been altogether unmindful of its duty and privilege; and all through that vast field beyond the Mississippi, even to the Pacific Ocean, there are heralds of the cross engaged in their sacred vocation. The episcopate, since 1859, has been coextensive with the boundaries of the United States; and the Church, in its complete organization, has been, and is, striving to bring men to the obedience of the faith of Christ.

The venerable William White, in the fiftieth year of his episcopate, was called away to his rest, July 17, 1836. His name will ever be held in grateful memory by the Church in America, as well for the long-continued and earnest labors in its behalf which he was permitted to perform, as for the wisdom and judgment of his course on all occasions during a life extended far beyond the ordinary limit allotted to man. Meekness and gentleness, a large-hearted liberality, a spirit of genuine toleration, a willingness to yield for peace' sake in all matters where principle was not, in his judgment, clearly involved — these and the like qualities fitted him admirably for the station he was called upon, in God's providence, to fill; and we may with reverent thankfulness trace the indications of God's goodness and mercy to his Church in America, that such a man was raised up to take large share in its early struggles and history, and to live to so great an age as to see the "little one become a thousand," and the grain of mustardseed grow up, and become a tree, and shoot out great branches. Bishop White's biographer and intimate friend, Dr. B. Wilson, classes him among "the Low Church divines, as they were called in England, of the established Church in that country," and the good bishop has been claimed as representing that portion of the clergy in the Protestant Episcopal Church to whom the same title has been applied. Doubtless, bishop White was not what is termed a "High-Churchman;" for, though he was on terms of great intimacy with bishop Hobart (of whom we have before spoken), and entertained for him warm affection and sincere respect, yet he was never willing to express his assent to all the views of bishop Hobart on the subject of the ministry, and the necessity of the apostolic succession in order to constitute a lawful ministry in the Church. He held episcopacy to be of divine origin, and therefore, of course, the best form and mode of Church government; but,

in view of the condition of the Protestant world, he did not consider it to be absolutely necessary, or that those who depart from or reject it are guilty of causing and perpetuating schism in the body of Christ. On the other hand, he was not at all a "Low-Churchman," in the sense of undervaluing episcopal organization and responsibility, or looking upon it as a matter of little or no moment. This was very evident by his steadfast adherence to the Church's ways and course in all matters where it was needful to take a stand in regard to other Christian bodies. His courtesy and kindness of heart, and his truly charitable estimate of the views held by pious people not connected with the Protestant Episcopal Church, and of the sincerity of their motives and aims, naturally led him to look with favor upon what might be proposed where it is usually thought Christians of all names can work together for the common good; but, practically, in all such matters he maintained his ground as stoutly as any High-Churchman ever did. He held steadily to the opinion that the Protestant Episcopal Church was much better off by keeping to itself in all ecclesiastical affairs, and that it was entirely inexpedient to form unions or alliances of any kind, or to "exchange pulpits," as the phrase is, or, in fine, to run the risk of any sort of possible entanglements with other denominations. This was the result of settled conviction on bishop White's part, and it was well understood to be so on all hands. It did not, however, prevent his having and preserving personal intercourse with Christians of every name; it did not lead him to indulge in denunciations of or interference with others, however far they may, in his judgment, have wandered from the true path; and it did not produce any ill feeling towards him by those who might have complained, in his case as well as that of others, of what is often termed "exclusiveness," or "bigotry," on the part of the Protestant Episcopal Church. If ever there have been any who have gone down to their graves without a single enemy, or without even a whisper against their characters for purity and integrity of life, bishop White certainly deserves to be ranked among these. Since the venerable patriarch passed away, the Protestant Episcopal Church has continued to go forward, increasing in numbers year by year, and growing, it is trusted, in grace and deeper and truer devotion to the Lord and Master of us all. It has had its seasons of controversy and earnest struggles (as what Church has not?) between men of differing views, conscientiously and sincerely held on both sides; and it has seemed at times as if controversy were eating into the very heart of the Church, and arousing passions and tempers far from accordance with the spirit of the Gospel. Some notice of these must here be given, not only as a part of



the history of the Protestant Episcopal Church, but also as illustrating its present position and its probable future in the great work of evangelizing this nation.

The Oxford Tract movement (begun at the University in 1833, culminating in Tract No. XC in 1841, and extending over some ten years in addition) was one which was warmly, even hotly, debated, and produced for the time a controversy of no small magnitude and bitterness. The excitement in England, and the results flowing from the movement there, were transferred to America. Party spirit lifted its head on high. Energetic supporters of the tracts and their teaching entered the arena, and equally energetic opponents ranged themselves against the tracts and all who favored them. On the one side it was urged that the tracts taught nothing more than the well-established High-Church doctrines of the old English divines, and it was claimed that this teaching was legitimately within the limits allowed by the standards of the Church of England. It was also said that there was great need of rousing the minds of Church people to the importance of doctrines which had fallen greatly, if not quite, out of sight, such as the apostolic succession, the value and obligation of the holy sacraments, the real presence in the Lord's Supper, the importance of priestly absolution, the necessity of securing a return to the unity of the primitive Church, etc. On the other side, the whole movement and the entire teaching of the tracts were fiercely denounced as tending directly to Romanizing and unprotestantizing the Church. When in England numerous perversions to Rome took place at this time, and especially when John Henry Newman, the coryphaeus of the whole undertaking, gave in his adhesion to the Roman Church (1845), it was triumphantly affirmed that a similar result would happen in the Protestant Episcopal Church, and thus prove to the world how pernicious was the teaching of these tracts, No. XC last and worst of all. Quite a number of persons did abandon the communion of the Church, and submit themselves to Rome; but there was not anything like the exodus which had been predicted, since between 1842 and 1852, including one bishop only Ives, of North Carolina, in 1852), there were less than thirty who left the Church's ministry for the sake of Roman Catholic inducements, and these, with two or three exceptions, were men of little or no influence in the Church or community. *SEE OXFORD TRACTS.* In connection with the Oxford Tract movement, and more or less infected with the unhappy spirit of discord existing at the time, there occurred what is ordinarily known as "the Carey Ordination." Arthur

Carey was a student in the General Theological Seminary, a young man of excellent character and good ability. He graduated in 1843. It was thought and generally understood that he was strongly inclined to the ultra teaching of the tracts in the direction of Romanism; and Drs. Hugh Smith and Henry Anthon, both of New York, who took some pains to ascertain Carey's views and sentiments, deemed him to be unfit for ordination in the Protestant, Episcopal Church. The bishop of New York, however (B. T. Onderdonk), after an examination of the young man, held by six presbyters in conjunction with Drs. Smith and Anthon. decided that he was worthy to obtain orders. Drs. Smith and Anthon publicly protested in the church at the time of the ordination, but bishop Onderdonk went forward and ordained Mr. Carey, July 2, 1843. (He died in March, 1844.) As was to be expected, this action of the bishop of New York gave offence in various parts of the Church. It was much discussed in religious journals and in pamphlets, and bishops Chase, McIlvaine, and Hopkins commented upon it in public, and with much severity of language. In January, 1844, bishop Onderdonk addressed a pastoral letter to his diocese, in which he protested against the course adopted by the above bishops, and called for a trial, if they saw fit to initiate it. A trial, accordingly, was begun at the close of the year; but it was based, as we shall see, on charges entirely diverse from theological unsoundness. Meanwhile, the General Convention of 1844 met in Philadelphia in October. Twenty-four bishops were present, and ninety-three clerical and ( eighty-four lay deputies. In addition to its other labors, the whole matter of the Oxford Tract movement, and its effects upon the American Church, came up for consideration. Several days were spent in the discussion of the general subject of errors in doctrine and practice in the Church, and an earnest effort was made to obtain from the convention a distinct and positive condemnation of the error and false teaching which, it was charged, were rife in the Church. We need not go into details. In the lower house resolutions were offered asking the bishops to "promulgate a clear and distinct expression of the opinions entertained by this convention respecting the rule of faith, the justification of man, the nature, design, and efficacy of the sacraments," etc. It was also stated, in an amendment, that "the minds of many of the members of this Church throughout its union are sorely grieved and perplexed by the alleged introduction among them of serious errors in doctrine and practice, having their origin in certain writings emanating chiefly from members of the University of Oxford in England;" and, further, that ' it is exceedingly desirable that the minds of such persons should be calmed, their anxieties allayed, and the Church

disabused of the charge of holding, in her Articles and Offices, doctrines and practices consistent with all the views and opinions expressed in said Oxford writings, and should thus be freed from a responsibility which does not properly belong to her.” But the house did not agree to any of the resolutions offered in this shape. It was, however, finally “*Resolved*, That the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies consider the Liturgy Offices, and Articles of the Church sufficient exponents of her sense of the essential doctrines of Holy Scripture; and that the canons of the Church afford ample means of discipline and correction for all who depart from her standards; and, further, that the General Convention is not a suitable tribunal for the trial and censure of, and that the Church is not responsible for, the errors of individuals, whether they are members of this Church or otherwise.” Thus the house disposed of the question; and the bishops, on their part, in compliance with certain memorials sent to them, gave expression to their godly counsel and warning in the pastoral letter which was soon after issued. In December, 1844, bishops Meade, Otey, and Elliott made a formal presentment against bishop Onderdonk, of New York, “as being guilty of immorality and impurity.” The trial was held in the city of New York. There were seventeen bishops present, constituting the court, viz. P. Chase, Brownell, Ives, Hopkins, Smith, McIlvaine, Doane, Kemper, Polk, Delancey, Madsden, Whittingham, Lee, Johns, Eastburn, Henshaw, Freeman; also the three presenters, and bishop Onderdonk as respondent. The trial began December 10, and was continued from day to day till January 3, 1845, when bishop Onderdonk was pronounced guilty by eleven votes, and sentenced to suspension from the office of a bishop and from all the functions of the sacred ministry. Bishop Onderdonk protested in the strongest terms his innocence, and published a *Statement of facts and Circumstances* in regard to his trial. It may be mentioned that the condemned bishop never acknowledged himself to be in any wise guilty (died 1861). The “Prayer of the Diocese of New York to the House of Bishops for relief from sufferings consequent upon the sentence of the Episcopal Court, January, 1845,” was made September 25, 1850; but this and all other efforts put forth to have him restored failed; and a new canon having been adopted applicable to the case of a diocese with a suspended bishop, Dr. J. M. Wainwright was consecrated provisional bishop of New York, in November, 1852. During these years, since the General Convention of 1844, the tractarian controversy gradually subsided. Both sides became weary of the struggle. Nearly everything had been said which could be said. A number of eminent men in the Church had

put their views into written shape (as Jarvis, Seabury, Hawks, McIlvaine, Hopkins, Stone, and others); and after a while, the storm was lulled, the atmosphere became purified, and the Church was gladdened with a return of sunshine and comparative peace and quiet.

The disturbed condition of the country, in consequence of the secession from the Union of several of the Southern States, caused no little anxiety to the hearts of many of the Church's members, lest the Protestant Episcopal Church too should suffer harm in the great and terrible struggle which had been begun in 1860-61, and was to be tiolght out to the bitter end. It was but natural that the bishops in the southern dioceses should begin to meet and act separately, as if the dismemberment of the United States were a completed fact. They did so by organizing a council, framing a constitution and canons, etc.; and for a time there was grave apprehension lest the Church should be deprived of its union and communion as heretofore. The General Convention of 1862 met in New York, with much reduced numbers, of course; and this subject came before the convention, and was fully debated. Resolutions pledging support to the government were adopted; and a day of fasting, humiliation, and prayer was observed, October 8, 1862, in view "of the present afflictive condition of the country." At the next convention, however, held in Philadelphia, October, 1865, the Church was entirely reunited; harmony and concert of action were restored; and those who for some years had been acting apart gladly joined again in combined efforts for the good of the whole Church in the United States. There was held a service of thanksgiving to Almighty God for the restoration of peace to the country and unity to the Church. At this convention resolutions were adopted, urging that Christian parents, in the discharge of their bounden duty, should not only train their children in the ways of truth and godliness; should not only furnish them with sound, healthful reading and education in the Church's schools and colleges; but should also strive, by prayer and spiritual culture, to form in their sons a desire to serve God in the sacred ministry. In the House of Deputies it was also "*Resolved*, That, in the judgment of this house, there has never been a time in the history of our Church when the demand for missionary effort, at home and abroad, was so urgent and imperative as at the present moment; and that we earnestly call upon our constituents, in every diocese of this Church, to arouse themselves to realize the exigencies of the hour, and to labor and give and pray with a freer heart and more fervent zeal." Further

resolutions advocated a system of itinerancy. and the due use of lay aid in carrying forward the work of the Church.

The most recent controversy through which the Protestant Episcopal Church has been called upon to pass, or, perhaps, more exactly speaking, is still passing, is that which is familiarly known as "ritualism." The question took a definite shape as early as the General Convention of 1868. Two reports, a majority and minority, were made in the House of Deputies, on the conduct of public worship. The former pleaded for "liberty in things indifferent or unessential, so long as unity can be maintained, and spiritual edification promoted, in any other way;" it also deprecated "the enactment of any canon on the subject of ritual as unwise and inexpedient at the present time." The minority report urged strongly "the maintenance of our wonted uniformity and simplicity in public worship," and denounced "all innovations on the common order of the Church which wound the consciences of many of its true and loving members," such as, "the burning of lights in the order for the Holy Communion, the burning of incense, reverences to the holy table or the elements thereon, the elevation of the elements," etc. After much debate, the action of the convention resulted in referring all matters of doubt in these respects to the godly counsel and judgment of the bishops in their respective dioceses, and the appointment of a committee of five bishops (viz. bishops A. Lee, Williams, Clark, Odenheimer, Kerfoot), to consider whether any additional provision for uniformity in matters of ritual, by canon or otherwise, is practicable and expedient, and to report to the next General Convention. In October, 1871, the convention again came together, on this occasion in Baltimore, Md. The attendance was very full; distinguished visitors from England and from some of the colonial churches were present; and a spirit of forbearance and good-will seemed to prevail, notwithstanding so exciting a subject as "ritualism" was before the convention. A very elaborate report was presented by the committee of five, in which, after much sound reasoning on the importance and value of uniformity in the public services of the Church, and the statement of the fact that "diversities of use" had grown and spread, the committee urged that some legislation was certainly necessary. They specified the various additions in the way of ornaments in the Church and novel practices, such as having a crucifix or carrying a cross in procession, bowings, prostrations, mixing wine and water for the Holy Communion, solitary communions, surpliced choirs, additional vestments freely used in some churches. and such like; and they

recommended the appointment of a joint committee of three bishops, three presbyters, and three laymen to consider and report upon these matters to the convention then in session. Such a committee, consisting of able and well-trying men, was appointed, and, through bishop Whittingham and Dr. W. C. Mead on behalf of the committee, reported a "canon of ritual." In this proposed law it was affirmed that "this Church recognises no other law of ritual than such as it shall itself have accepted or provided;" and the provisions for ritual in this Church were stated to be (1) the Book of Common Prayer, with the offices and ordinal thereto appended; (2) the laws of the Church of England in use in the American provinces before 1789, and not subsequently superseded, altered, or repealed by legislation, general or diocesan, of this Church; (3) the legislative or judicial action or decisions of this Church in its conventions, general or diocesan, or by its duly constituted authorities. Animated discussions followed in the House of Deputies. Amendments and substitutes were proposed again and again, and though the House of Bishops passed the canon reported by the joint committee, the lower house did not succeed in coming to any agreement as to this canon. It was attempted to postpone indefinitely the whole matter, but without success. The favorers of ritualism endeavored to get the convention committed to some action in accordance with their views; the opponents of ritualism were equally urgent in seeking to obtain legislation directly condemnatory of numerous acts and observances peculiar to the ritualistic party. A very prominent advocate of the system (Dr. De Koven, of Wisconsin) made a speech against the canon as adopted by the House of Bishops. He used strange and even offensive language in support of his sentiments and opinions, and challenged any one who pleased so to do to present him for trial, he having boldly adopted and uttered as his own the words of one of the most ultraritualists in England: "I believe in the real, actual presence of our Lord, under the form of bread and wine, upon the altars of our churches. I myself adore, and would, if it were necessary or my duty, teach my people to adore, Christ present in the elements under the form of bread and wine." The discussions, though exciting and continued from day to day, were conducted with good temper and general fairness. As, on the whole, where neither side in a controversy is willing to yield, it is usually found to be the easiest way to get out of present difficulty to pass some comprehensive resolutions, which may mean more or less according to the mode of looking at them by different parties, such was the course now adopted. It was finally "*Resolved*, the House of Bishops concurring, That this convention hereby expresses its decided

condemnation of all ceremonies, observances, and practices which are fitted to express a doctrine foreign to that set forth in the authorized standards of this Church. *Resolved*, That, in the judgment of this house, the paternal counsel and advice of the right reverend fathers, the bishops of the Church, are deemed sufficient, at this time, to secure the suppression of all that is irregular and unseemly, and to promote greater uniformity in conducting the public worship of the Church and in the administration of the holy sacraments.” Thus, as we have intimated above, the real question at issue was postponed rather than adjudicated. Ritualism went on its course with additional vigor and confidence, and its opponents became more and more dissatisfied with the existing state of things. Consequently the struggle, as was to be expected, was renewed again when the General Convention met in New York in October, 1874. Memorials were presented from various quarters on this subject, resolutions were introduced bearing directly upon it, and legislation was earnestly called for in order to restrain what was termed excess of ritual in the public service of the Church. In the House of Deputies the question of confirmation of the bishop elect (Dr. G. F. Seymour) of Illinois came up. He was charged with being an active member of the advanced ritualistic party; his case was discussed for a whole week in secret session, and, though Dr. Seymour energetically denied the imputations cast upon him, after a long struggle confirmation was refused by a close vote — viz. nineteen to twenty-two clerical, thirteen to twenty-seven lay. (Four years later Dr. S. was elected to the episcopate, and is now [1878] bishop of the diocese of Springfield. Ill.) This result in the Seymour case was looked upon as virtually a victory of the anti-ritualists, and after much debate in both houses agreement was had to the following effect. A canon was passed, almost unanimously (tit. i. can. 22), requiring every bishop to summon the standing committee as a council of advice, in case complaint is made to him in writing, by two or more presbyters, that ceremonies or practices not authorized by the Book of Common Prayer and symbolizing erroneous or doubtful doctrines, have been introduced into any Church, specifying, in regard to the Holy Communion, “the elevation of the elements in such manner as to expose them to the view of the people as objects towards which adoration is to be made; any act of adoration of or towards the elements in the Holy Communion, such as bowings, prostrations, or genuflections; and all other like acts not authorized by the rubrics of the Book of Common Prayer;” further, if after investigation it is found that such practices have been introduced, the bishop shall admonish, in writing, the offending minister to

discontinue such practices or ceremonies; and if he disregard such admonition, it shall be the duty of the standing committee to cause him to be tried for a breach of his ordination vow. Every minister charged with violation of this canon is to have opportunity to be heard in his own defence; the charges and findings are to be in writing, and a record is to be kept by the bishop and the standing committee of the proceedings in the case. Such was the latest direct action of the highest legislative authority of the Church on this subject. The opponents of ritualism have apparently settled down in the conviction that the present canon is sufficient to enable the bishops effectually to repress, when necessary, all unseemly practices in this direction. The favorers of ritualism, on the other hand (at least, the more outspoken of them), have treated with scant courtesy the action of the convention of 1874, and affirm that "the canon is flagrantly unconstitutional, and that no bishop has ever dared to put it in use, and none ever will." At the General Convention of 1877 the matter was hardly at all alluded to. This the anti-ritualists interpret as in their favor, in the confidence that the Church has become weary of the dispute, and is disposed for the future to adhere to the old-fashioned, simpler, less ornate ways of conducting public services. The ritualists hold the opposite view, and it was rather exultingly proclaimed in a letter to the *New York Tribune*, by Dr. John Henry Hopkins (just after the convention of 1877 had adjourned), that the result of the war against the system, of which he is one of the ablest advocates, "is victory all along the line for the ritualistic advance, and that this victory is so complete that the renewal of hostilities hereafter is hopeless." As a party, it is certain that the ritualists have shown themselves to be bold, confident, energetic, and full of zeal in behalf of the cause which they have undertaken to maintain. In the American Church they are probably not so numerous in proportion as in the Church of England; but, as an offset to this, it is to be noted that they have enlisted in their ranks numbers of the younger clergy, and, in view of what they have already accomplished, they not unnaturally look forward to ultimate and complete success. The bishops, to whom are committed the oversight and regulation of this whole matter under the canon, are in a rather difficult and delicate position. As, on the one hand, they are compelled to tolerate much that is regarded as defective and in violation of the plain meaning of the rubrics and canons, so, on the other, they may reasonably be expected to shrink from pressing too severely upon those who carry ritualistic practices to more or less of excess. The opinion may here be expressed — simply as an opinion, without reference to the merits of the questions at issue — that



ritualism has had its day, and that, while it may be admitted that considerable, perhaps even great, good has resulted and may yet further result from this movement, it will not be likely again to assume any special prominence in the history of the Protestant Episcopal Church.

The bringing of this topic before the reader in continuous order, from its rise to the present time, has necessarily led to the omission of a number of interesting historical facts and incidents in the progress of the Church of late years: these are herewith succinctly presented in their proper sequence and connection. On a previous page has been noted the action of the General Convention on the subject of liturgical relaxation and Church comprehension. This was in 1856 and 1859. At the convention of 1868 various "memorials" were presented pleading for larger latitude in the use of the Prayer-book. This was reported against by the House of Bishops, and the following resolution was unanimously adopted: "*Resolved*, That. in the opinion of this house, such latitude in the use of the Book of Common Prayer as the memorialists ask could not be allowed with safety, or with proper regard to the rights of our congregations." In 1874 the question of shortened services came up, but no definite action was had. The convention expressed its sense by resolution simply, "that nothing in the present order of Common Prayer prohibits the separation, when desirable, of the Morning Prayer, the Litany, and the Order for the Administration of the Lord's Supper into distinct services, which may be used independently of each other, and either of them without the others: *provided* that when used together they be used in the same order as that in which they have commonly been used and in which they stand in the Book of Common Prayer." At the next convention (October, 1877), the committee on canons in the House of Deputies reported in favor of an "order concerning divine service," more especially for shorter services on other days than Sundays and the greater festivals and fasts. To this the bishops declined to agree, and by general consent a joint committee was appointed to sit during the recess on the matter of providing shortened services, by rubric or otherwise, this committee to report in 1880. — In a country such as ours, where the laws regulating marriage and divorce differ considerably in different states, this subject must necessarily cause much perplexity and annoyance to the clergy, unless they have some law of the Church to guide and control their action. This was long felt throughout the Protestant Episcopal Church, and in hope of some remedy or aid the matter was brought before the General Convention of 1868. A canon was enacted

forbidding a clergyman to solemnize matrimony where there is a divorced wife or husband of either party still living, with a proviso in favor of the innocent party in a divorce for the cause of adultery. In 1877 the canon was put in its present shape, as follows: ‘No minister, knowingly after due inquiry, shall solemnize the marriage of any person who has a divorced husband or wife still living, if such husband or wife has been put away for any cause arising after marriage; but this canon shall not be held to apply to the innocent party in a divorce for the cause of adultery, or to parties once divorced seeking to be united again. If any minister of this Church shall have reasonable cause to doubt whether a person desirous of being admitted to holy baptism, or to confirmation, or to the holy communion, has been married otherwise than as the Word of God and discipline of this Church allow, such minister, before receiving such person to these ordinances, shall refer the case to the bishop for his godly judgment thereupon: *provided, however*, that no minister shall, in any case, refuse the sacraments to a penitent person in imminent danger of death.’ Questions touching the facts of any case named in the former part of the canon are to be referred to the bishop, and he is required to make inquiry such as he deems expedient, and to deliver his judgment in the premises. At the same convention (1877), an effort was made to have the Table of Prohibited Degrees, contained in the English Prayer-book, inserted in the American Book of Common Prayer, but it did not meet the approval of the convention. — Some extravagant and unwarranted assertions having been made at various times as to the meaning of “regeneration,” and its effects, etc., in the offices for infant baptism, there was issued, at the General Convention of 1871, the following “declaration of the bishops in council:” “We, the subscribers, bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States, being asked, in order to the quieting of the consciences of sundry members of the said Church, to declare our conviction as to the meaning of the word *regenerate* in the offices for the ministration of baptism of infants, do declare that, in our opinion, the word *regenerate* is not there so used as to determine that a moral change in the subject of baptism is wrought in the sacrament” (signed by all the bishops present, forty-eight in number).

The movement begun in Germany in 1870-71 by Dr. Dollinger and others has been watched by the Protestant Episcopal Church with deep interest and earnest hope that it may tend ultimately to solid reform in the Continental churches now in communion with Rome. In the convention of

1871, the bishops recorded their hearty sympathy with the heroic struggle then being made for religious liberty on the part of the Old-Catholic Congress recently assembled in Munich; and in 1874 it was "*Resolved*, That this house, with renewed confidence, reiterates the expression of its sympathy with the bishop and synod of the Old-Catholic communion in Germany, and the promise of its prayers for the divine blessing and direction on their work; also, that three bishops be appointed a commission of this house to keep up fraternal correspondence with the bishop and synod, for exchange of information and consideration of overtures for reconciliation and intercommunion between sundered churches."

The course pursued by the highest legislative authority on the subject of churches or congregations established in foreign lands in communion with the Protestant Episcopal Church illustrates the views and principles on which this Church deems it right to act. Twenty years ago, the Rev. W. O. Lamson began services in Paris, specially for the benefit of Church people sojourning in or visiting that city. The General Convention of 1859 recognised the propriety and lawfulness of having Protestant Episcopal churches abroad. Congregations accordingly have been organized during the interim since 1859 in Rome, Florence, Dresden, Geneva, and Nice, making six in all at this date (1878). At the General Convention of 1877 the matter was carefully regulated by canon, which says, "It shall be lawful, under the conditions hereinafter stated, to organize a church or congregation in any foreign country (other than Great Britain and Ireland, and the colonies and dependencies thereof), and not within the limits of any foreign missionary bishop of this Church." In order to secure proper and legitimate action, and also suitable control over these foreign churches or congregations, the canon goes on to state fully the mode in which they may be organized and conducted — viz. they must recognise their allegiance to the constitution of the American Church; must produce proper certificates; must be in canonical submission to a bishop, who is in charge of all such churches and is aided by a standing committee duly appointed; and they must conform to the provisions laid down for discipline, in case it become necessary. The bishop in charge at this date (1878) is the Rt. Rev. Dr. Littlejohn, of Long Island.

An association taking its rise in Europe, and calling itself the "Evangelical Alliance," held its sixth General Conference in New York, Oct. 2-12, 1873. It was composed of delegates from various Protestant denominations, foreign as well as American, who claim to be considered "evangelical" in

the proper and precise sense of that word. Among its delegates from abroad was the Very Rev. R. Payne Smith, D.D., dean of Canterbury, who brought with him a letter of sympathy from his grace, Dr. Tait, archbishop of Canterbury. The dean took part in the work of the Alliance, as did also a very few of the American Episcopal clergy; having fraternized with the Presbyterians at a public communion service, he was called to account by Dr. Tozer (recently an English missionary bishop in Africa, and just then on a visit to New York), and was censured through the papers of the day. The assistant bishop of Kentucky, Dr. Cummins, likewise joined in this irregular service, and thereby foreshadowed what soon after took place — viz. the commencement of the schism to which his name has been attached. He had become greatly dissatisfied with the state of affairs in the Protestant Episcopal Church; he was impressed with the fact, as he esteemed it, that this Church is too exclusive and in continual danger of going over to Rome, and so he made up his mind to abandon it to its fate and set up a new organization of his own, a sort of half-and-half Episcopal and Presbyterian arrangement. Under date of Nov. 10, 1873, he addressed a letter to bishop Smith, his diocesan, in which he enumerated various reasons or causes for the course he had resolved upon. He declared that his conscience was burdened with being compelled to officiate as bishop in ritualistic churches in Kentucky; that he had lost all hope of seeing eradicated from the Church's standards and services sacerdotalism and ritualism; that he was much hurt at being blamed for sharing in the service above alluded to in a Presbyterian place of worship, and that, consequently, he had determined to transfer his "work and office" to another sphere. Dr. Cummins was entirely right in abandoning the Church if he could not stay in it with a clear conscience, and labor in it in accordance with his solemn vows at ordination, one of which was especially, "with all faithful diligence to banish and drive away from the Church all erroneous and strange doctrine contrary to God's Word." Inasmuch, however, as he had abandoned his post, and was soon after degraded from the ministry, he had no "office" to carry with him, though he assumed that he had, and undertook to act as a bishop when he was no longer a bishop. Bishop Smith of Kentucky (who was also senior bishop), on receiving Dr. Cummins's letter, immediately instituted proceedings in accordance with the canon; Dr. Cummins was at once suspended from all exercise of the ministry; and the six months of grace allowed for retraction having passed away, the formal deposition took place June 24, 1874 (ratified afterwards

in full House of Bishops at General Convention in October, 1874). *SEE REFORMED EPISCOPAL CHURCH.*

The "Cheney case," as it has been called, may properly be dealt with in this connection. especially as Mr. Cheney has become quite prominent in the schismatical body which Dr. Cummins originated. The case, in substance, is as follows: The Rev. C. E. Cheney, of Christ's Church, Chicago, Ill., having mutilated the service for public baptism by omitting the words *regenerate* and *regeneration* wherever they occur, was brought to trial and suspended by bishop Whitehouse, February 18, 1871, the suspension to last until he should repent and amend. Mr. Cheney refused obedience; and the vestry of Christ's Church having invited him to continue with them, despite the sentence, he acceded to their wish. The result was that he was tried by an ecclesiastical court for contumacy, and, on the 2d of June, was finally degraded. But the vestry continuing to hold on to the property of Christ's Church, contrary to law and justice, Mr. Cheney remained where he was, until he joined the followers of Dr. Cummins and his movement. The question of the right to the property being a very serious one, as involving the whole subject of the right of religious bodies to hold property and prevent its alienation, the case of Christ's Church, Chicago, was carried into the courts, where, in accordance with precedent in like cases, it was decided in favor of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the diocese of Illinois. Not satisfied with this, the parties interested in getting possession of the church had the case taken by appeal to the Supreme Court of the state, where, early in 1878, singularly enough, the decision of the lower court was reversed, and judgment was given in favor of the vestry and congregation as against the diocese. So far as this particular piece of property is concerned, the matter is of no great importance; but the principle involved is of the gravest consequence. It has been decided, over and over again, that all ecclesiastical organizations shall possess the power to be governed by their own laws, so long as those laws do not interfere with the established law of the land; and, consequently, that all property belongs, of right, to those who adhere to and sustain the laws and principles of their respective organizations. If church property, by the action of vestries and congregations, call be legally diverted from its rightful ownership, in the way in which this in Chicago has been taken away from the Church, then there is no tenure of property anywhere which is safe. The subject has aroused attention among other Christian bodies, who are quite as much interested as the Protestant Episcopal Church can

be in the fundamental question at issue. It is to be hoped that the Supreme Court of the United States will be called upon to interpose, and settle fully and clearly a point of so great moment to all Christians or religious associations of every name.

In regard to the "provincial system," so called, we may briefly state that, as early as 1850, a motion was made in the House of Bishops by bishop Delancey to appoint a committee of five bishops, five clergymen, and five laymen, "to report to the next triennial General Convention on the expediency of arranging the dioceses, according to geographical position, into four provinces, to be designated the Eastern, Northern, Southern, and Western Provinces, and to be united under a General Convention or Council of the Provinces, having exclusive control over the Prayer-book, Articles, Offices, and Homilies of this Church, to be held once every twenty years." In 1853 no action was had, but the committee was continued, and the matter handed over to the next convention. It came up in 1856, but was indefinitely postponed by the bishops. The subject was brought up again in 1874, was warmly discussed, and again indefinitely postponed. In 1877 a preamble and resolution were offered in the House of Deputies expressing a desire to obtain "an authoritative recognition of the provincial system," and referring to the committee on canons "to inquire into the expediency of repealing the prohibition against suffragan bishops, and making such canonical provisions as will enable dioceses (just before described) to give the name and style of provincial or coprovincial bishops to all such bishops who may be elected and consecrated to assigned districts within their respective jurisdictions." The resolution was adopted; but in the House of Bishops the entire subject was again committed to a special committee, to report at the convention of 1880. There the matter stands for the present. It remains to be seen whether the Church will deem it best to adopt this system, or to continue under the arrangement now in existence. A canon was adopted in 1868 authorizing federate councils, as follows: "It is hereby declared lawful for the dioceses now existing, or hereafter to exist, within the limits of any state or commonwealth, to establish for themselves a federate convention, or council, representing such dioceses, which may deliberate and decide upon the common interests of the Church within the limits aforesaid; but before any determinate action of such convention, or council, shall be had, the powers proposed to be exercised thereby shall be submitted to the General Convention for its approval. Nothing in this canon shall be construed as forbidding any

federate council from taking such action as they may deem necessary to secure such legislative enactments as the common interests of the Church in the state may require." No definite action under this canon has as yet been carried into effect in any state. The subject has been discussed quite largely, and the various propositions connected with it now rest with the same committee who have the provincial system in hand and are to report in 1880.

An earnest and interesting communication to the presiding bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church was made, in 1871, by bishop Wilberforce, of Winchester, in relation to the work then commenced in England for the revision of the authorized version of the Holy Scriptures. At the General Convention held the same year, it was, in the House of Bishops, "*Resolved*, That the Rt. Rev. the Presiding Bishop be, and hereby is, requested to return to the Rt. Rev. the Lord Bishop of Winchester a courteous and brotherly acknowledgment of his communication relating to a revision of the English of the Holy Scriptures, stating that this house, having had no part in originating or organizing the said work of revision, is not at present in a condition to deliver any judgment respecting it, and at the same time expressing the disposition of this house to consider with candor the work undertaken by the Convocation of Canterbury, whenever it shall have been completed and its results laid before them." The attitude thus taken by the bishops in behalf of the Church is one of cautious reserve, but perhaps not too much so, considering the importance of the subject.

The Protestant Episcopal Church having made considerable progress in Hayti (numbering eleven clergy in 1874), and needing episcopal supervision and aid, was supplied with a bishop, under the arrangement of a "Covenant" entered into with the Church in that republic, and the Rev. Dr. J. T. Holly was consecrated as first bishop, in November, 1874. The terms of the covenant made it the duty of the Church in the United States to extend its nursing care to the Church in Hayti during its early growth and development; and four bishops, with the bishop of Hayti, were constituted a commission to take episcopal charge of the Church in Hayti, and secure its maintenance of the doctrine, worship, and discipline of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States, until such time as there should be three bishops resident in Hayti. and exercising jurisdiction in the Church there. When that time arrives, this Church will cease from all further charge or care of the Haytian Church.

The General Convention of 1877 met in Boston, Mass., on Oct. 3 for the first time that it met in that city since its organization after the civil war. It was very largely attended, and was marked by a spirit of good-will and earnest effort to promote in every way the interests of Christ's kingdom here on earth. There were no specially exciting topics on hand (as ritualism, etc.); and the action of the convention, so far as our present purpose is concerned, can be summed up in brief space. Probably the most important step taken was the reorganization of the Domestic and Foreign Missionary Society. Heretofore there had been a Board of Missions (a very large and rather cumbrous body), appointed triennially, and acting in the respective departments at home and abroad. After much discussion, the following canon was adopted: "Constitution of the Domestic and Foreign Missionary Society of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America, as established in 1820, and since amended at various times.

**"ART. I.** This society shall be denominated," etc.

**"ART. II** This society shall be considered as comprehending all persons who are members of this Church.

**"ART. III.** There shall be a Board of Missions of such society, composed of the bishops of this Church, and the members for the time being of the House of Deputies of this Church, bishops and deputies sitting apart as in General Convention, or together when they shall so decide. The Board of Missions thus constituted shall convene on the third day of the session of the General Convention, and shall sit from time to time as the business of the board shall demand.

**"ART. IV.** There shall be a Board of Managers, comprising all the bishops as *meinbeis ex officio*, and fifteen presbyters and fifteen laymen, to be appointed by the Board of Missions at every triennial meeting of the General Convention, who shall have the management of the general missions of this Church, and shall remain in office until their successors are chosen, and shall have power to fill any vacancies that may occur in their number. Eight clerical and eight lay members shall constitute a quorum. This board shall, during the recess of the convention, exercise all the corporate powers of the Domestic and Foreign Missionary Society. The Board of Managers shall report to the General Convention, constituted as a Board of Missions, on or before the third day of the session of the General Convention



“**ART. V.** The Board of Managers is authorized to form, from its own members, a committee for domestic missions and a committee for foreign missions, and such other committees as it may deem desirable to promote special missionary work, and is also authorized to appoint such officers as shall be needful for carrying on the work.

“**ART. VI.** The Board of Managers is intrusted with power to establish and regulate such missions as are not placed under episcopal supervision, and to enact all bylaws which it may deem necessary for its own government and for the government of its committees: *provided always* that, in relation to organized dioceses and missionary jurisdictions having bishops, the appropriations shall be made in gross to such dioceses and missionary jurisdictions, to be disbursed by the local authorities thereof. The board shall notify to the several bishops the gross sum so appropriated, and those bishops shall regulate the number of mission stations, appoint the missionaries, and assign to them their stipends, with the approval of the Board of Managers.

“**ART. VII.** No person shall be appointed a missionary who is not at the time a minister of the Protestant Episcopal Church of regular standing; but nothing in this section precludes the committees from making pecuniary appropriations in aid of missions under the care of other churches in communion with this Church, or of employing laymen or women, members of this Church, to do missionary work.

“**ART. VIII.** The Board of Managers is authorized to promote the formation of auxiliary missionary associations, whose contributions, as well as those specially appropriated by individuals, shall be received and paid in accordance with the wish of the donors, when expressed in writing. It shall be the duty of the Board of Managers to arrange for public missionary meetings, to be held at the same time and place as the General Convention, and at such other times and places as may be determined upon, to which all auxiliaries approved by the Board of Managers may send one clerical and one lay delegate.

“**ART. IX.** This constitution may be altered or amended at any time by the General Convention of this Church. All canons, and all action by or under the authority of the General Convention, so far as inconsistent with the provisions of this canon and such amended constitution, are hereby repealed: *provided always* that nothing herein shall in any

manner impair or affect any corporate rights of the said society, or any vested right whatever. This canon shall take effect immediately.”

The principal and immediate effect of this reorganization was, on the part of the Board of Managers, a resolution to reduce central expenses connected with the mission work. Thus the department of home missions to colored people was assigned to the care of the committee on domestic missions; a very considerable reduction of expenses was made in carrying on the work among the Indians; several officers were dispensed with, and a general reduction of salaries took place, the result being a saving of some \$12,000 per annum. It deserves also to be stated here that the American Church Missionary Society, the especial agency of those of the clergy and laity who declined in former years to act in conjunction with the Board of Missions, now acceded to the wish long before expressed by the board. The society continued its organization as a society; the work in Mexico, which had been very largely sustained by it, was handed over to the foreign committee; and it was resolved that, in general, its members should hereafter act in concert with the Board of Managers of the newly organized Domestic and Foreign Missionary Society of the Protestant Episcopal Church. This was deemed a happy resolve on their part, and excellent results are expected to follow in consequence.

For some years past there has been a growing desire to add greater effectiveness to the labors of godly and devoted women in the Church. The matter was brought up at the General Convention of 1874, but no action was obtained. In 1877 it came again before the convention, and a canon of “Deaconesses or Sisters” was proposed. After much discussion, however, the convention, apparently not feeling quite sure of its ground, refused to pass the proposed canon, and the following resolution was adopted: “That it be referred to a joint committee of three bishops, three clerical and three lay deputies, to inquire and report to the next General Convention what legislation may be necessary and expedient for the authorization and regulation of women working in this Church under the name of deaconess or sister.” Thus the matter lies over till 1880.

As the Church of England recently adopted a new Lectionary, it was deemed advisable by the convention of 1877 to place this revised Table of Lessons for Sundays and holydays before the Protestant Episcopal Church. Accordingly, it was formally resolved by both houses that the Lectionary be permitted to be used until the next General Convention. This Table,

therefore, not only of Lessons for Sundays and holydays, but also of Daily Lessons, and Lessons for Lent and for Ember Days and Rogation Days, is allowed to be used by any clergyman in place of those in the calendar in the Prayer-book, and a copy has been sent to every clergyman of the Protestant Episcopal Church. Whether it will be found to be so great an improvement upon the existing Table of Lessons as has been supposed by many may be doubted. The trial, however, of three years will lead to some settled agreement upon a matter so largely affecting the question of how to obtain the greatest edification in the reading of Holy Scripture in the public worship of the Church.

At the close of the convention of 1877 a joint resolution was adopted, which is worthy of being quoted in this connection, inasmuch as it shows the spirit and desire of this Church in regard to the very important as well as difficult subject of public-school education:

**“Resolved,** That it, is the solemn conviction of this General Convention, in both houses, that it is the duty of the clergy and laity of the Church to take, so far as the opportunity is afforded them, an active interest in the public schools provided by the state for the purpose of extending the important benefits of a secular education to all our citizens, and of diffusing side by side with these as much of religious influence and instruction as is possible; to supplement them with thorough Christian teaching else-where, and to add proper Church schools and institutions for the whole, and more complete work of education, wherever they are needed and the means for their support can be commanded;

**“Resolved,** That, with the concurrence of the House of Deputies, a joint committee, consisting of two bishops, two presbyters, and two laymen, be appointed to consider this whole matter during the recess of the convention, to collect facts and prepare suggestions for the next General Convention, and to promote, by any means deemed advisable, the general work of Christian education.”

**II. *Fundamental Principles, Constitution, Government, etc.*** — From what has already been stated, it is clear that the Protestant Episcopal Church, while holding in common with other Christians evangelical doctrines — as the incarnation, the divinity of our Lord, the atonement, the inspiration of Holy Scripture, salvation through faith in Christ, and all such like — at the

same time takes the ground that it is the American branch of the “one holy Catholic Church” spoken of in the Nicene Creed. It was planted on these Western shores, under God’s good providence, to be what it aims to be — the National Church of the United States. It is a historical Church. It traces its lineage through the Church of England directly back to the apostles of our Lord; and it gives, as its deliberate judgment, that “it is evident unto all men, diligently reading Holy Scripture and ancient authors, that from the apostles’ time there have been these orders of ministers in Christ’s Church—bishops, priests, and deacons.” It is not a new or recently formed denomination, and in this respect differs from the great bulk of Protestant Christian bodies, whatever titles they may give to their respective organizations. Its creed is the same creed which has been in use substantially in the same form since the very beginning — viz. that which is commonly called the Apostles’ Creed and the Nicene Creed as finally set forth by the General Councils in the 4th century, and received everywhere and by all throughout the Catholic Church. Its liturgy is the very concentration of the deep piety, soundness in the faith, earnestness, zeal, and fervor of the wise and holy and good of all the early as well as later ages; and its services of prayer and praise, combining the use of this liturgy with the continual and frequent reading of Holy Scripture in men’s ears, are in the truest and highest sense of the word evangelical, and calculated to meet all the longings of the pious soul for spiritual communion with God our Father, through our Lord Jesus Christ, and through the quickening energy of the Holy Ghost.\*

\*This statement of course represents our contributor’s opinion; but the paragraph contains several points upon which much might be said on both sides. — ED.

The position of the Protestant Episcopal Church relatively to Protestantism, on the one hand, and Romanism, on the other, is somewhat peculiar, but yet clearly marked out and defined. It cannot, consistently at least, recognise the validity of the ministry of the great body of Protestant denominations, whether Presbyterian or Congregational, for it distinctly enunciates that the only lawful ministry is that in the three orders. Hence it cannot have communion with them, or interchange of services, or union of action in undertaking to spread the Gospel throughout the world. It recognises, it is true, the validity of the episcopate in the Roman Catholic Church, but at the same time it positively and unqualifiedly repudiates the errors in doctrine and worship of that corrupt Church, not only in its own

proper home in Italy, but also wherever, in violation of the ancient canons, it has spread itself. The Protestant Episcopal Church has no sympathy with, but is in direct antagonism to, the claims of Rome in regard to the denial of the sufficiency of Holy Scripture for salvation, transubstantiation, sacrifice of the mass, purgatory, celibacy of the clergy, elevation of the Virgin Mary into a sort of goddess to be worshipped, the absolute supremacy of the pope by divine right over all the world in civil as well as religious matters, etc. Hence it cannot act in any concert with the Roman Church, or further its plans and purposes in any wise.

The constitution, framed for the purpose of uniting the Church in working together as one body, we give in full. It was adopted in October, 1789, and has remained the same ever since, with the exception of a few alterations which became necessary in consequence of the growth of the Church, the increase of the episcopate, and the formation of several dioceses within the limits of the larger and more populous states.

**“ART. I.** There shall be a General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America on the first Wednesday in October in every third year, from the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and forty-one, and in such place as shall be determined by the convention; and in case there shall be an epidemic disease, or any other good cause to render it necessary to alter the place fixed on for any such meeting of the convention, the presiding bishop shall have it in his power to appoint another convenient place (as near as may be to the place so fixed on) for the holding of such convention: and special meetings may be called at other times, in the manner hereafter to be provided for; and this Church, in a majority of the dioceses which shall have adopted this Constitution, shall be represented before they shall proceed to business, except that the representation from two dioceses shall be sufficient to adjourn; and in all business of the convention freedom of debate shall be allowed.

**“ART. II.** The Church in each diocese shall be entitled to a representation of both the clergy and the laity. Such representation shall consist of not more than four clergymen and four laymen, communicants in this Church, residents in the diocese, and chosen in the manner prescribed by the convention thereof; and in all questions, when required by the clerical or lay representation from any diocese, each order shall have one vote; and the majority of suffrages by

dioceses shall be conclusive in each order, provided such majority comprehend a majority of the dioceses represented in that order. The concurrence of both orders shall be necessary to constitute a vote of the convention. If the convention of many diocese should neglect or decline to appoint clerical deputies, or if they should neglect or decline to appoint, lay deputies, or if many of those of either order appointed should neglect to attend, or be prevented by sickness or any other accident, such diocese shall nevertheless be considered as duly represented by such deputy or deputie as may attend, whether lay or clerical. And if, through the neglect of the convention of any of the churches which shall have adopted, or may hereafter adopt, this Constitution, no deputies, either lay or clerical, should attend at any General 'Convention, the Church in such diocese shall nevertheless be found by the acts of such convention.

**“ART. III.** The bishops of this Church, when there shall be three or more, shall, whenever general conventions are held, from a separate house, with a right to originate and propose acts for the concurrence of the House of Deputies, composed of clergy and laity; and when any proposed act shall have passed the House of Deputies, the same shall be transmitted to the House of Bishops, who shall have a negative thereupon; and all acts of the convention shall be authenticated by both houses. And in all cases, the House of Bishops shall signify to the convention their approbation or disapprobation, (the latter with their reasoning in writing) within three days after the proposed act shall have been reported to them for concurrence; and in failure thereof, it shall have the operation of a law. But until there shall be three or more bishop's, as aforesaid, any bishop attending a General Convention shall be a member *ex officio*, and shall vote with the clerical deputies of the diocese to which he belongs; and a bishop shall then preside.

**“ART. IV.** The bishop or bishops in every diocese shall be chosen agreeably to such rules as shall be fixed by the convention of that diocese and every bishop of this Church shall confine the exercise of his episcopal office to his proper diocese, unless requested to ordain, or confirm, or perform any other act, of the episcopal office, by any Church destitute of a bishop.

**“ART. V.** A Protestant Episcopal Church in any of the United States, or any territory thereof, not now represented, may, at any time

hereafter, be admitted on acceding to this Constitution; and a new diocese, to be formed from time or more existing dioceses, may be admitted under the following restrictions, viz.:

“No new diocese shall be formed or elected within the limits of any other diocese, nor shall any diocese be formed by the junction of two or more dioceses, or parts of dioceses, unless with the consent of the bishop and convention of each of the dioceses concerned, as well as of the General Convention; and such consent shall not be given by the General Convention until it has satisfactory assurance of a suitable provision for the support of the episcopate in the contemplated new diocese.

“No such new diocese, shall be formed which shall contain less than six parishes, or less than six presbyters who have been for at least one year canonically resident within the bounds of such new diocese, regularly settled in a parish or congregation, and qualified to vote for a bishop. Nor shall such new diocese be formed, if thereby any existing diocese shall be so reduced as to contain less than twelve parishes, or less than twelve presbyters who have been residing therein, and settled and qualified as above mentioned: *provided* that no city shall form more than one diocese.

“In case one diocese shall be divided into two or more dioceses, the diocesan of the diocese divided may elect the one to which he will be attached, and shall thereupon become the diocesan thereof; and the assistant bishop, if there be one, may elect the one to which he will be attached: and if it be not the one elected by the bishop, he shall be the diocesan thereof.

“Whenever the division of a diocese into two or more dioceses shall be ratified by the General Convention, each of the dioceses shall be subject to the constitution and canons of the diocese so divided, except as local circumstances may prevent, until the same may be altered in either diocese by the convention thereof. And whenever a diocese shall be formed out of two or more existing dioceses, the new diocese shall be subject to the constitution and canons of that one of the said existing dioceses to which the greater number of clergymen shall have belonged prior to the erection of such new diocese, until the same may be altered by the convention of the new diocese.

“ART. VI. The mode of trying bishops shall be provided by the General Convention. The court appointed for that purpose shall be composed of bishops only. In every diocese, the mode of trying presbyters and deacons may be instituted by the convention of the diocese. None but a bishop shall pronounce sentence of admonition, suspension, or degradation from the ministry, on any clergyman, whether bishop, presbyter, or deacon.

“ART. VII. No person shall be admitted to holy orders until he shall have been examined by the bishop and by two presbyters, and shall have exhibited such testimonials and other requisites as the canons in that case provided may direct. Nor shall any person be ordained until he shall have subscribed the following declaration:

“I do believe the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments to be the Word of God, and to contain all things necessary to salvation; and I do solemnly engage to conform to the doctrines and worship of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States.’

“No person ordained by a foreign bishop shall be permitted to officiate as a minister of this Church until he shall have complied with the canon or canons in that case provided, and have also subscribed the aforesaid declaration.

“**ART. VIII.** A Book of Common Prayer, administration of the sacraments, and other rites and ceremonies of the Church, articles of religion, and a form and manner of making, ordaining, and consecrating bishops, priests, and deacons, when established by this for a future General Convention, shall be used in the Protestant Episcopal Church in those dioceses which shall have adopted this Constitution. No alteration or addition shall be made in the Book of Common Prayer, or other offices of the Church, or the articles of religion, unless the same shall be proposed in one General Convention, and by a resolve thereof made known to the convention of every diocese, and adopted at the subsequent General Convention. *Provided, however,* that the General Convention shall have power, from time to time, to amend the Lectionary; but no act for this purpose shall be valid which is not voted for by a majority of the whole number of bishops entitled to seats in the House of Bishops, and by a majority of all the dioceses entitled to representation in the House of Deputies.



**“ART. IX.** This Constitution shall be unalterable, unless in General Convention, by the Church, in a majority of the dioceses which may have adopted the same; and all alterations shall be first proposed in one General Convention, and made known to the several diocesan conventions, before they shall be finally agreed to or ratified in the ensuing General Convention.

**“ART. X.** Bishops for foreign countries, on due application therefrom, may be consecrated, with the approbation of the bishops of this Church, or a majority of them, signified to the presiding bishop, he thereupon taking order for the same, and they being satisfied that the person designated for the office has been duly chosen and properly qualified; the Order of Consecration to be conformed, as nearly as may be, in the judgment of the bishops, to the one used in this Church. Such bishops, so consecrated, shall not be eligible to the office of diocesan or assistant bishop in any diocese in the United States, nor be entitled to a seat in the House of Bishops, nor exercise any episcopal authority in said states.”

From the constitution just given it is evident that the General Convention is the highest legislative authority in the Church, and its legislation is for the benefit of the whole Church throughout the United States. There is as yet no Court of Appeals, although it is felt that there is need of such a court. It is believed that it will ere long be constituted, so as to adjudicate upon all those matters which a body, made up as the General Convention is, cannot adequately judge or act upon. Each diocese, whether a whole state or a portion of a state, is independent of all control except that of the general laws of the Church enacted by the General Convention. Each bishop, and the clergy and laity under his jurisdiction, meet in annual convention and legislate upon all subjects which specially concern the diocese and the preaching of the Gospel within its limits. Each parish also, consisting of its rector, vestry, and congregation, is independent in its sphere of labor, subject only to the canons of the diocese and of the whole Church, and to a visitation, at least yearly, of the bishop of the diocese. Thus freedom of thought and action is secured to all, with a due and proper subordination to higher authority in all cases where higher authority must needs supervene.

The laws which regulate Church affairs are contained in the “Digest of the Canons for the Government of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States,” as passed and adopted in the general conventions from

1859 to 1877. The canons are arranged in the most methodical and approved style of legal enactments; they have been prepared by some of the ablest canonists and lawyers in the communion of the Protestant Episcopal Church, and they cover the entire ground respecting which the Church can legislate as a whole or united body. They are distributed into Four Titles, Canons of each Title, and Sections of Canons. Historical notes as to dates are added, so that any particular canon upon any subject legislated upon by the Church may be traced from its origin through all its modifications to the present time. Title I is "Of the Orders in the Ministry and of the Doctrine and Worship of the Church." There are twenty-four canons under this Title, and they cover fully and explicitly all questions relating to candidates for orders, examinations, ordination of deacons, ordination of priests, general regulation of ministers and their duties, qualifications, consecration and work of bishops, domestic and foreign missionary bishops, mode of securing an accurate view of the Church, the use of the Book of Common Prayer, etc. Title II is "Of Discipline." There are thirteen canons under this Title, relating to offences for which ministers may be tried and punished, dissolution of pastoral connection, renunciation of the ministry, abandonment of the communion of the Church by a bishop, the trial of a bishop, judicial sentences, regulations respecting the laity, etc. Title III is "Of the Organized Bodies and Officers of the Church." There are nine canons under this Title, having reference to meetings of General Convention, standing committees, trustees of the General Theological Seminary, congregations and parishes, organization of new dioceses, etc. Title IV relates to "Miscellaneous Provisions." It has four canons, in reference to repealed canons, enactment, etc. of canons, time when new canons take effect. Our limits do not admit of printing these canons in full, nor is it necessary, inasmuch as they are readily accessible to all interested in their contents.

**III. Statistics.** — As showing the steady increase and spread of the Protestant Episcopal Church, we give the bishops, clergy, and dioceses by decades since 1820, as follows:

Years	Bishops	Presbyters and Deacon	Total	Dioceses
1820	9	301	310	15
1830	11	514	525	20
1840	19	1040	1059	27
1850	32	1557	1589	29
1860	43	2113	2156	33
1870	52	2786	2838	39
1890	72	4028	4100	51

From the *Church Almanac*, we learn that in 1889 there were nearly 3800 parishes, with churches and chapels, in the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States.

Baptisms during the year (infant and adult) — 58,536

Confirmations — 38,868

Marriages — 15,830

Sunday-school teachers — 41,325

Sunday-school scholars — 376,710

Communicants — 484,059

Contributions for missionary and church purposes — \$11,468,841

Home missionary bishops nine, exercising jurisdiction in the great territories as well as several of the Western states, in Texas. and on the Pacific coast. Their salaries and travelling expenses (amounting to at least \$30,000 per annum) are paid by the domestic committee. There are over 200 missionaries at work in these fields. Foreign missionary bishops three—one in China, one in Japan, one in Africa (to which add bishop in Hayti). There are in these jurisdictions, in addition to the bishops, thirty-five other clergymen (foreign and native), together with about 200 assistants, mostly native catechists, lay readers, and teachers. The missionary work in Greece is simply educational, and is conducted by one lady, assisted by 12 native teachers. In the Mexican Church there are at work the Rev. H. C. Riley, D.D., and P. G. Hernandez (bishops elect), with four other presbyters, two ladies, and 79 lay readers. The number of communicants in foreign fields is about 4000. There are also 31 day schools with 1800 scholars, and 18 Sunday-schools with 861 scholars.

Theological seminaries and schools (in 15 dioceses and 1 missionary jurisdiction) — 16

Church colleges (in 12 dioceses and 2 missionary jurisdictions) — 14

Academic institutions (in 26 dioceses and 6 missionary jurisdictions): — 81

Other educational institutions (in 13 dioceses) — 32

Church hospitals (in 20 dioceses and 2 missionary jurisdictions) — 27

Church orphan asylums (in 20 dioceses and 2 missionary jurisdictions) — 30

Church homes (in 21 dioceses) — 34

Periodicals devoted to the interests, support, and defence of the Protestant Episcopal Church: *The Churchman* (weekly), New York; *The Southern Churchman* (weekly), Alexandria, Va.; *The Episcopal Register* (weekly), Philadelphia, Pa.; *The Standard of the Cross* (weekly), Cleveland, O.; *The Western Church* (weekly), Milwaukee, Wis.; *The Pacific Churchman* (weekly), San Francisco, Cal.; *Our Dioceses* (weekly), Detroit, Mich.; *The Spirit of Missions* (monthly), New York; *The Church Magazine* (monthly), Brooklyn, N. Y.; *The Church Eclectic* (monthly), Utica, N. Y.; *The American Church Review* (quarterly), New York.

**IV. Authorities.** — Works used in the preparation of the present article: White [Bp.], *Memoirs of the Protestant Episcopal Church* (1836, 8vo); Wilson, *Life of Bishop White* (1839, 8vo); Wilberforce [Bp.], *History of the Protestant Episcopal Church* (1849, 12mo); Anderson, *History of the Church of England in the Colonies* (1856, 3 vols. 12mo); Hawkins, *Missions of the Church of England in the North American Colonies* (1845, 8vo); Hawks, *Contributions to the Ecclesiastical History of the United States* (1836, vol. i, 8vo, *Virginia*; 1839, vol. ii, 8vo, *Maryland*); id. *Constitution and Canons of the Protestant Episcopal Church* (1841, 8vo); Sprague, *Annals of the American Pulpit [Episcopalian]* (1859, vol. v, 8vo); Coit, *Puritanism* (1845, 12mo); Hoffman [Murray], *Law of the Protestant Episcopal Church* (1850, 8vo); id. *Ecclesiastical Law in the State of New York* (1868, 8vo), and *The Ritualistic Law of the Church* (1872, 8vo); Vinton, *Canon Law and the Constitution of the Protestant Episcopal Church* (1870, 8vo); Perry [Bp.], *Handbook of the General*

*Conventions, 1785-1877* (1877, 12mo); Hawks and Perry, *Journals of General Convention from 1785 to 1853* (1861, vol. i, 8vo, with notes).\*

\*The above article was originally written for our pages by the Rev. J. A. SPENCER, D.D., of New York city, and was afterwards reprinted by its author, from advance proofs, in another work which he was then editing. We have slightly modified one or two expressions to which many of our readers might take exception. — ED.

## Protestant Episcopal Church of Ireland

Until 1871 this body formed an integral part of the United Church of England and Ireland. It is still called by a majority of its members the *Church of Ireland*. Its official title is "*The Irish Church*."

Of the first introduction of Christianity into Ireland we have written under the article IRELAND *SEE IRELAND* (q.v.). It has been shown there that the Roman Catholic Church succeeded in establishing her hierarchical power in the 12th century, and that even after the Reformation in England the Irish Church remained attached to Rome, and only by the influence of the bishop of Rome, first felt in the island through the Danes, who made their earliest settlements on the east coast at the close of the 8th century. Bishop Malachy, who filled successively several sees in Ireland, and who was full of enthusiasm for papal authority, strove hard to induce the Irish bishops to accept palls from the pope. But it was not till after his death, in 1152, that, at the Synod of Kells, the four archbishops received these honors, which, though ostensibly marks of distinction, were in reality badges of servitude, binding Ireland to the footstool of the papacy. Three years later, pope Adrian IV, the only Englishman who ever wore the triple crown, sent Henry II of England a bull, authorizing him to invade Ireland. What the papal see then thought of the religious condition of the Church of Ireland may be learned from a bull published in 1172, confirming that of 1155. The pope states the object of permitting the invasion of Ireland to be that "the filthy practices of the land may be abolished, and the barbarous nation which is called by the Christian name may, through your clemency, attain unto some decency of manners; and that when the Church of that country, which has hitherto been in a disordered state, shall have been reduced to better order, that people may by your means possess for the future the reality as well as the name of the Christian profession."

In the reign of Henry VIII., papal supremacy was abolished in Ireland, the bishops and clergy all accepting the king as head of the Church. Queen Mary re-established the pope's authority, but Elizabeth's reign gave a distinctively Reformed character to the Church. Many rebellions occurring among the native Irish during this reign, and Rome astutely throwing all her weight against England, the Reformation came to be regarded as essentially English, though the leading clergy of the time assented to the change. The pope took advantage of the anti-English feeling by sending to the island multitudes of missionary bishops and priests, who succeeded in holding the native Irish within the pale of Roman Catholicism. During the two following centuries, the Protestant Episcopal Church (to which we now give this name, as during this period the Presbyterian Church of Ireland rose to importance), suffered many vicissitudes; but by the Revolution of 1688 and the battle of the Boyne it was placed in a position of assured stability as a Protestant body. Still, the very intimate connection between the Church and the government, necessitated by the hostile elements with which both had been surrounded, had exercised upon the former a very unwholesome influence. The Church had been treated as little more than a mere department of government. "Many of the bishops, during this period, seem to have held High-Church views; and, with some bright exceptions, a general deadness in religious matters prevailed, and along with it an indisposition to tolerate dissent in any shape whatever. This deadness of religious life characterized all the churches in the reigns of Anne and the Georges, though bright examples may be cited of the contrary spirit. The names of Richardson, Atkins, and Brown may be mentioned with honor as those of clergymen who, in the early part of the 18th century, took an active interest in the work of evangelizing the native Irish through the medium of their own language. Archbishop Boulter, bishop Berkeley, and others may be noted among the members of the Episcopal bench who exhibited an earnest spirit of devotion and practical godliness. Wesley and his followers among the Methodists did much by their labors, first inside and then outside the Church, to awaken evangelical life among all ranks of the national clergy. But English influence was, during this period, too often used in a wrong direction. English clergymen were frequently thrust into the best Church livings in Ireland, and Irish bishoprics were filled with Englishmen, while the earnest parochial clergymen of the land were neglected and despised. Dean Swift's witty description of the honest clergymen nominated to Irish bishoprics being waylaid and murdered by highwaymen on Hounslow Heath, who then

seized on their 'letters patent,' came to Ireland, and got consecrated in their room, shows what was thought, in some quarters, of many of the men who, at this dark Tera, bore spiritual rule in the Church of Ireland" (Wright's *Lecture on the Church of Ireland*).

Perhaps no other Church in Christendom was so much influenced by the Wesleyan revival of religion. The evangelical leaven imparted at that time, assisted by an intense antipathy to Romanism, has spread through the whole Church, so that ritualistic and Broad-Church elements are almost unknown within its bounds. This fact is the more striking as some of the most influential prelates have been, and are, Englishmen of High-Church tendencies.

By Gladstone's disendowment act, known as the "Irish Church Act, 1869," it was provided that on and after Jan. 1, 1871, the "Church of Ireland" should cease to be established by law. A corporate body, named "The Commissioners of Church Temporalities in Ireland," was appointed, to which body were intrusted all the temporal affairs of the Church until such time as the representative body of the Church should supersede them. This corporation was endowed with extensive powers for carrying out the purposes of the act. They were freed from all restraints of the courts of law, and received all the powers and privileges of the High Court of Chancery. The Commissioners were ordered to ascertain the amount of yearly income which any person, lay or clerical, derived from the Church, and "to pay each year to every such holder an annuity equal to the amount of yearly income so ascertained." This annuity was to continue, even though the annuitant should become disabled from attending to the duties of his office, "by age, sickness, or permanent infirmity, or by any cause other than his own wilfull default." All laws were repealed which would hamper the Church in exercising the utmost freedom in self-government. The ecclesiastical laws existing at the time of the disestablishment, including "articles, doctrines, rites, rules, discipline, and ordinances," were to continue binding on the members of the Church, as if subsisting "by contract;" except that nothing in these laws "should be construed to confer on any bishop, etc., any coercive jurisdiction whatsoever." It was also provided that no change should be made in the laws of the Church, so as to deprive any person of his annuity.

By a convention of bishops and representatives of the Church, held in Dublin in 1870, a constitution was agreed upon. The preamble asserts a

belief in the inspiration of the Bible, and a determination to preserve the “three orders of bishops, priests or presbyters, and deacons in the sacred ministry.” It contains also a protest “against all those innovations in doctrine and worship which, at the Reformation, this Church did disown and reject.”

The supreme court of the Church is the *General Synod*. It consists of three orders, viz., bishops, clergy, and laity. It is also divided into two houses, viz., the House of Bishops and the House of Representatives; the former consisting of all archbishops and bishops, the latter of 208 representatives of the clergy and 416 representatives of the laity, all these to be elected for three years. “The bishops shall vote separately from the representatives; and no question shall be deemed to have been carried, unless there be in its favor a majority of the bishops present, if they desire to vote, and a majority of the clerical and lay representatives present, voting conjointly or by orders; provided always that if a question affirmed by a majority of the clerical or lay representatives, voting conjointly or by orders, but rejected by a majority of the bishops, shall be reaffirmed at the next ordinary session of the General Synod by not less than two thirds of the clerical and lay representatives, it shall be deemed to be carried, unless it be negated by not less than two-thirds of the then entire existing order of bishops.” The General Synod has power to alter, abrogate, or enact canons, and to control any regulation made by a diocesan synod, so far as may be necessary to provide against the admission of any principle inexpedient for the common interest of the Church.

The *Diocesan Synod* consists of the bishop, of the beneficed and licensed clergymen of the diocese, and at least one layman, called synodsmen, for each parish in the diocese. The bishop, clergy, and laity sit and debate and vote together; but six members of either order may call, upon any question, for a vote by orders. If the bishop dissent from the other two orders with respect to any proposed act of the synod, all action thereupon is suspended until the next annual meeting of the synod; and should such act be then reaffirmed by two thirds of each of the other orders, and the bishop still dissent, it is submitted to the General Synod, whose decision is final.

The representative body consists of the archbishops and bishops, of one clerical and two lay members for each diocese, and of such number of other persons elected as shall be equal to the number of dioceses. This body is a Board of Trustees, holding the temporalities of the Church.



There is a Committee of Patronage in each diocese, consisting of the bishop, one lay and two clerical members. In each parish there are three persons named parochial nominators. When an incumbent is to be appointed, the Committee of Patronage and the parochial nominators form a Board of Nomination, presided over by the bishop, who has an independent and also a casting vote. This board nominates a clergyman to the bishop, who, if he decline to institute the nominee, must give him, if so required, his reasons in writing for so declining. Bishops are nominated by the diocesan synods, and confirmed by the Bench of Bishops.

The disestablished Church has already taken advantage of its freedom to revise carefully the Book of Common Prayer. Some extracts from the preface to the Revised Prayer-book, to be printed during this year (1878), will show the object and animus of the revision: "When this Church of Ireland ceased to be established by law, and thereupon some alteration in our public liturgy became needful, it was earnestly desired by many that occasion should be taken for considering what changes the lapse of years or exigency of our present times and circumstances might have rendered expedient." "We now afresh declare that the posture of kneeling prescribed to all communicants is not appointed for any purpose of adoration of Christ's body and blood under the veils of bread and wine, but only for a signification of our humble and grateful acknowledgment, and for the avoiding of such profanation and disorder as might ensue if some such reverent and uniform posture were not enjoined." "In the Office for Visitation of the Sick we have deemed it fitting that absolution should be pronounced to penitents in the form appointed in the Office for the Holy Communion." The portions of the Apocrypha which were in the Table of Lessons have been expunged, and the rubric has been omitted which directed the use on certain days of the Athanasian Creed.

The following are the numerical statistics of the Irish Protestant Episcopal Church as compared with other religious denominations in the island. The total number of clergymen is about 1900.

### **Picture for Protestant Episcopal Church of Ireland**

The only divinity school in Ireland available for theological students of the Protestant Episcopal Church is that of Trinity College. The Church has no official voice in the management of this school, but until very lately no one could obtain a theological degree from it without signing the Thirty-nine Articles. In Nov., 1876, a statute was passed by the senate of the university

abolishing this test and admitting even laymen to degrees. The board of Trinity College has also lately provided that any Christian Church of the land may establish a theological faculty alongside that of the Protestant Episcopal Church.

The act of disestablishment technically decreed also disendowment, but by far the greater part of the endowment of the Church was absorbed by the compensations granted. Most of those who were entitled to annuities commuted their income, or compounded with the ecclesiastical commissioners for a fixed sum, so arranged as to leave a large capital sum for church endowment, and this endowment was augmented by lame donations, amounting, in the first five years of disestablishment, to £1,180,108. As an example of composition, the bishop of Derry was entitled to an annual income of £13,781. Upon compounding, he received £101,493, leaving a balance to the Endowment Fund of the Church of £100,288. The present endowment of the Church is upwards of £7,000,000.

See Dr. Todd, *St. Patrick*; Killen, *Ecclesiastical History of Ireland*; King, *Church History of Ireland*; Froude, *History of England*; Godkin, *Ireland and her Churches*; pamphlets by Dr. C. H. H. Wright, on *The Divinity School of Trinity College*, *The Church of Ireland*, etc.; *The Irish Ecclesiastical Gazette, from 1871 to 1878*; *The Irish Church Directory*; Lanigan, *Ecclesiastical History of Ireland*. (G. C. J.)

### Protestant Episcopal Free-Church Association

This body, formed in 1875 within the pale of the Protestant Episcopal Church, advocates the freeseat system for houses of worship, and has grown to such large proportions in the short time of its existence that it now goes beyond its originally intended mission and assumes the work of Church extension also, i.e. it affords help to feeble churches, provided they do not rent or sell pews. The secretary of the society reported at its third annual meeting (May 13, 1878) 285 clerical, 13 life, and 126 annual contributors. Twenty-one of the bishops of the Church are patrons.

### Protestant Friends

*SEE FREE CONGREGATIONS; SEE RATIONALISM.*

## Protestant Methodists

*SEE METHODISM; SEE METHODIST PROTESTANTS.*

## Protestant Union of Germany

is a body composed of the members of the Evangelical Protestant Church. It has been in existence since 1863. Its aim is the complete separation of the Church from the State; a synodical Church system for all Protestant Germany; the union of religion and intellectual culture, faith and science, i.e. the advancement of the Christian religion in harmony with free investigations and ever-advancing intellectual culture, and the warning against everything hierarchical as well as against the radical denials of religion. It was projected in 1863 in the duchy of Baden, and in 1864 its headquarters were established at Heidelberg where the annual meetings of the Union, called the *Protestantentag*, were held and all business of the body was transacted. At present the headquarters of the Union are at Berlin, and since the unification of Germany the purpose is to organize a German National Church, for which the State shall apportion a tax upon every member and recognise the organism by collecting the tax so obtained. Every person belonging to this Church of the nation is to enjoy liberty of thought and utterance, giving even greater breadth of freedom than the members of the Anglican communion enjoy. See Dr. Lindsay's *Letter from Germany* in *Zion's Herald*, Boston, Oct. 5, 1876. *SEE PRUSSIA.* (J. H. W.)

## Protestantentag

*SEE PROTESTANT UNION OF GERMANY.*

## Protestantism

is the advocacy of the authority of the Sacred Scriptures above and without any other. The Romanist and Jew hold to *tradition* (q.v.) as having the warrant of authority, but the Protestants refuse to yield to any arguments not clearly and directly drawn from the sacred Word of God. There arise, of course, various questions as to what this Word is, and how it is to be interpreted. In regard to the former, the Protestant holds that the Holy Bible is composed only of the canonical writings of the Old and New Testament, *SEE CANON*, while the Roman Catholics also ascribe canonical authority to the so-called Apocrypha of the Old Testament. *SEE*

**APOCRYPHA.** The right of interpretation the Roman Catholic Church claims to be hers alone, while the Protestant Church concedes this right in a stricter sense to every one who possesses the requisite gifts and attainments, but in a more comprehensive sense to every Christian who seeks after salvation, proceeding upon the principle that Scripture is its own interpreter according to the *analogia fidei*. **SEE INTERPRETATION.** With this is connected the assumption of the Roman Catholic Church that the Vulgate version, which it sanctions, is to be preferred to all other versions as the authentic one, and is thus to a certain extent of equal importance with the original, while Protestants regard the original only as authentic.

The object of Protestant Christianity is freedom from that ecclesiasticism which the primitive Church was unacquainted with, and which owes its origin and development to the mediaeval Church. "The Reformation, viewed in its most general character," says Ullmann (*Reformers before the Reformulation*, 1, 13), "was the reaction of Christianity as Gospel against Christianity as law." It is therefore inconsistent for Anglican High-churchmen and their followers on this side of the Atlantic to assert that Protestantism is simply *negative*, It is positive as well, for it not only discards one interpretation of Christianity, but espouses another. It denies the right of the Church to stand in authority of the individual, but it gives a circumscribed and well-defined liberty to the individual — not absolute license. "The liberty which the Reformers prized first and chiefly," says Prof. Fisher (*Hist. of the Ref* p. 9), "was not the abstract right to choose one's creed without constraint. but a liberty that flows from the enforced appropriation by the soul of truth in harmony with its inmost nature and its conscious necessities." The nature of Protestantism, the essence of Protestantism, the principle of Protestantism, is freedom, but freedom only from the restraints of man, from a tyranny of conscience, from all systems which had( previous to the great Reformation been imposed upon man without any divine warrant. It is freedom on the basis of obedience to God and to his holy Word. It is that freedom which consists in the cheerful and ready obedience to the divine Word and to the divine Will. It is the freedom of the republic, and not the license of the commune; it is the liberty of common-sense, and not the enthusiasm of the idealist. "The principle of Protestantism," says Dr. Schaff, "is evangelical freedom in Christ, its aim to bring every soul into direct relation to Christ. Romanism puts the Church first and Christ next; Protestantism reverses the order.

Romanism says, Where the Church is (meaning thereby the papal organization), there is Christ; Protestantism says, Where Christ is, there is the Church; Romanism says, Where the Catholic tradition is, there is the Bible and the infallible rule of faith; Protestantism says, Where the Bible is, there is the true tradition and the infallible rule of faith; Romanism says, Where good works are, there are faith and justification; Protestantism says, Where faith is, there are justification and good works. Romanism throws Mary and the saints between Christ and the believer; Protestantism goes directly to the Saviour. Romanism proceeds from the visible Church (the papacy) to the invisible Church; Protestantism from the invisible Church, (the true body of Christ) to the visible; Romanism works from without, and from the general to the particular; Protestantism from within, and from the individual to the general. Protestantism is a protest against the tyranny of man on the basis of the authority of God. It proclaims the Bible to be the only infallible rule of Christian faith and practice, and teaches justification by grace alone, as apprehended by a living faith. It holds up Christ as all in all, whose word is all-sufficient to teach, whose grace is all-sufficient to save. Its mission is to realize the universal priesthood and kingship of all believers by bringing them all into direct union and fellowship with Christ” (*Christian Intelligencer*, Jan. 14, 1869). Dr. Hagenbach objects to this reduction of Protestantism to one fundamental principle, and offers *three* as its basis — viz. (1) the *real* principle, living faith in Christ; (2) the *formal* principle, the authority of the Scriptures as a rule of faith; (3) the *social* principle, forming a community, of which Christ is the individual head, and of which all the members are priests unto God (see *Theol. Studien t. Kritiken*, January, 1854, art. 1). In this division every essential characteristic of Protestantism seems to have been considered by this master theologian.

Romanists charge against Protestantism that its resistance of dogmatism makes it synonymous with scepticism (q.v.) and unbelief. This is very unfair. Protestantism reposes implicitly on what it believes to be the divine authority of the inspired writers of the books of Holy Scripture; whereas scepticism and unbelief acknowledge no authority external to the mind, no communication superior to reason and science. Protestantism, although by its attitude of independence it seems similar to the other two systems, is really separated by a difference of kind, and not merely of degree. “The spiritual earnestness which characterized the Reformation,” says Farrar (*Crit. Hist. of Free Thought*, p. 7), “prevented the changes in religious

belief from developing into scepticism proper; and the theology of the Reformation is accordingly an example of defence and reconstruction as well as of revulsion." Protestantism was a form of free thought, but only in the sense of a return from human authority to that of Scripture. It was equally a reliance on a historic religion, equally an appeal to the immemorial doctrine of the Church with Roman Catholicism, but it conceived that the New Testament itself contained a truer source than tradition for ascertaining the apostolic declaration of it.

Some writers — Romanists, and even some within the Protestant fold, but hardly of the faith — have declared "Protestantism a failure." They have attempted to show that its territory is principally within the limits it acquired in the period of the great Reformation, and that its prospects for extension are lessening every day. Macaulay has treated this question in a spirited essay, in which with certain reasons which are pertinent and valuable is coupled a singular denial that the knowledge of religion is progressive, or at all dependent upon the general enlightenment of the human mind. Apart from his paradoxical speculation on this last point, his statement of the grounds of the arrest of the progress of Protestantism, though eloquent and valuable, is quite incomplete. The principal causes of this arrest have been thus ably pointed out by Prof. Fisher (*Hist. of the Ref.* p. 415 sq.):

- (1.) The ferment that attended the rise of Protestantism led to a crystallizing of parties, and thus incited to raise a *barrier* in the way of its further progress.
- (2.) The political arrangements which were adopted in different countries, in consequence of the religious division, all tended to confine Protestantism within the limits which it had early attained.
- (3.) The want of the spirit of propagandism. Romanism is always aggressive; Protestantism, generally speaking, maintains only that which comes within its sphere.
- (4.) The counter-reformation of the Romish Church and its avowed determination to remove gross abuses have stayed but too often the step of aggression from the Protestants.
- (5.) The disjointed condition of Protestantism; its constant warfarings of brother with brother; the absence of a tolerant spirit for difference of

opinion in non-essentials, have facilitated the advance of their common enemy, still further strengthened by perfect organization.

(6.) The inability of Protestantism to turn to the best account the wide diversity of talents and character which is constantly developing in evangelical Christianity. In Romanism Ignatius and Bellarmine can labor side by side. In Protestantism Wesley and Whitefield must become the founders of new sects.

(7.) The disposition of races. Montesquieu, in his *Esprit des Loix*, remarks that Protestantism is prevalent in Northern, Catholicism in Southern Europe, and explains most judiciously, “C’est que les peuples du nord out et auront toujours un esprit d’indépendance et de liberte, que n’ont pas les peuples du midi.”

If Protestantism be a failure, it has its failure in its *successes*. These are well set forth in the following extract from Prof. Fisher’s address at the Evangelical Alliance Congress in 1874:

“(1.) Its whole character is favorable to civil and religious freedom and the promotion of the multiplied advantages which freedom brings in its train. Under Roman Catholicism man was deprived of his personal rights; under Protestantism he regained them. The progress of civilization, in the long course of history, is marked by the growing respect paid to the rights of the individual, and the ampler room afforded for the unfolding of his powers, and for the realizing of his aspirations. There was something imposing in those huge despotisms — Egypt, Assyria, Balyon, Persia — in which a multitude of human beings were welded together under an absolute master. Such empires were an advance upon a primitive state of things, where every man’s hand was against his neighbor. Yet they were a crude form of crystallization, and they were intrinsically weak. The little cities of Greece, with their freer political life, and the larger scope which they allowed for the activity and the culture of the individual — communities of citizens — proved more than a match for the colossal might of the East. Among the Greeks and Romans, however, although governments of law had supplanted naked force, the State was supreme, and to the State the individual must yield an exclusive allegiance. It was a great gain when the Christian Church arose, and when the individual became conscious of an allegiance of the soul to a higher kingdom — an allegiance which did not supersede his loyalty to

the civil authority, but limited while it sanctioned this obligation. But the Church itself at length erected a supremacy over the individual inconsistent with the free action of reason and conscience, and even stretched that supremacy so far as to dwarf and overshadow civil society. It reared a theocracy, and subjected everything to its unlimited sway. The Reformation gave back to the individual his proper autonomy. The result is a self-respect, an intellectual activity, a development of inventive capacity and of energy of character, which give rise to such achievements in science, in the field of political action, and in every work where self-reliance and personal force are called for, as would be impossible under the opposite system. In the period immediately following the Reformation signal proofs were afforded of this truth. The little states of Holland, for example, proved their ability to cope with the Spanish empire, to gain their independence, and to acquire an opulence and a culture which recalled the best days of the Grecian republics. They beat back their invaders from their soil, and sent forth their victorious navies upon every sea, while at home they were educating the common people, fostering science and learning, and building up nunivel sites famous throughout Europe. England, in the age of Elizabeth, proved that the native vigor of her people was reinforced in a remarkable degree by the stimulus derived from the peculiar genius of the Protestant religion. It was the period when she was acquiring her naval ascendancy; the period, likewise, of Shakespeare, Bacon, and Raleigh. Who can doubt that the United States of America are, not indeed wholly, but in great part, indebted for their position, as contrasted with that of Mexico and the political communities of South America, to this expansion of the power of the individual, which is the uniform and legitimate fruit of Protestant principles?

“(2.) The spirit of Protestantism favors universal education. The lay Christian, who is to read and interpret the Scriptures, and to take part in the administration of government in the Church, must not be an illiterate person. Knowledge, mental enlightenment, under the Protestant system, are indispensable. The weight of personal responsibility for the culture of his intellectual and spiritual nature which rests on every individual makes education a matter of universal concern. Far more has been done in Protestant than in Roman Catholic countries for the instruction of the whole people. It is enough to refer



to the common-school system of Holland and of New England, and to Protestant Germany, to show how natural it is for the disciples of the Reformation to provide for this great interest of society.

“The free circulation of the Bible in Protestant lands has disseminated an instrument of intellectual as well as of religious improvement, the good effect of which is immeasurable. As a repository of history, biography, poetry, ethics, as well as a monitor to the conscience and a guide to heaven, the Bible has exerted an influence on the common mind, in all Protestant nations, which it would be difficult to exaggerate. The practice of interpreting the Bible and of exploring its pages for flesh truth affords at mental discipline of a very high order. How often have the Scriptures carried into the cottage of the peasant a breadth and refinement of intellect which otherwise would never have existed, and which no agency employed by the Roman Catholic system, in relation to the same social class, has ever been able to engender!

“(3.) That Protestantism should be more friendly to civil and religious liberty than the Roman Catholic system would seem to follow unavoidably from the nature of the two forms of faith. Protestantism involves, as a vital element, an assertion of personal rights with respect to religion, the highest concern of man. Moreover, Protestantism casts off the yoke of priestly rule, and puts ecclesiastical government, in due measure, into the hands of the laity. As we have already said, it is a revolt of the laity against a usurped ecclesiastical authority: The Church of Rome teaches men that their first and most binding duty is to bow with unquestioning docility and obedience to their heaven-appointed superiors. How is it possible that Protestantism should not foster a habit of mind which is incompatible with a patient endurance of tyranny at the hands of the civil power? How can Protestantism, inspiring a lively sense of personal rights, fail to bring with it, eventually at least, a corresponding respect for the rights of others, and a disposition to secure their rights in forms of government and in legislation? How can men who are accustomed to judge for themselves and act independently in Church affairs manifest a slavish spirit in the political sphere? On the contrary, the habit of mind which the Roman Catholic nurture tends to beget leads to servility in the subject towards the ruler as long as an alliance is kept up between sovereign and priest. It is true that the Church of Rome can accommodate itself to any of the various

types of political society. Her doctors have at times preached an extreme theory of popular rights and of the sovereignty of the people. While the State is subordinate to the Church any form of government may be tolerated; and there may be an interest on the part of the priesthood in inculcating political theories which operate, in their judgment, to weaken the obligations of loyalty towards the civil magistrate, and to exalt by contrast the divine authority of the Church. When the civil magistracy presumes to exercise prerogatives, or to ordain measures, which are deemed hurtful to the ecclesiastical interest, a radical doctrine of revolution, even a doctrine of tyrannicide, has been heard from the pulpits of the most conservative of religious bodies. Generally speaking, however, the Church of Rome is the natural ally and supporter of arbitrary principles of government. The prevailing sentiment, the instinctive feeling, in that Church is that the body of the people are incapable of self-guidance, and that to give them the reins in civil affairs would imperil the stability of ecclesiastical control. To this reasoning it is often replied by advocates of the Roman Catholic system that Protestantism opens a door to boundless tyranny by leaving the temporal power without any check from the ecclesiastical. The State, it is said, proves omnipotent; the civil magistrate is delivered from the wholesome dread of ecclesiastical censure, and is left free to exercise all kinds of tyranny, without the powerful restraint to which he was subject under the mediaeval system. He may even violate the rights of conscience with impunity. The State, it is sometimes said, when released from its subordinate relation to the Church, is a godless institution. It becomes, like the pagan states of antiquity, absolute in the province of religion as in secular affairs, and an irresistible engine of oppression. It must be admitted that Protestant rulers have been guilty of tyranny; that, in many instances, they cannot be cleared of the charge of unwarrantably interfering with the rights of conscience, and of attempting to govern the belief and regulate the forms of worship of their subjects in a manner destructive of true liberty. The question is, whether these instances of misgovernment are the proper fruit of the Protestant spirit, or something at variance with it, and therefore an evil of a temporary and exceptional character. The imputation that the State, as constituted under Protestantism, is heathen depends on the false assumption that the Church and the priesthood, as established in the Roman Catholic system, are identical, or so nearly identical that one cannot subsist without the other. It is

assumed that when the supervision and control which the Church of Rome aspires to exercise over the civil authority are shaken off, nothing is left but an unchristian or antichristian institution. The fact that a layman can be as good a Christian as a priest is overlooked. The Christian laity who make up a commonwealth, and the Christian magistrates who are set over them, are quite as able to discern and quite as likely to respect personal rights, and to act for the common weal, as if they were subject to an organized priesthood. Since the Reformation a layman has been the head of the English Church and State, and civil magistrates in England have borne a part in ecclesiastical government. Without entering into the question of the righteousness or expediency of establishments, or broaching any of the controverted topics connected with this subject, we simply assert here that the civil government of England is not to be branded as unchristian or antichristian on account of this arrangement. As far as the administration of public affairs in that country has been characterized by justice and by a regard for the wellbeing of all orders of people, the government has been Christian — as truly Christian, to say the least, as if the supremacy had been virtually lodged with the pope, or with an aristocracy of priests.

“History verifies the position that Protestantism is favorable to civil and religious freedom. The long and successful struggle for independence in the Netherlands, the conflict which established English liberty against the despotic influence of the house of Stuart, the growth and establishment of the Republic of the United States, are events so intimately connected with Protestantism, and so dependent upon it, that we may point to them as monuments of the true spirit and tendency of the Reformed religion. That the persecution has darkened the annals of the Protestant faith, and that the earliest leaders in the Reformation failed to recognise distinctly the principle of liberty of conscience, must be admitted. But Protestantism, as is claimed at the present day both by its friends and foes, was illogical, inconsistent with its own genius and principles, whenever it attempted to coerce conscience by punishing religious dissent with the sword and the fagot. Protestants illustrate the real character and tendency of their system by deploring whatever acts of religious persecution the predecessors who bore their name were guilty of, and by the open and sincere advocacy of

religious liberty. Liberty of thought and freedom of speech and of the press, however restricted they may have been by Protestants in times past, it is the tendency of Protestantism to uphold.”

See Schenkel, *Das Wesen des Protestantismus* (2d ed. Schaffh. 1862); Frank, *Gesch. der prof. Theol.* (Leips. 1862-65, 2 vols.); Wylie, *Hist. of Prof.* (Lond. 1874 sq.); Gieseler, *Ecclesiastes Hist.* iv. 131 sq.; Hase, *Ch. Hist.* p. 437 sq.; Hagenbach, *Hist. of Doctr.* (see Index).

## Protestants

is a collective name for all genuine believers in evangelical Christianity — those who protest against the errors and renounce the communion of the Romish Church. It was originally applicable to the followers of Luther, but is now generally applied to all Christians not embraced in the Roman Catholic, Greek, or Oriental churches. *SEE REFORMATION.*

At first those who, in consequence of the religious innovations of Luther and his consorts in Germany and Switzerland, stepped out of the Catholic community were designated by no general name; they were called Lutherans, Zwinglians, Anabaptists, etc., etc. They received their collective name only in 1529 at the second Diet of Spires. The first Diet of Spires had been held in 1526. There it had been resolved, “Let every state of the empire conduct its affairs in such a way as it thinks justifiable before God and the emperor.” It was an edict of tolerance, with reservation of the imperial rights. The Roman Catholic party had been compelled to make concessions by the ambiguous attitude of the house of Wittelsbach. As soon, however, as the Bavarian dukes embraced more unequivocally the Catholic cause, and had made a close alliance with the ecclesiastical princes, the emperor Charles V, in order to satisfy the Romanists, resolved upon more energetic measures against the innovators. In the spring of 1527, the Romanists had already formed a secret league at Breslau, yet until the emperor was successful in Italy no overt measures could be thought of. After he had gained a complete victory in Italy, the policy of repression was boldly avowed, and in March, 1529, the second Diet of Spires was convoked for this purpose by the emperor. Ostensibly it was called to secure aid from the German princes against the Turks, and to devise the most effectual means by which to allay the religious disputes. Its real object, however, appeared when Ferdinand, archduke of Austria, and other popish princes, decreed that in the countries which had embraced the new religion it should be lawful to continue in it till the meeting of a

council, but that no Roman Catholic should be allowed to turn Lutheran, and that the reformers should deliver nothing in their sermons contrary to the received doctrine of the Church. It was furthermore specially decreed,

- (1) that it shall be forbidden nowhere in Germany to say or attend mass;
- (2) the preaching of the doctrine of Zwingli about the Eucharist shall be prohibited;
- (3) the Anabaptists shall not be tolerated;
- (4) libels against religious parties and about religious matters are interdicted.

These articles did not meet the pretensions of Luther's followers. The Lutheran states asserted that in matters of faith a majority of votes was not decisive, and that the resolutions of 1526, unanimously voted, could only be abrogated by a unanimous vote. They, in consequence, protested against the resolutions of the diet, and it was thus that the followers of the Reformation were in derision called *Protestants*. They declared their readiness to obey the emperor and the diet in all "dutiful and possible matters." but against any order considered by them repugnant to "God and his holy Word, to their soul's salvation, and their good conscience," they appealed to the emperor, to the free council, and to all impartial Christian judges. The essential principles involved in the protest against this decree and in the arguments on which it was grounded were (1) that the Catholic Church cannot be the judge of the Reformed churches, which are no longer in communion with her; (2) that the authority of the Bible is supreme, and above that of councils and bishops; (3) that the Bible is not to be interpreted and used according to tradition, or use, and wont, but to be explained by means of itself, its own language, and connection. As this doctrine — that the Bible, explained independently of all external tradition, is the sole authority in all matters of faith and discipline — is really the foundation-stone of the Reformation, the term Protestant was extended from those who signed the Spire protest to all who embraced the fundamental principle involved in it.

The protesting parties were as follows: John, the elector of Saxony, the landgrave of Hesse, the margrave of Brandenburg-Bayreuth, a duke of Brunswick Lineburg, a prince of Anhalt, a number of Frankish and Saxon imperial cities — Nuremberg, Ulm, Kempten, Nordlingen, Heilbronn,

Reutlingen, Isny, St. Gall, Weissenburg. Windsheim, Strasburg, Constance, Lindau, and Memmingen. The four last named had joined the protest on account of the interdiction of Zwingli's doctrine, which interdiction met with the entire approval of Luther and his zealous followers. The latter also accepted the article against the Anabaptists, and, while Luther approved of the protest, he exhorted at the same time the Protestant powers to destroy the impious Anabaptists with fire and sword, and accept the resolutions of the diet in this respect. Now, the new doctrines being in possession of a name which indicated their common hostile relation to the Roman Church, the schism became less curable, and reconciliation was thenceforth less practicable than ever. *SEE REFORMATION.*

The term Protestant, which thus came to be synonymous with non-Romanist, was applied, first, as a convenient historical term designating collectively all who deny the usurped supremacy of the pope; secondly, as a term of controversy implying (1) a condemnation of alleged Romish errors and superstitions, and sometimes (2) a yet further assertion of certain tenets supposed to be of the essence of Protestantism. This essential principle of Protestantism is the sufficiency and authority of the Scriptures as a religious rule of faith and practice. Those, on the one hand, who deny its sufficiency are not in principle Protestants. The former include not only the Roman Catholics, but all those who maintain the *authority* of the Church to speak for God, either in adding to the doctrines of the Bible or in giving them a binding and authoritative interpretation; and those, on the other hand, who deny its divine authority are not properly Protestants; and the latter embrace all those who hold that man's unaided reason is the all-sufficient guide and standard in religious faith and practice, and that the Bible is only to be used like other books—as a light, but not as an authority. In 1659 it was stated in Milton's *Treatise of Civil Power in Ecclesiastical Cases*: "It is the general consent of all sound Protestant writers that neither traditions, councils, nor canons of any visible Church, much less edicts of any magistrate or civil session, but the Scripture only, can be the final judge or rule in matters of religion, and that only in the conscience of every Christian to himself... With the name of Protestant hath ever been received this doctrine, which prefers the Scripture before the Church, and acknowledges none but the Scripture sole interpreter of itself to the conscience. If by the Protestant doctrine we believe the Scripture — not for the Church's saying, but for its own as the Word of God—then ought we to believe what in our conscience we apprehend the Scripture to say,

though the visible Church with all her doctors gainsay ... To interpret the Scripture convincingly to his own conscience none is able but himself, guided by the Holy Spirit; and not so guided, none than he to himself can be a worse deceiver... This is not the doctrine of the Church of England. If the Church have authority in controversies of faith, it is a matter of conscience to submit one's private judgment to that authority. There coexist in the Church of God two authorities mutually corroborative of each other, and, so far as individual interpretation of each, mutually corrective of each other — the inspired Word and the inspired Church; the inspired Word receiving its canonicity, its interpretation, from the inspired Church, and the inspired Church tested in its development by the inspired Word” (Bishop Forbes, on *Thirty-nine Art.* p. 95). Of course, since Protestantism recognises the right of private judgment in the interpretation of Scripture, it allows a wide divergence of theological views, and such a divergence actually exists. At the same time, the differences in the belief of the various Protestant sects generally relate to minor points, as of worship, ceremonial, and form of ecclesiastical government, nearly all the great Protestant denominations being substantially agreed respecting the fundamental points of doctrine as taught by the Word of God. Mr. Chillingworth, addressing himself to a writer in favor of the Church of Rome, speaks of the religion of the Protestants in the following excellent terms:

“Know then, sir, that when I say the religion of Protestants is in prudence to be preferred before yours, on the one side, I do not understand by your religion the doctrine of Bellarmine, or Baronius, or any other private man among you, nor the doctrine of the Sorbonne, of the Jesuits, or of the Dominicans, or of any other particular company among you, but that wherein you all agree, or profess to agree, the doctrine of the Council of Trent; so accordingly, on the other side, by the religion of Protestants, I do not understand the doctrine of Luther, or Calvin, or Melancthon, nor the Confession of Augsburg, or Geneva, nor the Catechism of Heidelberg, nor the Articles of the Church of England — no, nor the harmony of Protestant confessions; but that in which they all agree, and which they all subscribe with a greater harmony, as a perfect rule of faith and action — that is, the Bible. The Bible I say the Bible only-is the religion of Protestants. Whatsoever else they believe beside it, and the plain, irrefragable, indubitable

consequences of it, well may they hold it as a matter of opinion; but as a matter of faith and religion, neither can they with coherence to their own grounds believe it themselves, nor require belief of it of others, without most high and most schismatical presumption. I, for my part, after a long, and, as I verily believe and hope, impartial, search of the true way to eternal happiness, do profess plainly that I cannot find any rest for the sole of my foot lint upon this rock only. I see plainly, and with my own eyes, that there are popes against popes and councils against councils; some fathers against other fathers, the same fathers against themselves; a consent of fathers of one age against a consent of fathers of another age; traditive interpretations of Scripture are pretended, but there are few or none to be found: no tradition but that of Scripture can derive itself from the fountain, but may be plainly proved either to have been brought in in such an age after Christ, or that in such an age it was not in. In a word, there is no sufficient certainty but of Scripture only for any considering man to build upon. This, therefore, and this only, I have reason to believe. This I will profess; according to this I will live; and for this, if there be occasion, I will not only willingly, but even gladly, lose my life, though I should be sorry that Christians should take it from me. Propose me anything out of this book, and require whether I believe or no, and, seem it never so incomprehensible to human reason, I will subscribe it with hand and heart as knowing no demonstration can be stronger than this God hath said so, therefore it is true. In other things, I will take no man's liberty of judging from him; neither shall any man take mine from me."

The body of Protestants consists, generally speaking, of Sweden, Denmark, and Norway — all Lutheran; the larger half of the population of the Netherlands; about half of the population of Switzerland, including the cantons of Aargau, Zurich, Berne, most of Vaud — all Calvinistic; the English, Irish, and Scottish churches, with their colonial and American daughters; the Scottish Presbyterians; the large bodies of Lutherans, Calvinists, Huguenots, in the other countries of Europe; the English and Irish Nonconformists and their descendants in the United States and the colonies.

Of the chief of these Protestant denominations we give here a brief narrative of the process of their separate formation, referring the reader for



fuller information to the separate articles under their respective titles. “The Lutherans took the name and accepted the teachings of Luther, who, while maintaining the doctrine of justification by faith alone, and the authority and sufficiency of the Scriptures, also maintained, in a modified form, the doctrine of the real presence of Christ in the communion, and allowed the use of images and pictures in the churches. Zwingli, the Swiss reformer, denied that the Lord’s Supper was anything more than a commemorative ordinance. Many of the Reformers in other countries shared his views, and out of the controversy between him and Luther sprang the Reformed churches of Germany and Holland. Meanwhile John Calvin had commenced his labors as the organizer of the Reformation. The product of his literary labor was the *Institutes*; of his executive labor, the Presbyterian form of government. For both he found, eventually, a free field in Geneva, and his labors there not only gave to the Reformed churches of Switzerland their final character — a character which they bear to this day — but furnished the model of doctrine and government which the Presbyterian churches of Great Britain and the United States have since largely adopted. This, also, is substantially the form of government of the Reformed Church of France. Certain tenets peculiar to this form of theology were repudiated by other leaders among the Reformers. Arminius, in Holland, denied that the Scriptures taught the doctrine of predestination and others connected intimately, if not necessarily, with it. From him sprang the Arminians, who, as a sect, are reduced to an insignificant number, but whose doctrines are accepted in the main by the Methodists, by most of the Episcopalians, and by many in other denominations. The Socinians denied that the doctrines of the Trinity, the atonement, and the proper deity of Jesus Christ were to be found in the Bible. They thus revived the views of the earlier Arians, while at the same time they carried their denials much further. Their views have found expression in one wing of the Unitarian and Universalist churches of the present day. Their most general acceptance is in New England and in parts of Great Britain; but there are Socinian churches in nearly if not quite all Protestant communities. The Reformation in England was partly religious, partly political. Henry VIII did not intend to modify the doctrine of the Church, but only its government, and its government, only so far as to secure its independence of the papacy. The movement was too deep and popular for him to control; but the loyal and ecclesiastical influence combined to retain the Episcopal form of government and the union of Church and State. Both are still preserved in the Church of England, and the former in the Episcopal Church of this country. Its symbols of doctrine

allow equal liberty to Arminians and to Calvinists. The civil and religious controversies which, a few centuries later, plunged England into civil war, gave impetus and organization, though not birth, to the idea of absolute ecclesiastical independence. The result was the organization of churches which were mainly Calvinistic in belief, but in which the absolute right of the people of each Church to manage their own affairs was maintained. In England they took the name of Independents, in the United States that of Congregationalists. As early as the days of Luther, the Reformers were divided on the question of baptism; those who maintained that baptism should be administered only by immersion and to adults took the name of Baptists, which they retain to this day. The 18th century witnessed a general revival of religious spirit, especially in England and the United States, differing from that which characterized the Reformation in that it was less a battle against error in doctrine, and more a simple awakening of Christian zeal to use for the redemption of the masses the truths which the Reformation had brought to light. Out of this awakening grew Methodism, which is substantially Arminian in doctrine and Episcopal in government, and differs from the Episcopal Church, from which it came out, rather in the spirit and character of its adherents than in theology. These churches represent the chief forms of Protestantism. There is also a large number of minor denominations, but most of them are offshoots from these great branches.”

The total Protestant population of the world is estimated in 1890 to be more than 120,000,000, a little more than half the Roman Catholic population. It is thus divided:

United States .....	3,000,000
British America .....	3,000,000
Mexico.....	9,000
South America .....	70,000
Dutch American possessions.....	35,000
Danish and Swedish possessions .....	5,000
Hayti.....	12,000
Spain ... .	9,000
Portugal .....	11,000
France .....	2,000,000
Austria .....	3,400,000
Prussia .....	18,249,539
West of Germany proper .....	11,134,440

Italy .....	103,000
Switzerland .....	1,667,109
Holland .....	2,831,539
Belgium ..	15,0010
Great Britain and Ireland .	24,500,000
Denmark .....	2,0S9,000
Sweden and Norway .....	6 589,000
Russia .....	4,000,000
Turkey .....	15,000
Greece .....	2,000
Asiatic Russia .....	45,000
China .....	34,555
Japan .....	30,000
East and Farther India .....	4110,000
Archipelago .....	55,000
Pesia .....	1,500
Arabia .....	2,000
English African possessions .....	1,000,00
Algeria .....	9,000
Egypt .....	3,500
Liberia .....	50,000
Madagascar .....	100,000
Australia and Polynesia .....	2,000,00

The population connected with or under the influence of Protestant churches at the close of 1874 was about as follows:

Divisions	Protestants	Total Population
America	33,000,000	84,500,000
Europe	71,800,000	301,600,000
Asia	1,800,000	798,000,000
Africa	1,200,000	202,500,000
Australia	2,200,000	4,400,000
Total	110,000,000	1,391,000,000

## Protesters

*SEE RESOLUTIONERS; SEE SCOTLAND, CHURCHES IN.*

## Protevangelium

a spurious gospel ascribed to James, containing an account of the birth of Mary and of Christ. It is supposed to have been originally composed in Hebrew. Postellius brought the MS. of this gospel from the Levant, translated it into Latin, and sent it to Oporinus, a printer at Basle, where Bibliander, a Protestant divine, and the professor of divinity at Zurich, caused it to be printed in 1552. Postellius asserts that it was publicly read as canonical in the Eastern churches. *SEE GOSPEL, SPURIOUS.*

## Prothade

ST., a French prelate who flourished near the opening of the 7th century; he died before 625. He has been called son of the patrician Prothade, but without proof. It is at least certain that he was the successor of St. Nicet in the metropolitan see of Besanlon. He compiled a ritual for the use of the two cathedral churches at Besanlon-St. Itienne and St. Jean, which has not reached us without interpolations; it has recently been published by the abbe Richard.

## Prother, Amos Summers,

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Clarke County, Ind., April 17, 1832. He went to Iowa when quite young, and with his parents settled near Libertyville, Jefferson County. He was converted in 1846, and at once joined the Methodist Episcopal Church. His convictions of duty pointed him to the ministry as a life-work, and, the better to fit himself for the sacred office, he entered the Mount-Pleasant Collegiate Institute, afterwards the Iowa Wesleyan University, in 1852, where he continued his studies until 1857, when he graduated. He was licensed to preach while at college. After graduating he was immediately employed on the Dodgeville Circuit by the presiding elder, and in 1857 joined the Iowa Conference. His appointments were Denmark, Wapello, Dodgeville, Grand View, Crawfordsville, New London, Kossuth, Montezuma, New Sharon, and Birmingham, At the last-named place he died, April 1, 1873, greatly respected by his own people and the Church generally.

## Prothesis

(1), a small altar in Greek churches corresponding to the credence table. The name is taken from the shew-bread, which was called ἡ πρόθεσις

τῶν ἄρτων — the setting-out of the loaves. (2.) A small side-altar in a Clugniac church, on the epistle side, at which the ministers of the altar, on Sundays and festivals, partook of both kinds, using a silver calamus to drink of the chalice.

### Prothonotary

a word that has a different signification in the Greek Church from what it has in the Latin; for in the first it is the name of one of the great officers of the Church of Constantinople, who takes rank next to the patriarch, and writes all despatches he sends to the grand seignior; besides which lie is empowered to have an inspection over the professors of the law, into purchases, wills, and the liberty given to slaves; but in the Roman Church they were formerly called prothonotaries who had the charge of writing the acts of the martyrs and circumstances of their death, a title of honor whereunto are ascribed many privileges, as legitimizing bastards, making apostolic notaries, *SEE PROTONOTARIUS APOSTOLICUS*, doctors of divinity and of the canon and civil law: they are twelve in number.

### Proto

(*first*). This adjective is prefixed to the name of several officers in the Greek Church, denoting that he who holds it is the chief of his class such as *prothonotary*, *protoppaas*, *protopsaltes*, *protosyncellus*.

### Protodiacon

The protodiacon, or archdeacon, holds the first rank among the deacons employed in the Episcopal Church to assist the bishop during worship and in the exercise of his pontificalia. He is constantly near the person of the bishop or archbishop, and stands at his side while he is performing the liturgical rites or conferring holy orders. The splendor of the episcopal dignity reflected on this office, and the influence which the archdeacons in all times exercised upon the bishops, made of the proto- or arch-deacon, in the Greek-Russian Church, a very important person. In larger parishes several deacons are employed, but only the first deacon of an episcopal church is distinguished by the honorary title of archi- or proto-diaconus.

### Protonotarius Apostolicus

is a notary appointed by the papal see. The qualification of *7irpLTro* (primus) is but honorary. In the apostolic chancery rules the word

“prothonotary” is regularly employed, but the papal bulls and rescripts call the same functionary “notarius apostolicus.” The papal notaries appointed in the city of Rome (*in curia*), and forming, twelve in number, a special college of prelates, are distinguished by the addition [Notarii] “de numero participantium” from those appointed abroad (*extra curiam*), who are simply notarii or protonotarii, sometimes with the specification “extra numerum.” The former are the regular and paid, the latter the extraordinary and titular notaries. The origin of the papal notariate is assigned to the 1st century, for pope Clement I is said to have employed seven of them in noting the memorabilia of the Church, and composing trustworthy accounts of the various manners in which the martyrs were brought to death. In later times it became the business of the prothonotaries to write the biographies of the popes, to draw up authentic minutes of the debate in the Consistory of Cardinals, especially in cases of beatification, canonization, etc. Their college was increased to twelve members and endowed with great privileges by pope Sixtus V. They precede in the papal chapel at different solemnities the Auditores S. Rotae, all cameral ecclesiastics and lower prelates, and the generals of orders. Formerly they even enjoyed precedence over bishops, but Paul II decreed that at Rome and abroad they should step after the episcopate. Only in public consistories and in processional cavalcades four prothonotaries take their place immediately after the assistant bishops of the pontifical chapel, and consequently in front of the episcopate. They are, moreover, not subject to the jurisdiction of the ordinaries, but are placed under the immediate protection of the pope; they can freely dispose by testament even of their beneficial fortune to the amount of 2000 ducats; they receive all messages and graces of the pope free of tax and stamp; they have free access to the papal chancery, to the public consistories, and to the cardinal consistories, debating cases of beatification or canonization. They are entitled, under certain restrictions, to use portable altars in saying mass, and at certain festivals to wear the pontifical badges (comp. Sixt. V, *Constt.* “Romanus Pontifex” and “Laudabilis”). They have also the peculiar privilege of creating annually six doctors, who enjoy all the rights of regularly graduated doctors; but only residents of Rome can be thus promoted (Bened. XIV, *Const. Inter Conspicuos*, d. iv Cal. Septbr. 1744). These distinctions belong exclusively to the regular prothonotaries appointed by the pope himself. Those “extra statum,” and the titular notaries, who can be appointed not only by the pope, but also by his legate *a latere*, and, with some restrictions, by the college of real prothonotaries, occupy in the scale

of rank the degree next to the canons of a cathedral, and only if they are themselves provided with a canonry have they precedence over the other members of chapters. They wear the violet talarium, with the mantlet of the same color. In the performance of Church functions they are permitted the ring, but without jewel. — Wetzler u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lexikon*, s.v.

### Protopapa

is the archpriest in the Greek Church who stands on the left hand of the patriarch (q.v.). His dignity is entirely ecclesiastical: he administers the holy sacrament to the patriarch at all high and solemn masses, and receives it from him. He is the head ecclesiastical dignitary, not only with respect to his peculiar privileges, but to his right and title to precedence.

### Protopresbyter

(*πρῶτος ἱερεύς*, usually called *protopope*) is in the Russo-Greek Church an intermediate degree between the bishop and the simple priests. The situation and functions of the protopresbyter are essentially the same as those of the former archpriests of the episcopal cathedrals, and of the deans in the country. Each cathedral has its protopresbyter, but the same dignity exists in other important churches of large cities where several popes are employed. This title belongs also to such popes of the first rank as exercise some rights of supervision and administration over several surrounding parishes; for every diocese or eparchy in Russia is divided into several protopopes (as in the Roman Catholic Church into deaneries). This class of dignitaries forms, in litigious and disciplinary matters of ecclesiastical resort, the first instance in the diocese. In important cities the protopopes are generally employed as counsellors, assessors or secretaries in the episcopal consistories or other ecclesiastical colleges. The distinguishing garment of the protopopes is the so-called *epigonatikon*. The protopresbyterate is the most influential of the lower clerical functions, and the highest degree open to a secular ecclesiastic; for in the Greek Church the episcopate, and the still higher dignities, can only be occupied by unmarried priests, or such as are separated from their wives by death or voluntary renunciation, and who belong to the monastical order, mostly archimandrites (abbots) and hegemons (priors). — Wetzler u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lexikon*, s.v.

## Protopsaltes

is the chief singer or master of the choir in Greek churches.

## Protosyncellus

is the vicar or assistant of a Greek patriarch, who generally resides along with him in his palace.

## Protothronus

is, in the Greek Church, the name of the first bishop of an ecclesiastical province; he holds the first rank after the patriarch or after the metropolitan. At the death of either of these latter dignitaries, the protothronus assumes his jurisdiction until a successor is installed.

## Prototype

is a term used in theology to designate the original *type* (q.v.) or form of anything, and especially in the following dogma: The prototypal form in which Adam was created was the image of God; in Christ that image is restored; and it is the hope of the Christian that this form will be his also when he wakes up after God's likeness and is satisfied (<sup><D51></sup>Psalm 15:17). It is a term, therefore, that has an anthropological, Christological, and an eschatological character, as referring to Adam, to the Redeemer, and to the redeemed. Now, in what does that likeness consist? Not surely in outward form, but in spiritual attributes, for God is Spirit. But those attributes pertain to the soul invested in body, which God has not; therefore the likeness of God must be restricted to such divine attributes as are reflected in man independently of his material nature, such as a love for all that is good and holy, right, reason, and free-will, which constitute in him the "likeness and glory" of God (<sup><G10></sup>1 Corinthians 11:7; *SEE GLORY*), and exclusive of other attributes that serve only to mark the imperfection of the creature. When Irenaeus, therefore (c. *Hoer.* v, 6); speaks of the image of God as being *sua natura* of a bodily character, he may express correctly the philosophical notion of the Deity, and therefore of the divine likeness, as derived from ancient schools, but he hardly speaks with the authority of Catholic antiquity on a point which had as yet received but little consideration. Our only safe guide is the apostle, who expresses himself with sufficient explicitness. With him Christ is the very "image of God" (<sup><A04></sup>2 Corinthians 4:4), "in the form of God" (<sup><S07></sup>Philippians 2:6), and "the



express image of his Person,” as well as “the brightness of his glory” (<sup><S01B></sup>Hebrews 1:3), “the image of the invisible God” (<sup><S015></sup>Colossians 1:15). He is now to us as the prototypal form in which Adam was created full of grace and truth; and man’s hope of having that form restored in him hereafter depends on the genuineness with which some few rays of that glory are reflected in his soul now. So it has been decreed from everlasting that all who are called according to God’s sanctifying purpose should be “conformed to the image of his Son” (<sup><S02></sup>Romans 8:29); that “as we have borne the image of the earthy,” we may also “bear the image of the heavenly” (<sup><S15></sup>1 Corinthians 15:49); that having his high exemplar before us, and “beholding as in a glass the glory of the Lord,” by a continually progressive, sanctifying process, we “may be changed into the same image from glory to glory as by the Spirit of the Lord” (<sup><S18></sup>2 Corinthians 3:18). It is of this “renewing in the spirit of our minds,” according to the prototypal likeness of Christ, that the apostle speaks when he exhorts his charge to “put on the new man, which is renewed in knowledge after the image” of the Creator (<sup><S10></sup>Colossians 3:10), and “after God (<sup><twmrk></sup>) is created in righteousness and in the holiness of truth” (<sup><S02></sup>Ephesians 4:24). According to Roman Catholic doctrine, original righteousness was not this prototypal likeness, but a superadded gift conferred after the act of creation was complete. So the Tridentine Catechism says, “Quod ad animam pertinet, eam ad imaginem et similitudinem suam formavit Deus, liberumque ei tribuit arbitrium; omnes praeterea motus animi atque appetitiones ita in eo temperavit, ut rationis imperio nunquam non parerent. ‘Tum originalis justitiae admirabile donum addidit,’ etc. (ed. Colon. 1565, p. 63). The council purposed, in the first instance, to express its meaning as “justitiam et sanctitatem in qua Adam conditus fuerat,” but accepted the correction of Paceco, and wrote “constitutus fuerat” (Pallavicini, *Hist. Conc. Trid.* 7:9). For the teaching of the schools on this point, *SEE SCHOLASTIC THEOLOGY*; for the whimsical notions of Judaism, *SEE CABALA*.

### Protracted Meetings

*SEE REVIVAL.*

### Proud, Joseph

an English minister of the New Jerusalem Church, who was born in the second half of the last century, is noted as the author of several of the ablest polemics ever issued by the Church of which he was a much

esteemed member. He died about 1860. His works are: *Reply to Dr. Priestley's Letters on Swedenborg* (1792, 8vo): — *Hymns for the New Church* (12mo): — *Jehovah's Mercy*, a poem (8vo): — *Unitarian Doctrine Refuted* (Lond. 1806, 8vo): — *Letters on the Fundamental Doctrines of the Unitarian Religion* (1808, 8vo): — *The Aged Minister's Last Legacy to the New Church* (Birm. 12mo; 2dc ed. Lond. 1855). See Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, 9:67.

### Proudfit, Alexander Moncrief

D.D., an American divine of much celebrity, was born at Pequa, Pa., in 1770, and was educated at Columbia College, New York (class of 1792). He entered the ministry of the Associate Reformed Presbyterian Church, and was made pastor of the congregation at Salem, N. Y., in 1795, where he lived until 1835, when he became agent of the American Colonization Society. He resigned that post in 1842, and died in 1843. He published: *Discourses on the Ruin and Recovery of Man* (Salem, 1806, 12mo; again, 1813, 12mo): — *Discourses on the Leading Doctrines and Duties of Christianity* (1815, 4 vols. 12mo): — a work on the *Parables* (1820, 12mo): — and a number of single *Sermons, Tracts*, etc. (1798-1836). See *Memoir of the late A. M. Proudfit, D.D.*, etc., by John Forsyth, D.D., minister of the Union Church. Newburgh, N. Y. (12mo), reviewed in the *Meth. Quar. Rev.* 6:358, by R. W. Dickinson; Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, 9:67; *Memorial Volumn A. B. C. F. iM.* 1862, p. 114; *Pincet. Rev.* Oct. 1846, p. 609. Proudfit, John Wilbur, D.D., son of the preceding, was born at Salem, N.Y., Sept. 22, 1803, graduated at Union College in 1821, and at Princeton Theological Seminary in 1826. After a brief pastorate at Newburyport, Mass., he was elected professor of ancient languages in the University of the City of New York, where he remained from 1833 until 1838. He then spent some time in Europe. and in 1841 accepted the professorship of Latin and Greek literature in Rutgers College. In 1854 his chair was confined to Greek literature alone. He resigned in 1861, and transferred his ecclesiastical relation in 1864 to the Presbyterian Church. After a second protracted residence in Europe, he enlisted in the service of his country, and during the war was an exceedingly devoted and useful chaplain to the soldiers of the U.S. Army, being located on Bedloe's Island, in New York Harbor. After his return from the war he lived in New York City. He was a sincere and devout believer in the religion which he preached. His daily walk seemed to be "close with God," until, at last, "God took him." He died of pneumonia,

March 9, 1870, after a very short illness, perfectly submissive to the will of the Lord and happy in the prospect of heaven. Dr. Proudfit was an eminent classical scholar and divine. His mind was highly cultivated, his tastes were refined, and his public life was distinguished by his devotion to literary and theological pursuits. He was a frequent contributor to religious newspapers, and to the *Princeton Review* and other serial publications. For some time he was editor of the *New Brunswick Quarterly Review*. In these periodicals he was actively engaged in the discussion of the exciting controversies connected with what is known as "Mercersburg theology." He edited an edition of Plautus and other classical works. His scholarship was far greater than his ability as a practical teacher of youth. His sermons were always carefully elaborated in style. elegant in expression, and evangelical in spirit, but his quiet delivery failed to give them the power to which their real merits entitled them. Some of these were published by request, among which is *A Baccalaureate Discourse to the Graduating Class of 1841 in Rutgers College*, one of the best specimens of his pulpit efforts. Dr. Proudfit was unusually tall and slender, dignified in appearance, with an intellectual head, benevolent face, and polished manners. He excelled as a conversationalist, being full of anecdote and illustration, and happily interweaving his reminiscences of public men and incidents of travel in foreign lands. He took a deep interest in the evangelization of the papal nations of Europe, and was familiar with the great religious questions of those lands. (W. J. R. T.)

### Proudfit, Robert

D.D., an eminent American divine and educator, was born at Hopewell, Pa., June 6, 1777, and graduated at Dickinson College, Pa., in 1798. In 1801 he was ordained, and installed as pastor of the Associate Reformed Church at Broadalbin, N. Y., in which charge he continued until 1818, when he accepted an invitation to the professorship of Greek and Latin at Union College, Schenectady, which situation he filled with distinguished ability until 1849, when, by an act passed by the board of trustees of that college, he was relieved from active duty, and assumed the title of emeritus professor in the same institution. During the whole time he was in active duty as professor, Dr. Proudfit did not neglect the call of his sacred profession, and, while his health permitted, he ceased not to preach the Gospel whenever he had opportunity. The zeal and earnestness with which he labored for the Master's cause gained many souls to the Church, and Dr. Proudfit's memory is in the hearts of many made happy by his agency.

He died at Schenectady, N. Y., Feb. 11, 1862. See Wilson, *Presbyt. Hist. Almanac* (1862), p. 306.

## Proudhon, Pierre Joseph

a noted French socialist, was born of humble parents, July 15, 1809, at Besancon. After a rudimentary education, he engaged in printing, and soon became an author — especially of an *Essai de Grammaire Generale*, for which he received a pension. In 1840 he published his work entitled *Qu'est-ce que la Propriete*, which eventually became infamous from the answer which it gave to that question — “*La Propriete, c'est le Vol!*” and caused him the loss of his pension. During the Revolution he edited an inflammatory paper, which was soon suppressed, but gave him such popularity that he was elected to the Assembly. His notorious principles of anarchy prevented his being heard in the debates, and the papers which he issued in revenge were suppressed for their scurrility. In 1849 he started a *Banque du Peuple* to carry out his communistic ideas, but it was closed by the authorities, and he fled to Geneva, but on his return to Paris he was imprisoned. During his three years of incarceration he married, and issued several remarkable political works. He died in obscurity at Paris, Jan. 19, 1865. His social theories are of the most extravagant and dangerous character, greatly resembling the radical and immoral principles of the communistic revolutionists who are now agitating Europe and this country. See Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, s.v.

## Provender

(*a/Psijna* *anispo*), fodder for cattle (<sup><0125></sup>Genesis 24:25, 32). In the account of king Solomon's stables, in <sup><1028></sup>1 Kings 4:28, we read, “Barley, also, and straw for the horses and dromedaries, brought they unto the place where the officers were, every man according to his charge.” Harmer remarks upon this passage: “Besides provisions for themselves, the Orientals are obliged to carry food for the beasts on which they ride or carry their goods. That food is of different kinds. They make little or no hay in these countries, and are therefore very careful of their straw, which they cut into small bits, by an instrument which at the same time threshes out the corn; this chopped straw, with barley, beans, and balls made of bean and barley meal, or of the pounded kernels of dates, are what they are wont to feed them with. The officers of Solomon are accordingly said to have brought, every man in his month, barley and straw for the horses and dromedaries;

not straw to litter them with, there is reason to think, for it is not now used in those countries for that purpose, but chopped straw for them to eat, either alone or with their barley. The litter they use for them is their own dung, dried in the sun, and bruised between their hands, which they heap up again in the morning, sprinkling it in summer with fresh water, to keep it from corrupting. In some other places we read of provender and straw, not barley and straw; because it may be other things were used for their food anciently, as well as now, besides barley and chopped straw. **ל יל בל** *belil*, one of the words used for provender (<sup><231b></sup>Isaiah 30:24), implies something of mixture, and the participle of the verb from which it is derived is used for the mingling of flour with oil; so the verb in <sup><17921></sup>Judges 19:21 may be as well translated ‘he mingled [food] for the asses’ as ‘he gave them provender,’ signifying that he mixed some chopped straw and barley together for the asses. Thus also barley and chopped straw, as it is just after reaping, unseparated in the field, might naturally be expressed by the Hebrew word we translate provender, which signifies barley and straw that had been mingled together, and accordingly seems to be so. ‘They reap every one his corn in the field’ (<sup><8316></sup>Job 24:6), ‘*Hebrew*, mingled corn or dredge,’ says the margin. What ideas are usually affixed to secondary translation I do not know, but Job apparently alludes to the provender, or heap of chopped straw, lying mingled together in the field, after having passed under the threshing instrument, to which he compared the spoils that were taken from passengers so early as his time by those that lived somewhat after the present manner of the wild Arabs, which spoils are to them what the harvest and vintage were to others. With this agrees that other passage of Job where this word occurs (vi, 5), ‘Will the ox low in complaints over his provender?’ or ‘fodder,’ as it is translated in our version, when he has not only straw enough, but mixed with barley.” Travellers in the East, wherever they mention the subject, use much the same terms as Walpole, who, in his *Journal*, remarks, “Neither hay nor oats are known to the Turks; nor has any nation in the East ever used them for their horses.” *SEE FODDER.*

### Provenzale, David Ben-Abraham,

who flourished in the 16th century, was a preacher at Mantua, and was so eloquent that he was styled **μυνϙrdh ϙar wvwdbc**, i.e. the prince of preachers in his generation. He wrote: **dwbary** [a commentary on the Pentateuch from an archaeological point of view: — **μyryϙh ryϙ rwab**,

a commentary on the Song of Songs: — *rwd hgl ph*, a comparative lexicon, Hebrew, Latin. Greek, and Italian: — and *dwd l dgm*, a Hebrew grammar. See Furst *Bibl. Jud.* 3, 123; De Rossi, *Dizionario Storico deyll Autori Ebrei*, p. 272 (Germ. transl. by Hamberger); Etheridge, *Introduction to Hebrew Literature*, p. 288, Steinschneider, *Jewish Literature*, p. 239. (B. P.)

## Proverb

**l v̄m**; *nmashal*, rendered in the A.V. “byword,” “parable,” “proverb” (*παραβολή, παροιμία*), expresses all and even more than is conveyed by these its English representatives. It is derived from a root **l v̄m**; *mashdl*, “to be like” (Arab. *mathala*, to “resemble”), and the primary idea involved in it is that of likeness, comparison. This form of comparison would very naturally be taken by the short, pithy sentences which passed into use as popular sayings and proverbs, especially when employed in mockery and sarcasm, as in <sup><3104></sup>Micah 2:4; <sup><3106></sup>Habakkuk 2:6, and even in the more developed taunting song of triumph for the fall of Babylon in <sup><2144></sup>Isaiah 14:4. Probably all proverbial sayings were at first of the nature of similes, but the term *mashal* soon acquired a more extended significance. It was applied to denote such short, pointed sayings as do not involve a comparison directly, but still convey their meaning by the help of a figure, as in <sup><0902></sup>1 Samuel 10:12; <sup><2422></sup>Ezekiel 12:22, 23; 17:2, 3 (comp. *παραβολή*, <sup><0423></sup>Luke 4:23). From this stage of its application it passed to that of sententious maxims generally, as in <sup><1001></sup>Proverbs 1:1; 10:1; 25:1; 26:7, 9; <sup><1113></sup>Ecclesiastes 12:9; <sup><1312></sup>Job 13:12, many of which, however, still involve a comparison (<sup><2118></sup>Proverbs 25:3, 11, 12, 13, 14, etc.; 26:1, 2, 3, etc.). Such comparisons are either expressed, or the things compared are placed side by side, and the comparison left for the hearer or reader to supply. Next we find it used of those larger pieces in which a single idea is no longer exhausted in a sentence, but forms the germ of the whole, and is worked out into a didactic poem. Many instances of this kind occur in the first section of the book of Proverbs; others are found in Job 27 and 29, in both which chapters Job takes up his *mashal*, or “parable,” as it is rendered in the A.V. The “parable” of Balaam. in <sup><0217></sup>Numbers 23:7-10; 24:3-9, 15-19, 20, 21-22, 23-24, are prophecies conveyed in figures; but *mashal* also denotes the “parable” proper, as in <sup><2170></sup>Ezekiel 17:2; 20:49 (21:5); 24:3. Lowth, in his notes on <sup><2144></sup>Isaiah 14:4, — speaking of *mashal*, says: “I take this to be the general name for poetic style among the Hebrews, including

every sort of it, as ranging under one, or other, or all of the characters, sententious, figurative, and sublime; which are all contained in the original notion, or in the use and application of the word *mashal*. Parables or proverbs, such as those of Solomon, are always expressed in short, pointed sentences; frequently figurative, being formed on some comparison, both in the matter and the form. Such, in general, is the style of the Hebrew poetry. Balaam's first prophecy (<sup><OR></sup>Numbers 23:7-10) is called his *mashal*, although it has hardly anything figurative in it; but it is beautifully sententious, and, from the very form and manner of it, has great spirit, force, and energy. Thus Job's last speeches, in answer to the three friends (ch. 27-31), are called *mashals*, from no one particular character which discriminates them from the rest of the poem, but from the sublime the figurative, the sententious manner which equally prevails through the whole poem, and makes it one of the first and most eminent examples extant of the truly great and beautiful in poetic style." Sir W. Jones says, "The moralists of the East have in general chosen to deliver their precepts in short, sententious maxims, to illustrate them by sprightly comparisons, or to inculcate them in the very ancient forms of agreeable apologues: there are, indeed, both in Arabic and Persian, philosophical tracts on ethics written with sound ratiocination and elegant perspicuity. But in every part of the Eastern world, from Peking to Damascus, the popular teachers of moral wisdom have immemorially been poets, and there would be no end of enumerating their works, which are still extant in the five principal languages of Asia." **SEE PARABLE**. Our Lord frequently employed proverbs in his public instructions; and the illustration of these proverbs as occupied many learned men, who proceed partly by the aid of similar passages from the Old Test., and partly from the ancient writings of the Jews, especially from the Talmud, whence it appears how much they were in use among that people, and that they were applied by Christ and his apostles agreeably to common usage. The proverbs contained in the Old and New Test. are collected and illustrated by Drusus and Anireas Schottus, whose works are comprised in the ninth volume of the *Critici Sacri*, and also by Joachim Zehner, who elucidated them by parallel passages from the fathers, as well as from heathen writers, in a treatise published at Leipsic in 1601. The proverbs which are found in the New Test. have been illustrated by Vorstius and Visir. as well as by Lightfoot and Schottgen in their *Horae Hebraeae et Talmudicae*, and by Buxtorf in his *Lexicon Chaldaicum Talmudicum et Rabbinicum*, from which last-mentioned works Rosenmuller, Kuinol, Dr. Whitby, Dr. Adam Clarke, and

other commentators, have derived their illustrations of the Jewish parables and proverbs. See Kelly, *Proverbs of all Nations* (Lond. 1859, 8vo); Sterling, *Literature of Proverbs* (ibid. 1860, 8vo); Bohn, *Book of Proverbs*. *SEE PROVERBS, BOOK OF*.

## Proverbs, Book Of

the 20th book of the Old Test., according to the arrangement of the English Bible, where it is placed between the Psalms and Ecclesiastes, doubtless from its presumed relation to the other works of Solomon; and in the Hebrew Bible it likewise follows the Psalms as part of the Kethubim, or Hagiographa. In the German MSS. of the Hebrew Old Test. the Proverbs are placed between the Psalms and Job, while in the Spanish MSS., which follow the Masorah, the order is Psalms, Job, Proverbs. This latter is the order observed in the Alexandrian MS. of the Sept. Melito, following another Greek MS., arranges the Hagiographa thus: Psalms. Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Song of Songs, Job, as in the list made out by the Council of Laodicea; and the same order is given by Origen, except that the book of Job is separated from the others by the prophets Isaiah, Jeremiah, Daniel, and Ezekiel. But our present arrangement existed in the time of Jerome (see *Prtf. in Libr. Regum*, iii: "Tertius ordo ἀγιόγραφα possidet. Et primus liber incipit ab Job. Secundus a David....' Tertius est Solomon. tres libros habens: Proverbia, quae illi parabolae, id est Masaloth appellat: Ecclesiastes, id est, 'Coeleth: Canticum Canticorum, quem titulo Sir Asirim prmnotant"). In the Peshito Syriac, Job is placed before Joshua, while Proverbs and Ecclesiastes follow the Psalms, and are separated from the Song of Songs by the book of Ruth. Gregory of Nazianzum, apparently from the exigencies of his verse, arranges the writings of Solomon in this order: Ecclesiastes, Song of Songs, Proverbs. Pseudo Epiphanius places Proverbs, Ecclesiastes. and Song of Songs between the 1st and 2d books of Kings and the minor prophets. The following article treats of the book both from an internal and an external point of view. *SEE BIBLE*.

**I. Title.** — As in the Pentateuch, the book of Proverbs takes its Hebrew title from its opening words — yl vjha~~th~~mbu] or yl vjha *wisdom*, simply. From this are directly derived the titles it bears in the Sept. παροιμίαι, Σαλομῶντος) and Vulgate (*Libel Proverbiorum, quem Hebraei "Misle" cappellant*), and the name by which it is universally known in English. Another title, perhaps more appropriate to the book as a whole, is derived from its chief subject, "Wisdom." In the *Tosaphoth to Baba Bathra* (fol. 14



b), we find Proverbs and Ecclesiastes combined under the name **hmkj** ; **rpse** “the book of wisdom,” and this title appears to have passed thence into the early Church. Clemens Roman. (*Lj. ad Coos.* i, 57) when quoting i, 23-31 says, **οὕτως λέγει ἡ πανάρητος σοφία**, a name which, according to Eusebius (*H. E.* 4:22), was adopted by Hegesippus. Ireteus, and “the whole band of the ancients,” following the unwritten Jewish tradition, and by Clem. Alex. (*Strom.* ii, § 22). It is styled by Gregory Naz. (*Orat.* xi) **παιδαγωγική σοφία**, and by Dion. Alex. **σοφή βίβλος**. In the catalogue of canonical books compiled by Melito of Sardis preserved by Eusebius (*H. E.* 4:26), we find **Παρ. Σαλομ. ἡ καὶ Σοφία**, a name which, as well as *Sopientia*, is of frequent occurrence in the early fathers (see Cotelerius in Clem. Rom. *l.c.*; Vales. ad Euseb. *l.c.*), though by no means restricted to the book of Proverbs, being equally used. as Cotelerius proves, of ‘Ecclesiasticus’ and ‘The Wisdom of Solomon,’ a circumstance from which some confusion has arisen.

The word **l v̄m**; *mashal*. by which the so-called “Proverbs” of Solomon are designated (<sup><2100></sup>Proverbs 1:1, 6; 10:1; 25:1; and <sup><1042></sup>1 Kings 4:32 [5:12]), is more appropriately translated in the Vulgate “parabola.” It is akin to the verb **l v̄m**; corresponding with the Arabic *mnathala* and the Syriac *methal*, “to be like,” and primarily signifies “a comparison,” “similitude,” “parable” (<sup><370></sup>Ezekiel 17:2; 24:3); whence it easily passed to those pithy, sententious maxims so often in the East appearing in the form of a terse comparison, of which many are to be found in the book before us e.g. 26:1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 14, 17 — and then to “proverbs” in general, whether containing a similitude or not (<sup><902></sup>1 Samuel 10:12; 24:13 [14]; <sup><213></sup>Ecclesiastes 12:9). Its scope was still further enlarged by its application to longer compositions of a poetical and figurative character — e.g. that of Balaam (<sup><427></sup>Numbers 23:7, 18, etc., and <sup><827></sup>Job 27:1; comp. <sup><1415></sup>Psalms 49:5; 78:2), and particularly to taunting songs of triumph over fallen enemies—e.g. against the king of Babylon (<sup><244></sup>Isaiah 14:4), the Chlalleans (<sup><316></sup>Habakkuk 2:6; comp. also <sup><314></sup>Micah 2:4; <sup><637></sup>Deuteronomy 28:37; <sup><107></sup>1 Kings 9:7). **SEE PROVERB.**

But the book of Proverbs, according to the introductory verses which describe its character, contains, besides several varieties of the *mashal*, sententious sayings of other kinds, mentioned in 1:6. The first of these is the **hdyj** *æhidah*, rendered in the A.V. “dark saying,” “dark speech,” “hard question,” “riddle,” and once (<sup><316></sup>Habakkuk 2:6) “proverb.” It is

applied to Samson's riddle (Judges 14), to the hard questions with which the queen of Sheba plied Solomon (<sup><1100></sup>1 Kings 10:1; <sup><4901></sup>2 Chronicles 9:1), and is used almost synonymously with *marshal* in <sup><3701></sup>Ezekiel 17:2, and in <sup><9904></sup>Psalms 49:4 (5); 78:2, in which last passages the poetical character of both is indicated. The word appears to denote a knotty, intricate saying, the solution of which demanded experience and skill: that it was obscure is evident from <sup><9418></sup>Numbers 12:8. In addition to the *chidah* was the *hxyh* <sup><1006></sup>*melitsah* (Proverbs 1:6, A.V. "the interpretation," marg. "an eloquent speech"), which occurs in <sup><3816></sup>Habakkuk 2:6 in connection both with *chidah* and *marshal*. It has been variously explained as a mocking, taunting speech (Ewald); or a speech dark and involved, such as needed a *melits*, or interpreter (comp. <sup><1423></sup>Genesis 42:23; <sup><4321></sup>2 Chronicles 32:31; <sup><3823></sup>Job 33:23; <sup><3427></sup>Isaiah 43:27); or again, as by Delitzsch (*Der Prophet Htbclukmk*, p. 59), a brilliant or splendid saying ("Glanz-oder Vohlrrede, oratio splendida, elegyas, lumninibus ornata"). This last interpretation is based upon the usage of the word in modern Hebrew, but it certainly does not appear appropriate to the Proverbs; and the first explanation, which Ewald adopts, is as little to the point. It is better to understand it as a dark, enigmatical saying, which, like the *mashal*, might assume the character of sarcasm and irony, though not essential to it. *SEE PARABLE.*

As might be expected from the nature of the work contemplated, the proverbs before us almost exclusively bear reference to the affairs of this life; but while a future existence is not formally brought to view, yet the consciousness of such an existence runs throughout, and forms the basis on which many of the strongest, most decisive, and oft-repeated declarations are made. For example, ch. 11:7 has no meaning except on the supposition that the writer believed in a future life, where, if not here, the hope and expectation of good men should be realized. If death were, in his judgment, annihilation, it would be equally the overthrow of the expectation of the righteous as of the wicked. See also, as affording similar indication, ch. 14:32; 23:17, 18. *SEE IMMORTALITY.*

**II. Canonicity.** — The canonical authority of the book of Proverbs has never been called in question, except among the Jews themselves. We learn from the Talmud (*Shabbath*, fol. 30 *b*) that the school of Shammai, thus early adopting the principle of the free handling of Scripture, was led by some apparent contradictions in the book (e.g. <sup><1104></sup>Proverbs 26:4, 5) to question its inspiration, and to propose to cast it out of the canon. It is

indeed certain, if we credit the Jewish tradition, that it did not at once take its place on a level with the other canonical Scriptures, but, like the Antilegomena of the New Test., remained for a time in suspense. According to Wolf (*Bibl. Hebr.* 2, 119) and Zunz (*Gott. Vor'traag.* p. 14), it was not till the period of the Persian rule that “the men of the great synagogue” admitted it to an equal rank with the other Hagiographa. In the remarkable passage of the Talmud, however, which contains the most ancient opinion of the Jews on the formation of the Old-Test. canon (*Baba Bathra*, p. 14, apud Westcott, *Bible in the Church*, p. 36), its recognition is fixed earlier: the Proverbs (“Meshalim”) being included with Isaiah, Canticles (“Shir Hashirim”), and Ecclesiastes (“Kohemoth”) in the memorial word Jamshak, specifying the books “written” — i.e. reduced to writing-by Hezekiah and his learned men. With the trifling exception mentioned above, its right to a place in the canon has never been questioned since its admission into it, and there is no book of Holy Scripture whose authority is more unshaken. The amount of inspiration in the book has been a matter of speculation since the days of Theodore of Mopsuestia, who believed that the wisdom contained in it was that of Solomon only, not of the Spirit of God; even as some of the rabbins found in Ecclesiastes no divine wisdom, but merely that of Solomon. Leaving such vain and impracticable distinctions, the canonical authority of the book is attested to us by the frequent use of it in the New Test. The following is a list of the principal passages:

- |                              |   |
|------------------------------|---|
| <1016> Proverbs 1:16         | Romans 3, 10, 15.                                 |
| <1017> Proverbs 3:7          | <5126> Romans 12:16.                              |
| <10181> Proverbs 3:11, 12    | <51275> Hebrews 12:5, 6; Revelation 3, 19.        |
| <10184> Proverbs 3:34        | <5046> James 4:6.                                 |
| <1002> Proverbs 10:12        | <1048> 1 Peter 4:8.                               |
| * <1013> Proverbs 11:31      | <1048> 1 Peter 4:18.                              |
| <1073> Proverbs 17:13        | <5127> Romans 12:17; <1165> 1 Thessalonians 5:15; |
| 1 Peter 3, 9.                |   |
| <1072> Proverbs 17:27        | <5019> James 1:19.                                |
| <1019> Proverbs 20:9         | <1008> 1 John 1:8.                                |
| <1020> Proverbs 20:20        | <1154> Matthew 15:4; <1070> Mark 7:10.            |
| <1028> Proverbs 22:8 (Sept.) | <1007> 2 Corinthians 9:7.                         |
| * <1152> Proverbs 25:21,22   | <5120> Romans 12:20.                              |
| * <1011> Proverbs 26:11      | <1022> 2 Peter 2:22.                              |
| <1021> Proverbs 27:1         | <5043> James 4:13,14, 16.                         |

Of these only those marked with an asterisk are actual quotations; in the others there is a more or less direct allusion. *SEE WISDOM PERSONIFIED.*

**III. Divisions.** — The thirty-one chapters of the book of Proverbs may be roughly divided into four sections:

1. The hortatory introduction (1-9);
2. The first collection of “the Proverbs of Solomon,” properly so called, with its appendices (10-24);
3. The second collection, compiled by Hezekiah’s scribes (25-29);
4. An appendix by different writers.

1. The first of these sections has no continuous connection, and is hardly capable of any very accurate subdivision. The separate chapters form in some instances a connected whole (e.g. 2, 5, 7, 8, 9); sometimes the connection does not extend beyond a few verses (e.g. <sup><2001></sup>Proverbs 3:1-10, 13-26; <sup><2044></sup>Proverbs 4:14-19; <sup><2001></sup>Proverbs 6:1-5, 6-11). There is little coherence between the separate chapters, and little unity beyond that of the general subject or the mode of treating it; so that if one chapter were to be removed, the organization of the whole would not be affected, and it would hardly be missed. Ewald, however, who, somewhat in defiance of the internal evidence, looks on this portion as “an original whole, thoroughly connected, and cast, as it were, at one gush,” after the general introduction (<sup><2001></sup>Proverbs 1:1-7) discovers three subdivisions, marked as well by the contents as by the position of the imperative verb at the beginning of the sections (e.g. <sup><2008></sup>Proverbs 1:8; 4:1; <sup><2050></sup>Proverbs 6:20); while in the smaller divisions “mi son” stands before the verb (e.g. <sup><2010></sup>Proverbs 1:10, 15; 2:1; 3:1, 11, 20; 4:21, etc.). Ewald’s subdivisions are —

(1) a general admonition to the pursuit of wisdom, not fully completed, but running off into particulars (<sup><2008></sup>Proverbs 1:8-3);

(2) an exhaustive enumeration of the particular points of his admonition (<sup><2008></sup>Proverbs 4:1-6:29), until

(3) the discourse, gradually rising in power and grandeur, at last attains an almost lyrical flight (<sup><2050></sup>Proverbs 6:20-9). According to Delitzsch (in Herzog’s *Encyklop.*) this section is divisible into fifteen separate strains —

- (1) ~~2007~~ Proverbs 1:7-19;
- (2) ~~2020~~ Proverbs 1:20-33;
- (3) Proverbs 2,
- (4) ~~2081~~ Proverbs 3:1-18;
- (5) ~~2089~~ Proverbs 3:19-26;
- (6) ~~2087~~ Proverbs 3:27-35,
- (7) ~~2041~~ Proverbs 4:1-5:6;
- (8) ~~2087~~ Proverbs 5:7-23;
- (9) ~~2061~~ Proverbs 6:1-5,
- (10) ~~2086~~ Proverbs 6:6-11,
- (11) ~~2062~~ Proverbs 6:12-19;
- (12) ~~2060~~ Proverbs 6:20-35;
- (13) Proverbs 7;
- (14) Proverbs 8;
- (15) Proverbs 9.

2. The second section (10-24) evidently contains three subdivisions —

(a) the collection of unconnected proverbs or gnomes (~~2001~~ Proverbs 10:1-22, 16);

(b) “the words of the wise” (comp. 1:6; ~~2007~~ Ecclesiastes 9:7, 12:11), consisting of a more connected series of maxims, with a hortatory preface recalling the style of the first section (~~2027~~ Proverbs 22:17-24:22);

(c) a shorter appendix of proverbial sayings, with the title “these also belong to the wise,” ending with a description of a sluggard (~~2023~~ Proverbs 24:23-34).

3. The third section is a continuous series of gnomic sayings without any subdivision (Proverbs 25-29).

4. The fourth section, like the second, separates into three parts —

(a) “the words of Agur,” a collection of proverbial and enigmatical sayings (30),

(b) “the words of king Lemuel” (~~2101~~ Proverbs 31:1-9); and

(c) a short alphabetical poem in praise of a virtuous woman (~~2110~~ Proverbs 31:10-31).

**IV. *History of the Text.*** — The variations from the existing Masoretic text of the book of Proverbs presented by the versions of the Sept., the Peshito-Syriac, the “argum, and to some extent by the Vulgate, bear witness to the former existence of copies differing in many and not unimportant points from that which has become the authoritative text. The text, as preserved in these ancient versions, differs from that of our Hebrew Bibles both in excess and defect. They contain clauses, verses, and sometimes paragraphs not to be found in our extant copies, for the existence of which it is difficult to account, unless they formed part of the book which was before the translators; while other portions are wanting, for the absence of which no sufficient account can be given, except that they were not read in the ancient Hebrew MSS. they employed. The very large number of minor discrepancies, both in language and arrangement, which we meet with, all tend to confirm this view, and it well deserves consideration what influence these variations, which every student knows are not confined to this book, should have on the ordinarily received hypothesis of the integrity and purity of the present Hebrew text. This, however, is not the place for the prosecution of this investigation. We shall content ourselves with pointing out the principal points of variation.

**1.** To commence with the Sept., the earliest of the existing versions. The translation of this book, like that of Job, proves a more competent acquaintance with the Greek language and literature than is usual with the Alexandrine translators. The rendering is more free than literal, giving what the writer conceived to be the general spirit of the passage without strict adherence to the actual words. Bertheau remarks that the version of this book appears to have been undertaken rather with a literary than a religious object, as it was not read in the synagogues or required for their internal regulation. It is to this freedom of rendering that not a few of the apparent discrepancies are due, while there are others which are attributable to carelessness, misconception of the writer’s meaning, or even possibly to arbitrary alterations on the part of the translators. In some cases, also, we find two incompatible translations fused into one — e.g. <sup><1125></sup>Proverbs 6:25; 16:26; 23:31. Of the majority, however, of the variations no explanation can be offered but that they represent a different original, and therefore deserve consideration for the history of the text.

In the first division (1-9) these variations are less considerable than in the second. Two verses appended to ch. 4 remove the abruptness of the close and complete the sense. To the simile of the ant (6:8), that of the bee is

added. The insertion after 8:21 seems out of place, and disturbs the continuity. In ch. 9 there are two considerable additions to the description of the wise and foolish women, which seem to complete the sense in a very desirable manner. The variations are much more considerable in the section 10-24. A large number of verses are wanting (<sup><1004></sup>Proverbs 11:4; 13:6; <sup><1007></sup>Proverbs 16:1-4; 18:23, 24; <sup><1001></sup>Proverbs 19:1, 2; 20:14-19; <sup><1005></sup>Proverbs 21:5; 22:6; 23:23 — which comes in very awkwardly in the Hebrew text; 24:8); the arrangement of others is dislocated — e.g. ch. 15 closes with ver. 29, vers. 30, 32, 33 standing at the beginning of ch. 16, while a verse very similar to ver. 31 is found after 16:17; 19:3 stands as the last verse of ch. 18; in ch. 20 vers. 20-22 come between vers. 9 and 10. The most extraordinary dislocation, hardly to be ascribed to anything but an error of the scribe, appears in ch. 24. After ver. 22 is introduced <sup><1027></sup>Proverbs 29:27, to which succeed four distichs descriptive of the wrath of a king and urging attention to the writer's words, not found in the Hebrew. We then find 30-31, 9 (i.e. the prophecy of Agur and of Lemuel), with the remainder of ch. 24 foisted in between vers. 14, 15 of ch. 30. The remainder of ch. 31, the acrostic on a virtuous woman, stands in its right place at the end of the book. The additions in this section are also numerous and important. We find proverbs intercalated between the following verses: <sup><1004></sup>Proverbs 10:4, 5; <sup><1016></sup>Proverbs 11:16, 17 (by which a very imperfect antithesis in the Hebrew is rectified); <sup><1021></sup>Proverbs 12:11, 12, 13, 14, 13:9, 10, 13, 14 (found in the Vulgate, 14:15, 16); <sup><1042></sup>Proverbs 14:22, 23; 15:5, 6; 18, 19, 27, 28; 28, 29; 17:6, 7; 16, 17; 18:22, 23; <sup><1007></sup>Proverbs 19:7, 8; 22:8, 9 (found with slight variations <sup><1007></sup>2 Corinthians 9:7); 9, 10; 14, 15. In the dislocated ch. 16 five or perhaps six new proverbs appear. Intercalated proverbs are also found in the section 25-29 — e.g. <sup><1050></sup>Proverbs 25:10, 11; 20, 21; 26:11, 12 (found also in <sup><1042></sup>Ecclesiastes 4:21), <sup><1071></sup>Proverbs 27:20, 21; <sup><1072></sup>Proverbs 21:22; 29:25, 26. Besides these, a careful scrutiny will discover a large number of smaller interpolations throughout, many of which are only explanatory clauses.

To specify the words and clauses which vary from the Hebrew would carry us far beyond our limits. For these and the comparison of the two versions generally, the student may be referred to Jager, *Observ. in Prov. Salom. vers. Alex.*, and Schleusner, *Opusc. Critic.* In many of these cases the Sept. has probably preserved the true reading (e.g. 10:10, b); but, on the whole, Ewald and Bertheau agree that the Masoretic text is the better and purer.

**2.** The Peshito-Syriac version, like the Sept., while it agrees with the Hebrew text generally, presents remarkable deviations in words and clauses, and contains whole verses of which there is no trace in the Hebrew. Some of the variations only prove a different interpretation of the text, but others are plainly referable to a difference in the text itself (e.g. <sup><1072></sup>Proverbs 7:22 sq.; 15:4-15; 19:20; 21:16; 22:21, etc.), and thus confirm the view that at the time the version was executed — i.e. anterior to the 4th century — the present Hebrew text was not universally recognised.

**3.** The Vulgate translation of Proverbs, hastily executed by Jerome in three days (together with Ecclesiastes and Canticles), offers largely the same phenomena as the Sept. version. Many of the additions of the Sept. are to be found in it — e.g. <sup><1004></sup>Proverbs 10:4; 12:11, 13; 15:5, 27 (comp. <sup><1005></sup>Proverbs 16:6); 16:5, etc.; and in one or two instances it has independent additions — e.g. <sup><1040></sup>Proverbs 14:21; 18:8. There can be little doubt that in these points it preserves an authentic record of the state of the text at a period anterior to any existing Hebrew MS.

**4.** We may conclude this hasty review with the Targum. That on the Proverbs is considered by Zunz (p. 64), on linguistic grounds, to be nearly contemporaneous with those on the Psalms and Job, and is assigned by Bertheau to the latter half of the 7th century, though it is not quoted before the 12th. The version is close, and on the whole follows the original text very faithfully, though with some remarkable deviations (the following are quoted by Bertheau — <sup><1072></sup>Proverbs 7:22; 10:3; 14:14; 25:1, 20, etc.). Its similarity to the Peshito is too remarkable to be accidental (<sup><1002></sup>Proverbs 1:2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 10, 12, 13; <sup><1009></sup>Proverbs 2:9, 10, 13-15; 3:2-9, etc.), and is probably to be accounted for by the supposition of a subsequent recension of the text, which is very corrupt, based upon that version. See Wolf, *Biblioth. Hebrews* 2, 1176; Dathe, *De Rat. Consens. rems. Chald. et Syr. Proverbs Salom.*; Zunz, *Gottesdienst. Vortrag.*

## V. Form and Style. —

**1.** The difference of style and structure between the first and second divisions is apparent on the most cursory perusal. Instead of the detached gnomes of the latter, we find a succession of hortatory addresses, varying in length and differing in subject, though for the most part on the same plan and with the same general object, in which the writer does not so much define wisdom as enlarge upon the blessings to be derived from its



possession, and the lasting misery which is the consequence of the violation of its precepts, and in the most powerful and moving language urge the young to the earnest pursuit of it as the best of all good things. Whether originally written as a proem or introduction or not, it is certainly well fitted to occupy its present place, and prepare the mind of the reader for the careful consideration of the moral and practical precepts which follow. The style is of a much higher and more dignified character than in the succeeding portions; the language is more rhetorical; it abounds in bold personifications and vivid imagery. The concluding chapters (8, 9) are cast in the grandest mould of poetry, and are surpassed in true sublimity by few portions of Holy Scripture. At the same time, when this portion is viewed as a whole, a want of artistic skill is discoverable. The style is sometimes diffuse and the repetitions wearisome. The writer returns continually on his steps, treating of the same topic again and again, without any apparent plan or regular development of the subject.

As regards the form, we find but little regularity of structure. The paragraphs consist sometimes of no more than two or three verses (<sup>2108</sup>Proverbs 1:8-9; 3:11-12; <sup>2109</sup>Proverbs 6:1-5, 6-11, 12-15, 16-19); sometimes the same thought is carried through a long succession of verses, or event an entire chapter (<sup>2110</sup>Proverbs 2:1-22; 5:1-20; 6:20-35; 7, 8, 9). A very favorite arrangement is a paragraph of ten verses (<sup>2111</sup>Proverbs 1:10-19; 3:1-10; 11-20; 4:10-19; <sup>2112</sup>Proverbs 8:12-21; 22-31), a form which, if we may trust the Sept. version, existed also in the copies employed by them in <sup>2113</sup>Proverbs 4:20-27; 5:6-11; and, according to the Peshito-Syriac, in <sup>2114</sup>Proverbs 4:1-9. The parallelism of members is sometimes maintained, but frequently neglected. The parallels are usually synonymous (e.g. <sup>2115</sup>Proverbs 1:8-9, 11, 12, etc.). The antithetical parallels found in <sup>2116</sup>Proverbs 3:32-35 belong to a series of gnomes which disturb the harmony of the passage, and appear scarcely in their appropriate place. It may be remarked that the name "Elohim" occurs only six times in the whole book, and thrice in this section (<sup>2117</sup>Proverbs 2:5-17; 3:4). The other places are, <sup>2118</sup>Proverbs 25:2; 30:5-9. Other unusual words are **t/mkj**; "wisdoms," for wisdom in the abstract (<sup>2119</sup>Proverbs 1:20; 9:1; found also in 24:7); **hrz**; "the strange woman," which occurs repeatedly (e.g. <sup>2120</sup>Proverbs 2:16; 5:3, 20, etc., found nowhere else save in <sup>2121</sup>Proverbs 22:14; 23:23); and **hYrka**; "the stranger" (<sup>2122</sup>Proverbs 2:16; 7:5, etc.; found also in <sup>2123</sup>Proverbs 20:16; 23:27; 27:13); i.e. the foreign prostitute, then as now lurking at the dark corners of the streets, taken as the

representative of the harlot sense seducing the young and inexperienced from true wisdom. Ewald also notices the unusual construction of  $\mu\upsilon\alpha\pi\omicron\nu\lambda$  a dual fem. with a verb in the masc. plur. ( $\langle 2102 \rangle$  Proverbs 5:2); while in the next verse it has properly a fern. plur., and the unusual plur.  $\mu\upsilon\nu\beta\alpha\epsilon$  ( $\langle 2104 \rangle$  Proverbs 8:4).

**2.** In the second division, “the Proverbs of Solomon,” which form the kernel of the book, (Proverbs 10-  $\langle 2127 \rangle$  Proverbs 22:17), we find a striking similarity of structure throughout. Every verse (reckoned by Delitzsch at 375) in its normal form consists of two members, each containing three, four, or more rarely five short words. (The one exception to this rule [19:7] is probably due to the loss of a member, which is supplied by the Sept.) Every verse is independent, with no necessary connection with those that precede or follow, and, generally speaking, no attempt at arrangement. Ewald’s theory of a continuous thread of connection running through this collection in its original form, and binding together the scattered sayings, has absolutely no evidence in its favor, and can only be sustained by supposing an almost total dismemberment of this portion of the book. It is true there are cases in which the same subject recurs in two or three successive verses (e.g.  $\langle 2102 \rangle$  Proverbs 10:2-5; 18-21; 11:4-8; 24-26), but these are the exceptions, and only occur, as Ewald elsewhere allows, when, from the studied brevity of the proverbial form, a thought cannot be expressed in all its fulness in a single verse. The cases in which the same characteristic word or words recur in successive proverbs are more frequent (e.g.  $\langle 2106 \rangle$  Proverbs 10:6, 7; 8:10;  $\langle 2105 \rangle$  Proverbs 11:5, 6; 10, 11, etc.). But in every instance each verse gives a single definite idea. nor do we ever meet with two verses so connected that the latter contains the reason of the counsel, or the application of the illustration given in the former.

Nearly the whole of the proverbs in the earlier part of this division are *antithetical*; but after the middle of ch. 15 this characteristic gradually disappears, and is almost entirely lost in the concluding chapters. A large number are *synonymous* (e.g.  $\langle 2102 \rangle$  Proverbs 11:7, 25, 30; 12:14, 28; 14:13, 17, 19, etc.), some *aphoristic* (e.g.  $\langle 2131 \rangle$  Proverbs 11:31; 13:14), especially with the comparative and  $\hat{m}\alpha$  (e.g.  $\langle 2129 \rangle$  Proverbs 12:9; 15:16, 17; 16:8, 9, etc.), or  $\gamma\epsilon\acute{\alpha}\alpha\iota$  “much more” (e.g.  $\langle 2131 \rangle$  Proverbs 11:31; 15:11; 17:7). Others are *synthetic* ( $\langle 2108 \rangle$  Proverbs 10:18; 11:29; 14:17, etc.); only two are *parabolic* ( $\langle 2105 \rangle$  Proverbs 10:26; 11:22).

The style is lower and more prosaic than in the former section. Ewald regards it as an example of the most ancient and simplest poetical style, full of primeval terseness, and bearing the visible stamp of antiquity in its language and imagery without any trace of later coloring. He remarks very justly that the proverbs in this collection are not to be looked upon as a collection of popular sayings, embodying mere prudential wisdom. but that they belong to the higher life, and are as broad in their grasp of truth as in their range of thought. The germ of many of them may have been found in popular sayings; but the skill and delicacy with which they have been fashioned into their present shape, though of the simplest kind, display the hand of a master.

Ewald remarks the following peculiar phrases as occurring in this section. “Fountain of life,” <sup><1001></sup>Proverbs 10:11; 13:14; 14:27; 16:22 (comp. <sup><1919></sup>Psalms 36:9 [10]): “tree of life,” <sup><1088></sup>Proverbs 3:18; 11:30; 13:12; 15:4: “snares of death,” 13:14; 14:27 (comp. <sup><1985></sup>Psalms 18:5 [6]): and the following favorite words — **aPējŋi** “healin in” in various similes and applications, <sup><1028></sup>Proverbs 12:18; 13:17; 16:24 (but this also occurs in the former section, <sup><1022></sup>Proverbs 4:22; 6:15) **hTj æ** “destruction,” <sup><1004></sup>Proverbs 10:14, 15, 29; 13:3; 14:28; 18:7; 21:15; and only in four other places in the whole Bible: **j jpye** part from **j WP**, “to blow,” <sup><1027></sup>Proverbs 12:17; 14:5, 25; 19:5-9 (comp. <sup><1069></sup>Proverbs 6:19; <sup><1926></sup>Psalms 12:6; 27:11): the unfrequent roots **āl s**, “perverseness,” <sup><1008></sup>Proverbs 11:3; 15:4, and the verb **āLsæ** “to pervert,” “destroy,” <sup><1036></sup>Proverbs 13:6; 19:3; 21:12; 22:12: the phrase **hqŋyæab**, “shall not go unpunished,” <sup><1025></sup>Proverbs 11:21; 16:5; 17:5 (comp. <sup><1030></sup>Proverbs 28:20; 6:29): **āDeæ** “he that pursueth,” <sup><1019></sup>Proverbs 11:19; 12:11; 13:21; 15:9; 19:7 (comp. 28:19), and nowhere else. Ewald instances also as archaic phrases not met with elsewhere, **h[yGæpid[i** “but for a moment,” <sup><1029></sup>Proverbs 12:19: **dyl ]dy**; “hand join in hand,” 11:21; 16:5: **[LGithæ** “meddled with,” <sup><1074></sup>Proverbs 17:14; 18:1; 20:3: **Grjæ** “whisperer,” “talebearer,” <sup><1068></sup>Proverbs 16:28; 18:8 (comp. <sup><1030></sup>Proverbs 26:20-22). The word **vye** “there is,” though frequent elsewhere, scarcely occurs in Proverbs, save in this section, <sup><1024></sup>Proverbs 11:24; 12:18; 13:7, 23; 14:12, etc.

**3.** With <sup><1027></sup>Proverbs 22:17, “the words of the wise” (comp. <sup><1006></sup>Proverbs 1:6), we are carried back to the style and language of the proem (ch. 1-9), of which we are also reminded by the continued address in the second

person singular, and the use of “my son.” There is, however, a difference in the phraseology and language; and, as Maurer remarks, the diction is not unfrequently rugged and awkward, and somewhat labored. Parallelism is neglected. The moral precepts are longer than those of ch. 10-22, but not so diffuse as those of the first section. We find examples of the distich, <sup>[123]</sup>Proverbs 22:28; 23:9; 24:7-10: the tristich, <sup>[124]</sup>Proverbs 22:29; 24:29: but the tetrastich is the most frequent, the favorite form being that in which the second member gives the ground of the first, <sup>[125]</sup>Proverbs 22:22, 23; 24, 25; 26, 27, etc. We also find proverbs of five members, <sup>[126]</sup>Proverbs 23:4, 5; 24:3, 4: several of six, <sup>[127]</sup>Proverbs 23:1-3, 12-14, 19-21; 24:11, 12: and one of seven, <sup>[128]</sup>Proverbs 28:6-8. We have a longer strain, <sup>[129]</sup>Proverbs 23:29-35, against drunkenness.

4. The short appendix, <sup>[130]</sup>Proverbs 24:23-34, comprising more “words of the wise,” can hardly be distinguished in style or form from the preceding. It closes with a “proverb-lay” of five verses on the evils of sloth.

5. The second collection of “the Proverbs of Solomon” (ch. 25-29), transcribed (𐤒𐤒𐤕𐤓𐤁, Sept. ἐξεγράψαντο, Aq. μετήραν; Gr. Ven. μετήνεγκαν; comp. Pusey, *Daniel*, p. 322 note) by the scribes of Hezekiah, closely resembles the former one. They are, according to Pusey, “identical in language.” It has, however, some very decided points of difference. The “parabolic” proverb is much more frequent than the “antithetical,” the two members of the comparison being sometimes set side by side without any connecting link (e.g. <sup>[131]</sup>Proverbs 25:12, 13), which is in other cases given merely by w, “and,” or <sup>^</sup>Ke “so” (<sup>[132]</sup>Proverbs 26:1, 2, 18-19; 27:8, etc.). The parallelism is sometimes strict, sometimes lax and free. There is a want of the sententious brevity of the former collection, and the construction is looser and weaker. The proverbs are not always completed in a single verse (<sup>[133]</sup>Proverbs 25:6, 7; 9, 10; 21, 22; 26:18, 19); and more frequently than in the former section we have series of proverbs with an internal connection of subject (<sup>[134]</sup>Proverbs 26:23-25; 27:15, 16, 23-27), and others in which the same key-word recurs (<sup>[135]</sup>Proverbs 25:8-10; 26:3-12; 13-16). This is not found so often after <sup>[136]</sup>Proverbs 27:5; but a close examination of the text suggests the idea that this may be due to a disturbance of the original order (comp. <sup>[137]</sup>Proverbs 27:7, 9; 28:4, 7, 9; 29:8, 10, etc.). Ewald discovers a want of the figurative expressions of the earlier collection, and a difference of language and phraseology, while Rosenmüller remarks that the meaning of the proverbs

is more obscure and enigmatical. The greater part of them are moral precepts. "The earlier collection may be called 'a book for youth;' this 'a book for the people'" (Delitzsch); "the wisdom of Solomon in the days of Hezekiah" (Stier).

**6.** The three supplemental writings with which the book closes (ch. 30, 31) are separated from the other portions and from one another no less by style and form than by authorship. Ewald somewhat arbitrarily divides ch. 30 after ver. 14 (a division, however, sanctioned by the Sept.), and thinks it not improbable that ch. 30 and ~~31:1-9~~ Proverbs 31:1-9 are from the same pen. He also regards the opening verses of ch. 30 as a dialogue, vers. 2-4 being the words of an ignorant disciple of Agur, to which the teacher replies. The difference between the enigmatical savings of Agur (which find a counterpart in the collections of Oriental proverbs) and the simple admonitions of Lemuel's mother is very great if we assign them to one author. In ch. 30 we have, in Ewald's words, instead of moral aphorisms, a succession of elegant little pictures illustrative of moral truths, evidencing a decay of creative power, the skill of the author being applied to a novel and striking presentation of an old truth. The ancient terse proverbial form is entirely lost sight of, and the style rises to a height and dignity warranting the use of the term **aCmi**(comp. ~~Isaiah 13:1~~; ~~Habakkuk 1:1~~, etc.) applied to both. In "the words of king Lemuel" we find much greater regularity. The parallelism is synonymous, and is maintained throughout. The alphabetical ode in praise of a virtuous woman — "a golden A B C for women" (Doderlein) — has all its verses of about the same compass. The parallelism is very similar to that of the Psalms, especially those in which the same alphabetical arrangement is found.

**VI. Authorship and Date.** — On these points the most various opinions have been entertained, from that of the rabbins and the earlier school of commentators, with whom some modern writers (e.g. Keil) agree, who attribute the whole book to Solomon (even ~~Proverbs 30:31~~ are assigned to him by Rashi and his school), to those of Hitzig and other representatives of the advanced critical school, who, however widely at variance with one another, agree in reducing to a minimum the wise king of Israel's share in the book which from the remotest antiquity has borne his name. In the face of such wide discrepancies, where the same data lead careful investigators (e.g. Ewald and Hitzig) to exactly opposite conclusions, a satisfactory decision of the question of authorship and date

is hardly to be hoped for. It may rather be doubted whether the evidence at present before us is such as to admit of an absolute determination of the question at issue. Where so much indefiniteness exists, all we can do is to balance probabilities and to abstain from dogmatic decisions.

The evidence in favor of a composite origin of the book appears, we must confess, irresistible. No unprejudiced person, we think, accustomed to the consideration of such questions, could read the book for the first time, even in English, without seeing in it the traces of several different authors, or at least editors. Irrespective of the two concluding chapters, the express reference to other sages ( $\mu\upsilon\mu\kappa\epsilon\iota$ ) in <sup><2007></sup>Proverbs 22:17; 24:23; comp. 1:6) indicates a diversity of authorship, while the difference of style between various divisions of the work strengthens the hypothesis. Indeed, a careful observer will find at the very outset an indication of the composite character of the book in the introductory verses which profess to give the contents and character (<sup><2001></sup>Proverbs 1:1-7). These prepare us to find in it, not merely “proverbs” and “eloquent speeches” (margin, A.V.: “interpretation”), but also such “words of the wise” as those we have just referred to, and “dark sayings” like those of Agur.

Are we, then, to discard the title, “the Proverbs of Solomon,” and to consider that the designation has been given to the book erroneously? To us this appears rash in the extreme. We know from historical sources that Solomon was the author of a very large number of proverbs; and nothing but that restlessness of speculation which discards old beliefs simply, as it would seem, because they are old, and seeks to unsettle all that has hitherto been held certain, can discover any sufficient reason for questioning that Solomon was the composer of the greater part of those contained in our present book, especially in the sections 10 - 22:16; 25 - 29. However much these collections may have been modified in successive redactions, though too much has probably been conceded to this hypothesis, of which there is no definite trace, and by which a work may be made to assume any form that may suit the theory to be supported, we have no sufficient reason for doubting that Solomon was the originator of the peculiar style of poetry in which they are composed, and that, even if they are not *all* to be referred to him, the mass are his, and that they are all pervaded with his spirit, and may be assigned to his epoch. Even those attributed to “the ancients” may have been found by Solomon already floating in a semi-gnomic form, and recast by him in a more distinctly proverbial dress. Eichhorn finds in them no trace of language or thought

subsequent to the time of Solomon. Even Ewald, who insists most on the collection as we have it having suffered from abbreviations, transpositions, and unauthorized additions, remarks that the proverbs all breathe the happy peace and growing civilization of Solomon's age; nor is there any epoch either earlier or later to which we could preferably assign them.

The proverbs in the later collection (ch. 25-29), though they present some diversities, do not differ so essentially from the earlier ones as to give any sufficient grounds for questioning the accuracy of the superscription (~~25:1~~ Proverbs 25:1). The title itself informs us that the compilation was not made till four centuries after Solomon, and the differences are not greater than might be looked for in sayings that had been so long floating about among the common people, and thereby subjected to disfigurement and change. The indications of an altered state of society and a decrease of confidence in the rulers, in which Ewald discovers such unmistakable proofs of a later date, are hardly so evident to others as to himself. We know too little of the internal economy of Solomon's reign to enable us to pronounce authoritatively that such and such expressions are inconsistent with the state of the people and tone of thought at that period.

The objection brought by Eichhorn and others against assigning the proverbs in the two collections to Solomon, that the genius of no one man, not even one as divinely gifted with wisdom as Solomon, is sufficient for the production of so large a number, is puerile in the extreme. Those we possess are but a portion of the three thousand ascribed to him (~~10:1~~ 1 Kings 4:32), and scarcely give twenty for each of the forty years of his reign.

The general didactic tone of the book is asserted to be more consistent with the character of a prophet or priest than that of a king (Davidson). To this it is replied that this is true of kings in general. but not of such a king as Solomon, to whom God gave a wise and understanding heart, whose proverbs are eminently didactic, and who has in ~~10:1~~ 1 Kings 8 discoursed on the divine economy towards man in a way that no prophet or priest could well surpass. The praises of monogamy, and the strict illjunctions against adultery, are urged by Bertholdt as reasons why Solomon, a polygamist himself, and Bathsheba's son, could not be the author of this section. It is, however, a remarkable feature of the Old Test. in general, and not peculiar to this place, that polygamy, however generally practiced, is never praised; that invariably where the married state is spoken of in terms of praise it is the union of one man to one woman that is held up to

honor. Beside the force of this objection is considerably modified by the reflection that precepts are here given for the mass of men, with whom monogamy is the general rule, though polygamy may be common among the richer classes (Wilkinson's *Egypt*, 2, 62); and also that the contrast here drawn (<sup><1058></sup>Proverbs 5:18, etc.) is not between monogamy and polygamy, but between the marriage tie and adulterous connection. As to the supposition that the repeated warnings against adultery could not come from one whose own mother fell into that sin, no great weight can be attached to it; for a moral and religious teacher must disregard considerations which would influence other men. The allusions to deeds of violence (<sup><1011></sup>Proverbs 1:11-19; 2:12, etc.) are supposed by Ewald to indicate a state of confusion inconsistent with that state of peace and social security which marked the reign of Solomon (<sup><1025></sup>1 Kings 4:25). To this it is replied that a condition of great private wealth, such as was the condition of Solomon's times, always tempts needy and unprincipled men to acts of unlawful violence; and that nothing beyond crimes which now are committed in the most civilized and best-regulated countries are referred to in the passages in question. Besides, Judaea always afforded in its caverns and wildernesses peculiar facilities for robbers (<sup><1002></sup>Judges 6:2; <sup><1024></sup>1 Samuel 24:1). From a supposed degeneracy of style, Ewald attributes this section to the earlier part of the 7th century B.C. But other critics do not see this. Davidson thinks it indicates a flourishing state of Hebrew literature, and refers it probably to the 9th century B.C., an opinion in which he coincides with Hitzig. The grounds on which Ewald relies for his alleged degeneracy of style seem weak. Thus, he asserts that the plural *ishim* (<sup><1004></sup>Proverbs 8:4) is so unusual as to indicate a very late date. It is certainly very unusual, for it occurs only three times (Furst). From these, however, we cannot argue as to the (late, as one of them is in Isaiah, another in <sup><1003></sup>Psalms 141:3, attributed to David, and the third in the passage above referred to.

Similar and equally futile objections have been based, by Bertholdt and others, on the familiarity displayed in the proverbs with circumstances and conditions in life with which it is supposed that Solomon as a king could have had no experimental acquaintance. For example, it is maintained that <sup><1005></sup>Proverbs 10:5; 12:10, 11; 14:4; 20:4, must have been written by a landowner or husbandman: <sup><1005></sup>Proverbs 10:15, by a poor man: <sup><1014></sup>Proverbs 11:14; 14:19, by a citizen of a well-ordered state: <sup><1015></sup>Proverbs 11:26, by a tradesman: <sup><1004></sup>Proverbs 12:4, by one who was not a polygamist: <sup><1040></sup>Proverbs 14:1; 15:25; 16: 1; 17:2; 19:13, 14; 20:10, 14, 23,



by an ordinary citizen: <sup><119D></sup>Proverbs 25:2-7, not by a king, but by one who had lived some time at a court: <sup><1271></sup>Proverbs 27:11, by a teacher of youth: <sup><1072></sup>Proverbs 17:23-27, by a sage who lived a nomadic life: <sup><1316></sup>Proverbs 28:16, by one free from those errors which weakened Solomon's throne, and robbed his son of his kingdom. It is needless to point out the weakness of these fancied arguments which would affect no one who had not a theory of his own to support. They are akin to those which have been used with as little success to prove that no *one* man could have written the plays of Shakespeare, and they display the most marvellous ignorance of that many-sidedness and keenness of perception and insight which are characteristic of the highly gifted among mankind.

As little weight is to be assigned to the objections drawn from the repetitions. It is true that we find the same idea, and even the same words, recurring not only in the two collections (e.g. <sup><1209></sup>Proverbs 21:9, 25:24; 18:8, 26:22; <sup><1272></sup>Proverbs 22:3, 27:12; 22:13, 26:13; 19:24, 26:15; 19:1, 28:6), but in the same collection (e.g. <sup><1042></sup>Proverbs 14:12, 16:25; 10:1, 15:20; 16:2, 21:2; 10:2, 11:4; 13:14, 14:27; 26:12, 29:20). This latter is, however, no more, as Umbreit remarks, than is natural in such a compilation, in the formation of which one is very apt to forget what had already been set down; while the former class of repetitions is easily to be accounted for by the anxiety of the collectors to lose nothing which had the stamp of Solomon's authorship, even though the same idea had already been expressed in the earlier collection; and it goes far to confirm the view that Solomon was the composer of the whole.

The internal evidence — derived from language, construction, ideas, historic background, and the like — varies with every successive critic, and is entirely inadequate to warrant any decisive verdict. Its precariousness is proved by the opposite results to which the same data lead various commentators. Keil maintains that every part of the book, with the exception of the last two chapters, corresponds to the epoch of Solomon, and that only. Eichhorn agrees with this to a certain extent, but limits the correspondence to ch. 1-24; while Ewald, Hitzig, and Bertheau, and other minor critics, arrive at conclusions expressed with equal confidence and at variance with these and with one another. There is, however, one evidence which speaks strongly in favor of an early date — the entire absence of all reference to idolatry. The form of religion appearing throughout is purely Jehovistic (as we have noticed above, Elohim occurs only four times in the

body of the work), and false gods and foreign faiths are not even referred to.

The above remarks refer chiefly to the collection of proverbs properly so called, which we have no Difficulty in ascribing, on the whole, to Solomon as their ultimate author. We may, if we choose, suppose that the men of Hezekiah made a collection of unwritten proverbs current among the people, and by them supposed, truly or not, to have come down from Solomon; but the men of Hezekiah, or whoever wrote the superscription of 25:1, declare those they put forth to have been copied from written records. Assuming this to be the correct view, the difference between these proverbs and those which went before is, that whereas in Solomon's time the latter were arranged as we have them, the former were in Hezekiah's time selected from more ancient written records and added to the existing collection. It gives us the idea, which is itself an extremely probable one, that voluminous records were made in Solomon's time of the wise king's sayings, either by himself or by scribes. This idea derives considerable confirmation from the notice in <sup><1083></sup>1 Kings 4:30-34, where we are told of the accurate account taken of his compositions and sayings, and even of the precise number of his proverbs and songs. We are led to suppose, then, that in Solomon's time a selection (10-22:16) was made by himself, or under his immediate supervision, while in Hezekiah's time a further selection was made, and an exact transcript taken. A comparison of the proverbs in these two collections lends strong confirmation to this view, In selecting or arranging a collection in Solomon's time, and under his inspection, the choice would naturally fall upon the most perfect, and as alterations might be freely made by their actual author, these would tend to bring them into a still more finished form. Accordingly, we find in the more ancient collection a certain tastefulness and polish which the others do not possess. In the former each verse contains its own perfect sense, and this usually comprised in a certain number of words, varying from seven to nine, beyond which they very rarely extend. In the latter, while the sense is generally contained in one verse, it not unfrequently runs through two or more verses. Examples from these might easily be produced as concise and perfect in form as the others (e.g. <sup><1087></sup>Proverbs 25:2, 3, 14); but very commonly the sense is brought out in a much more diffuse manner (e.g. <sup><1086></sup>Proverbs 25:6, 7, 9, 10, 21, 22; 26:18, 20; 27:15, 16, 23-27). In the individual verses also we find occasionally a far greater number of words than are ever admitted into those of the older collection (e.g. <sup><1087></sup>Proverbs

25:7, 20); and the parallelism, which never fails in the verses of the earlier, is often wanting in those of the later division (<sup><1018></sup>Proverbs 25:8, 21, 22; 26:10; 27:1). This agrees with the idea which we think warranted by a comparison of <sup><1019></sup>Proverbs 25:1 with <sup><1019></sup>1 Kings 4:32, 33, that the proverbs in this collection are probably much as they fell from Solomon's lips, and were first committed to writing by himself or others under him; and that while the former collection received his own final corrections, the men of Hezekiah simply copied from the text before them, but did not venture upon any alteration in the form.

The case is somewhat different with regard to the introductory chapters (1-9), and there is more ground for the diversity of opinion as to their date and authorship. It is certainly quite possible that the whole or a considerable portion of this section may have been written by Solomon. The differences of style, of which Ewald makes much, are, as Bertheau has shown, somewhat exaggerated by him, and are not perhaps greater than may be accounted for by the different nature of the compositions. The terse simplicity of a proverb would be out of place in a series of hortatory addresses such as those which characterize this section. Ewald dwells with emphasis on the internal evidence of a late date afforded by the state of society, and the tone of feeling as portrayed here. But we repeat our former remark, that we know too little of the internal history of Judaea at this time to allow us to speak with so much confidence on these points, and express our conviction that the conclusions drawn by Ewald are not warranted by the premises. The imagery all points to a large and profligate city, such as Jerusalem may well have become during the middle of Solomon's prosperous reign; and the vivid representation of the habits of the foreign prostitutes and lawless freebooters who roamed its streets is hardly more than could have been attained by one who, like Harun Alraschid, was fond of laying aside his kingly state and visiting his city in disguise.

It is evident, from what we have remarked in a former section, that we regard the poem (ch. 1-9) in its present form as a composite work, though very possibly proceeding from one pen. The similarity of style, subject, and treatment, is strongly in favor of unity of authorship, while the internal evidence favors the view that it is compiled of various unconnected members, collected and arranged subsequently to the time of their composition. The date of this compilation it is impossible to fix. The evidence on this point is faint and untrustworthy, and has led different

investigators to very opposite conclusions. Ewald places it in the 7th, Hitzig in the 9th century B.C., while Keil, as we have seen, ascribes it to the time of Solomon. The resemblance that may be traced in this portion of the work to the spirit and teaching of the book of Job, and the recurrence of some of the words and images found there, is employed both by Hitzig and Ewald to aid in determining the date of this section (comp. <sup><18150></sup>Job 15:7 with <sup><1025></sup>Proverbs 8:25; <sup><18217></sup>Job 21:17, <sup><1039></sup>Proverbs 13:9; <sup><18288></sup>Job 28:18, <sup><1086></sup>Proverbs 8:16; <sup><1857></sup>Job 5:17, <sup><1081></sup>Proverbs 3:11; see Pusey, *Daniel*, p. 323, note 7). But as there is no unanimity as to the date of the composition of Job, little help is to be expected from this source, nor can we be surprised at the diversity of opinion among those who have employed it: Ewald maintaining that the writer of Proverbs had read and made use of Job: Hitzig, on the contrary, believing that the former is the earlier work, and that the author of Job borrowed from Proverbs. The adoption of such expedients proves most forcibly the complete want of any decisive testimony which will enable us to arrive at any trustworthy conclusion as to the date of this section. In the midst of this uncertainty, the above solution is as probable as any other —namely, that it is due to Solomon's authorship out of materials existing at his time.

The similarity in style between 1-9 and the appendix to the first collection of proverbs (<sup><1027></sup>Proverbs 22:17-24) appears to favor the view that this supplement is due to the same person by whom the proem was prefixed to the book. Ewald enumerates several reasons for ascribing the two to the same writer (p. 42), but finally decides against the unity of authorship. The proverbs themselves, designated as "words of the wise," are evidently distinguished from those of Solomon, and are probably to be regarded as the adages of other sages, which the compiler of the work thought too valuable to be lost, and therefore appended to his larger collection. The short supplement (<sup><1023></sup>Proverbs 24:23-34) is accounted for by Umbreit on the supposition that the compiler had laid aside his work for a time, and took it up again on the discovery of fresh sayings worthy of preservation. He renders ⲡⲓⲙⲁⲓ ⲓⲓ "for," not "of the wise," and regards them as directed to the compiler's scholars. Ewald, Bertheau, Delitzsch, etc., defend the received translation.

It only remains for us to speak of the threefold supplement (30, 31), with regard to the authorship and date of which again nothing can be determined. It would be hardly profitable to discuss the marvellous fabric of fanciful history and biography which has been evolved from the scantiest

materials by Hitzig, Bunsen, and Bertheau. Those who desire it may refer to their works to see the grounds on which “Massa” (A.V. “the prophecy”) is identified with a district in Arabia (<sup><0100></sup>Genesis 10:30; 25:14; <sup><1000></sup>1 Chronicles 1:30) of which Lemuel was king, and Agur with a descendant of the Simeonites, who in the reign of Hezekiah drove out the Amalekites from Mount Seir (<sup><1000></sup>1 Chronicles 4:42); or, again, on which it is sought to prove that Agur and Lemuel were brothers, sons of the reigning queen of Massa. We would rather commend to our reader Eichhorn’s sensible words that “Agur should remain Agur, and belong to the wise men of the old world of whom history gives us no further information,” and with him deprecate “spinning a long thread of tedious conjectures about a name, which do not advance us an inch in our insight into the literature of the old world, or any profitable learning.” As little to the purpose is the fancy of Doderlein that the opening part of ch. 30 is a dialogue that Ithiel is a heathen; Agur a much valued servant of Ithiel, to whom, as his master, his prayer (<sup><1000></sup>Proverbs 5:7-9) is addressed. Many are content with saying that Agur was an unknown Hebrew sage, the teacher of Ithiel and Ucal — names from which, also, many unprofitable speculations have been built — and that he lived subsequently to the reign of Hezekiah. Still more probable do we regard the view which identifies him with Solomon himself under a fanciful name. *SEE AGUR; SEE MASSA.*

Lemuel — “to God,” “devoted to God,” after the analogy of **l aē**; <sup><0000></sup>Numbers 3:24 (Pusey) — may certainly be regarded as a figurative name descriptive of an ideal king, “a monarch as he should be” (Ewald; Eichhorn; comp. Pusey, *Lect. on Daniel*, p. 13 note 1, p. 323, note 5). *SEE LEMUEL.*

The alphabetical lay which concludes the whole has usually been thought to belong to the latest period of Hebrew poetry, and hardly to be placed higher than the 7th century. Its style and language seem to distinguish it from the words of Lemuel, with which it has sometimes been confounded; but we are again warned against the precariousness of such grounds of argument as to authorship.

The results of our inquiry may be thus summed up. The nucleus of the book is the larger collection of proverbs (Proverbs 10-22:16). These may safely be regarded as really what they profess to be, “the proverbs of Solomon.” Whether they were arranged as we now have them and published by him, there is not sufficient evidence to determine. It is

probable, however, that the collection was either contemporaneous with or not long subsequent to him. The greater part of the hortatory introduction (1-9) may also be, with great probability, ascribed originally to Solomon, though we incline to the belief that its present form is due to a later compiler, who collected the admonitions of the wise king, and prefixed them to his book of proverbs. The same author also appears to have added the appendix (<sup><1217></sup>Proverbs 22:17; 24:22), containing proverbs of which Solomon was not the proper author. but perhaps only the earliest collector, and after this from similar sources were supplied the few supplementary sayings (<sup><1223></sup>Proverbs 24:23-34). The time when this was done cannot be fixed, but there are cogent arguments in favor of a late date. The second collection, as its name declares, was formed by the scribes of Hezekiah, cir. B.C. 725. The last two chapters contain compositions of the dates and authors of which nothing certain can now be known. They, too, may have been in some important sense due to Solomon, but were probably inserted by a later editor.

It will not be worth while to enumerate the many and widely varying theories of recent critics as to the dates of the composition of the different parts of this book, and the time when it assumed its present form. One or two of the most characteristic may be specified. Suffice it to say that Ewald would place the publication of Proverbs 10-22:16 about two centuries after Solomon, and 1-9 in the first half of the 7th century. Not much later the second collection of proverbs (25-29) was added, the sections <sup><1217></sup>Proverbs 22:17-24 being due to the same compiler. Hitzig, on the contrary, views 1-9 as the earliest part of the book; 10-22, 16 and <sup><1217></sup>Proverbs 28:17-29 being added about B.C. 750. Twenty-five years later Hezekiah's collection followed; the gaps being filled up and the volume completed by some unknown compiler at a later period. The theory of Delitzsch (Herzog, *Encyklop.*, s.v. Spruche) is marked by more calm sense, but even this is in parts not a little fanciful or conjectural. Rightly regarding 10-22, 16 as the kernel of the book, and mainly composed by Solomon, he divides the whole into two portions —

**(1)** 1-24, 22 put forth in the time of Jehoshaphat; the introduction (1-9) and appendix (<sup><1226></sup>Proverbs 22:16-24, 22) being written by the compiler, whom he regards as “a highly gifted didactic poet, and an instrument of the spirit of revelation;” and

(2) <sup>1223</sup>Proverbs 24:23-31, published in the reign of Hezekiah; the introductory and closing portions (<sup>1223</sup>Proverbs 24:23-34, and 30:31) being set on either side of the collection of Soiomon's proverbs to serve as a kind of foil.

The two periods which are generally selected in opposition to the above views of the Solomonic authorship for the composition of various parts of the book are the reign of Hezekiah and the times subsequent to the captivity. Neither of these periods seems to suit the general character of Proverbs at all so well as the reign of Solomon. Hezekiah found his kingdom in great domestic miserv-immersed in idolatry and subject to foreign rule. At home his pre-eminent character was that of a social and religious reformer, struggling against the sins and evils of his times; abroad the most active period of his reign was distinguished by a series of wars, during some of which his kingdom was reduced to the verge of ruin, the whole land overrun by hostile armies, its fenced cities taken, and the king forced to submission. The terror of an Assyrian invasion also hung over the land for years. The later period of his reign, indeed, was peaceful; but the evils of preceding reigns were far from being eradicated, and he had before him the certain prospect, conveyed by prophecy, of the utter prostration of his kingdom. His chief works seem to have been the making a pool and conduit to bring water to Jerusalem. On his death Judah relapsed into idolatry. The times subsequent to the captivity were marked by equally strong characteristics, and chiefly of a mournful kind — a feeble, struggling, and too often languid and depressed remnant, striving amid many difficulties to maintain their ground and bear up amid manifold discouragements. With neither of these periods does the general character of Proverbs agree. Royalty marks it throughout, sharply distinguishing it from any period subsequent to the captivity; as by other marked features it bears the impress of a time different from Hezekiah's. Its warnings are not against the public sins which disgraced that period, nor are its consolations suited to the public trials which were threatening to bring both king and kingdom to the ground. Its pointed allusions to a powerful monarchy, a numerous and wealthy people, and such sins as readily spring up in a time of plenty; its fine linens of Egypt, its high places thronged, its roads covered with travellers, its gates and cities crowded and rejoicing, its precious stones and fine gold and architectural illustrations, its people living beneath the eye of their monarch and dependent on his good-will, all seem to mark a reign when an absolute monarch ruled over a great and

wealthy people, who lived at ease at home, and had no dreaded enemy in their borders; who traded to distant lands and brought their products into common use; when the worship of Jehovah prevailed through the land, and men had leisure for learning; when wisdom sat on the throne, personified in Solomon, and the evils which must ever exist while man is a fallen being were evils inseparable from any condition of humanity, and especially from one abounding with the elements of material prosperity.

*SEE SOLOMON.*

**VII. Commentaries.** — The following are the special exegetical helps on the whole book; a few of the most important of them are designated by an asterisk — Origen, *Commentarii* (in *Opp.* vol. 3); also *Scholia* (in *Bibl. Patr.* Gallandii, vol. xiv); Basil, *Commentarii* (in *Opp.* II. i); Bede, *Expositio* (in *Opp.* vol. iv; also in *Works*, vol. ix); Honorius, *Commentarius* (in *Opp.* p. 1140); Ralbag [Levi ben-Gershon], *vWlrPq* with Ben-Meir's commentary], by Baholes (Leiria, 1492, fol.; afterwards in the Rab. Bibles; also [with Aben-Ezra, etc.] in Latin by Ghiggheo, Amst. 1638, 4to); Arama, *μ/ι vb̄ai dyi* (Constantinop. s.a. 4to; with notes by Berlin, Leips. 1859, 8vo); Imm. ben-Salomo, *vWlrPq* with Kimchi on Psalm] (Naples, 1486. fol.); Shalom ben-Abraham, *yq̄m]bqi* (Salonica, 1522, fol.; also in Frankfurter's Bible); Melancthon, *Explicatio* (Hag. 1525, and elsewhere later, 8vo); Munster, *Adnotatione*, (Basil. 1525, 8vo); Jos. ibn-Jachja, *vWlrPq* with Job, etc.] (Bologna, 1538, fol.; also in Frankfurter's Bible); Cajetan [Rom. Cath.], *Enarratio* (Lugd. 1545, fol.); Fobian, *μyGrTi* (Constantinop. 1548, 4to); Arboreus [Rom. Cath.], *Commentarius* (Par. 1549, fol.); Malvenda [Rom. Cath.], *Explicatio* (in *Opp.* Lugd. 1550, fol.); Bayne, *Commentarii* (Par. 1555, fol.; also in the *Critici Sacri*, vol. iii); Lavater, *Commentarii* (Tigur. 1562, 4to, 1565, 1572, 1586, fol.); Strigel, *Scholia* (Lips. 1565, Neost. 1571, 8vo); Jansenius [Rom. Cath.], *Adnotationes* (Lovan. 1568. 8vo, and elsewhere later, with Psalm, etc.) Sidonius [Rom. Cath.], *Commentarii* (Mog. 1570, fol.); Mercer, *Commentarii* (Genev. 1573, fol.; also [with Job] Amst. 1651, fol.); Cope, *Exposition* (transl. by Outretd, Lond. 1580, 4to); aard. ben-Jakob, *yl v̄inæ* (Cracow, 1582, 4to); Is. ben-Miose, *ryDj yi μymæ* (Lublin, 1592, 4to); Drabit, *Auslequngq* (Erf. 1595, 8vo); Musselt *Commentaire* (Lond. 1596, 8vo); Wilcocks, *Commentary* (in *Works*); Alspach, *μynæ]br̄o* (Ven. 1601, 4to; and later elsewhere, fol.); Cleaver, *Explanation* (Lond. 1608, 1615, 4to); Dod, *Exposition* [on ch. ix-xvii] (Lond, 1609, 4to); Agell



[Rom. Cath.], *Commentarius* (Par. 1611, fol.); Cartwright, *Commentarii* (L. B. 1617, anli later elsewhere, 4to); Imninuts, *Expositio* (Par. 1619, 2 vols. fol.); De Salazar [Rom. Cath.], *Expositio* (ibid. 1619-21, and elsewhere later, 2 vols. fol.); Jizchaki, **vllrPē** with Aben-Ezra's and others] (in Latin by Ghiggheo, Mail. 1620, 4to; by Breithaupt, Gotha, 1714. 4to); Duran, **hmbv]qvj** (Ven. 1623, 4to); Egard, *Christenthum*, etc. [on ch. i-ix] (Lub. 1624, 8vo); Guillebert [Rom. Cath.], *Paraphrasis* (Par. 1626, 1637, 8vo); A Lapide, *Commentarius* (Antw. 1635, fol.); Jermin, *Commentary* (Lond. 1638, fol.); Bohll, *Commentarius* (Rost. 1640, 4to); Maldonatus [Rom. Cath.], *Commentarius* [includ. Psalm, etc.] (Par. 1643, fol.); Geier, *Curac* (Lips. 1653 and later, 4to); Gorse [Rom. Cath.], *Explication* (Par. 1654, 12mo); Taylor, *Exposition* [on ch. iix] (Lond. 1655-57, 2 vols. 4to); Leigh, *Annotations* [includ. Job, etc.] (ibid. 1657, fol.); Deckey, *Handbuch* (Magdeb. 1667, 4to); Anon. [Rom. Cath.], *Recueil* [patristic] (Par. 1677, 1704, 8vo; also in Germ., Chemn. 1707. 12mo; Dresd. 1720, 8vo); David ben-Mose, **Ḥm; dwd** (Amst. 1683, 4to); Bossuet [Rom. Cath.], *Notac* [includ. Ecclesiastes, etc.] (Par. 1693. 8x-o; also in (*Euvres*, vol. xxi); Oier, *Verklacaring* [on ch. i-ix] (Amst. 1698, 4to); Anon. [Rom. Cath.], *Analyse* [with Ecclesiastes] (Par. 1702, 12mo); )u iHamel [Rom. Cath.], *Adnotattiones* (ibid. 1703, 12mo); Goldschmidt, **qdx,ynēai** (Wilmersd. 1714, 8vo); also **yl vlna** (F. a. Mi. 1713, 12mo); Pinto, **āllrx; āsk** (Amst. 1714, 1735, 8vo); C. B. Alichaelis, *Adnotattiones* (Hal. 1720, 4to; also in *Comment. in Hagiog.* vol. i); Meiri, **vllrPē** first in Frankfurter's Bible, Amst. 1724-27; separately, Fiirth, 1844, 8vo); Wolle, *Auslegung* (Leips. 1729, 8vo); Is. ben-Elija, **yl vlna** (Wandsb. 1731, 8vo); Kortum, *Auflosung* (Goriz 1735, 4to); Grey, *Notes* (Lond. 1738, 8vo); Hansen, *Betrachtungen* (Lib. 1746, 4to); \*Schultens, *Commentarius* (L. B. 1748, 4to; abridged, with additions by Vogel and Seller, Hal. 1768, 8vo); Gavison, **hj Kvbirm]** (Legh. 1752, 4to); Lnsner, *Observationes* (Lips. 1761, 4to; also in Velth. and Kuinil's *Commentt.* ii, 270); De Witt, *Dissertationes* (Amst. 1762, 8vo); Dathe, *Prolusio* (Lips. 1764, 8vo; Lond. 1838, 18mo; also in *Opitsc.* Lips. 1796); Judetnes, **μy]t t/nv]** [with Ecclesiastes] (Amst. 1765, 4to); Vogel, *U.,nschreibung* (Leips. 1767, 8vo); Hirt, *Eklarung* (Jen. 1768, 4to); Durel, *Remarks* [includ. Job, etc.] (Oxf. 1772, 4to); Hunt, *Observations* (ibid. 177 5,4to); Schnurrer, *Observationes* (Tiibing. 1776, 4to; also in *Disserf.* Goth. 1790); Bode, *Versio* [includ. Ecclesiastes and Cant.] (Helmst. 1777, 4to; also in Germ.,

Quedlinb. 1791, 8vo); Moldenhauer, *Erlaut.* [with Ecclesiastes and Cant.] (ibid. 1777, 4to); J. D. Michaelis, *Anmerk.* (Gtt. 1778, 8vo; also in *Bibliothek*, 7:168); Doderlein, *Anmerk.* (Altd. 1778 and later, 4to); also his *Scholia* [on poet. books] (Hal. 1779, 4to); Reiske, *Conjecturæ* [with Job] (Lips. 1779, 8vo); Zinck, *Commentarius* [includ. other books] (Augsb. 1780, 4to); Arnold, *Anmerk.* (Frckft. and Leips. 1781, 8vo); Schleusner, *Collatio* (Lips. 1782, 4to); also *Commentarius* (ibid. 1790-94, 4to); Troschel, *Salomon's Moral* (Berl. 1782, 8vo); Struensee, *Erlaut.* [includ. Psalm] (Hal. 1783, 8vo) Schoinhdeder, *Erklar.* (from the Danish by Wolff, Flensb. 1784, 8vo); De Vilioisin, *Versio* [from the Veneto-Greek, includ. other books] (Argent. 1784, 8vo); also Dahler's *Animadversiones* [on the same] (ibid. 1788, 8vo); Knis, *De Usu Proverbs* (Giess. 1787, 4to); Hodgson, *Notes* (Oxf. 1788, 4to); Juger, *Observationes* [on the Sept.] (Meld. and Lips. 1788, 8vo); Euchel, *µWGrTi* (Berl. 1789, and later elsewhere, 8vo); Reichard, *Smrklar.* (Hal. 1790, 8vo); Ziegler, *Erlalt.* (Leips. 1791, 8vo); reviewed by Hasse (in the latter's *Biblioth.*, Regensb. 1793, No. 5); Castalio, *Notce* (Havn. 1793, 8vo); Hensler, *Erlaut.* [includ. 1 Samuel] (Hamb. and Kiel, 1795, 8vo); Hammond, *Paraphrase* [on ch. i-ix] (in *Works*, vol. iv); Wilna, *vWrPa* (Sklov, 1798, and later elsewhere, 4to; Königsb. 1857, 8vo); Rhode, *De Poet. Gnomnica* (Havn. 1800, 8vo); Tingstadt, *Vamice Lectt.* (Upsal. 1800, 4to); Wistinitz, *bqöyi [ rza* (Wilna, 1800, 4to); Muntinghe, *Anmerk* (fromn the Dutch by Scholl, F. a. M. 1800-2, 3 vols. 8vo); Schellillg, *Notce* [includ. other books] (Stuttg. 1806, 8vo); Dahler, *Uebersetz.* [from the Sept.] (Strasb. 1810, 8vo); Mard. Kohen, *rmäm* (Grodno, 1811, 4to); Kelle, *Anmerlk.* (Freyb. 1815, 8vo); Holden, *Notes* (Liverp. 1819, 8vo); Melsheimer, *Ammerk.* (Mannh. 1821, 8vo); Lawson, *Exposition* (Edinb. 1821, 1855, 2 vols. 12mo); Case, *Commentary* (Lond. 1822, 12mo); \*Umbreit, *Commentura* (Heidelb. 1826, 8vo); \*Gramberg, *Anmerk.* (Leips. 1828, 8vo); \*Rosenmüller, *Scholia* (Lips. 1829, 8vo); Bockel, *Em laut.* (Hamb. 1829, 8vo); Bridges, *Exposition* (Lond. 1830 and later, 2 vols. 8'vo); French and Skinner, *Notes* (ibid. 1831, 8vo); Stern, *rWaba* (Pressb. 1833, 8vo); Lowenstein, *Erklar.* (Frckft. 1838, 8vo); Freund, *ba; rsWm* (Vien. 1839, 8vo); Newman, *Version* (Lond. 1839, 18mo); Maurer, *Commentarius* (Lips. 1841, 8vo); Nichols, *Explanation* (Lond. 1842, 12mo); Noyes, *Translation* [includ. Ecclesiastes and Cant.] (Bost. 1846, 1867, 8vo); \*Bertheau. *Erklar.* (Leips. 1847 8vo); Binney, *Lectures* (Lond. 1851, 18mo); \*Stuart, *Commentary* (N. Y. 1852, 8vo); Gaussen, *Reflexions* (Toulouse, 1857,

8vo); \*Hitzig, *Auslegun* (Ztir. 1858, 8vo); Elster, *Commentar* (Gitt. 1858, 8vo); Stein, *Bearbeit.* (Brilon, 1860, 8vo); Anon., *Exposition* (Lond. 1860, 12mo); Schulze, *Biblische Spruchwoirte* (Gott. 1860, 8vo); Brooks, *Arrangement* (Lond. 1860, 12mo); Wardlaw, *Lectures* (ibid. 1861, 3 vols. 8vo); Diedrich, *Erklar.* [includ. other books] (Neu-Rupp. 1665, 8vo); Mtuscher, *Version* (Gambier, 0., 1866, 12mo); Conant, *Translation* (N. Y. 1872, 4to); Miller, *Commentary* (Lond. 1874. 8vo). **SEE OLD TESTAMENT.**

## Providence

(*Lat. providentia*; Gr. *πρόνοια*; both signifying *foresight*), a term importing the wisdom and power which God continually exercises in the preservation and government of the world, for the ends which he proposes to accomplish.

### I. *The Doctrine Proved.* —

#### 1. *From Reason.* —

(1.) From the existence of a Supreme Creator. If there be a Supreme Being who created all things, it is reasonable to infer that he upholds and governs all things; hence, nearly all men concur in the belief of a superintending providence.

(2.) From the perfections of the Supreme Creator, viz., knowledge, power, wisdom, goodness, justice, and righteousness, all of which reason teaches us to ascribe to him in infinite measure. All things being known to him, and all things being possible to him (if not essentially contradictory), and he being able to discern the best plan, and preinclined to execute that plan, a providence becomes the natural and proper sphere for the activity of his attributes. Moreover, being just and righteous, his government of his rational creatures will necessarily be by the principles of justice and righteousness; for the end and perfection of these attributes consist in their exercise. Hence power must uphold, wisdom direct, goodness bestow, righteousness discriminate, and justice adjudge; and this constitutes a providence.

(3.) From the dependence of God's creatures. That which is not self-existent is contingent. The contingent may cease to be, there being nothing in the nature of things to insure its continuance; therefore, the perpetuity of the contingent is dependent upon the will of the self-existent. The Supreme

Creator alone is self-existent: hence, upon his will the existence of the created depends; and that will, *in exercise*, implies a providence.

(4.) From the order, harmony, and regularity observable in the course of nature. The course of nature is that wise adjustment and counterpoise of natural forces by which the planets swing in their orbits, the seasons revolve with the year, the tides ebb and flow in their intervals, the currents of the atmosphere shift to their ever-changing conditions, the endless procession of life keeps pace with the dead-march of decay, and all the varied phenomena of the universe appear. Viewing these wonderful complications in the light of their necessary dependence upon the self-existent, God's handiwork is plainly evident in the complexities of their multiform evolutions, the equipoise of their contending forces, and the continuity of adjustment, which proclaim unceasing watchfulness and care.

(5.) From the moral faculties of men. Conscience, which utters its authoritative "*ought*" or "*ought not*" concerning suggested actions, must be delusive, if there be no providence to note its verdict. But if our sense of responsibility be false, and we must hence discredit the affirmations of our highest faculties concerning ourselves, then is all truth visionary and all knowledge misleading.

Further, we have a faculty the legitimate expression of which is worship; hence all nations have their forms of devotion. But to stand in awe of the Creator's justice, to trust in his goodness, to submit to his will, to pray to him for the supply of our wants, to depend upon his wisdom for direction—all these acts of worship are not only unauthorized but absurd, and our noblest instincts are false to fact if there be no superintending providence by which his responses may be indicated.

(6.) From the system of compensations which prevails, embracing recompense for suffering, compensation for loss, and retribution for wrong. In this system, the recompense includes the natural benefits of discipline, and such compensative provisions of grace as the reason recognizes as matters of fact in present human experience. The compensation comprises the reparative processes by which loss in one direction is made up by increased efficiency in another, as in the added keenness of the senses of hearing and touch attending the loss of sight. The retribution comprehends not only the natural operation of the law, "As a man soweth, so also shall he reap," but all those special illustrations of that law in marked and mysterious judgments upon wrongdoing which

occasionally occur, and which bear such likeness to the sin that men agree to call them retributive. In all these a providence is implied. The doctrine is further proven —

## 2. From the Scriptures. —

(1.) By a class of passages which declare in general his preserving power (<sup><0485></sup>Genesis 48:15; <sup><0606></sup>Nehemiah 9:6; <sup><0721></sup>Job 7:20; 10:12; 33:18; <sup><0945></sup>Psalms 16:5; 36:6; 46:9; <sup><2443></sup>Isaiah 46:3-4; <sup><0029></sup>Matthew 10:29; <sup><0236></sup>Luke 12:6; <sup><0478></sup>Acts 17:28; <sup><5017></sup>Colossians 1:17).

(2.) By a class of passages which assert God's control of the regular operations of nature (<sup><0098></sup>Exodus 9:18; 23:26; <sup><1180></sup>1 Kings 18:1; <sup><0850></sup>Job 5:10; 9:5-6; 28:24-27; 36:29-32; 37:6-16; 38:25; <sup><0747></sup>Psalms 74:17; 89:9; 104:10, 13-15, 19-21, 24-30; 105:32; 135:6-7; 136:25; 145:15-16; 147:8-9, 18; 148:8; <sup><2457></sup>Isaiah 45:7; 1, 3; <sup><2452></sup>Jeremiah 5:22-24; 10:13; 14:22; 31:35; 33:20, 25; 51, 16; <sup><0507></sup>Ezekiel 32:7-8; 38:22; <sup><0023></sup>Joel 2:23; <sup><0046></sup>Amos 4:6-10, 13; <sup><0800></sup>Zechariah 10:1; <sup><0165></sup>Matthew 6:26, 28-32; <sup><0447></sup>Acts 14:17).

(3.) By a class of passages which specifically declare his sovereignty over *birth* (<sup><0335></sup>Genesis 33:5; 48:9; Josh. 24:3, 4; <sup><0017></sup>1 Samuel 1:27; <sup><0808></sup>Job 10:18; <sup><0706></sup>Psalms 71:6; 139:15-16; <sup><2443></sup>Isaiah 46:3); *life* (<sup><0640></sup>Joshua 14:10; <sup><0022></sup>2 Samuel 12:22; <sup><0800></sup>Job 7:1; 14:5; <sup><0618></sup>Psalms 66:8-9; 91:3-16; <sup><2380></sup>Isaiah 38:1-5; <sup><0817></sup>Philippians 2:7; <sup><5054></sup>James 5:14-15); *disease* (<sup><0095></sup>Exodus 9:15; 23:25; <sup><0800></sup>Job 2:10; 5:6, 17-18; <sup><0800></sup>Psalms 39:9, 13; <sup><0808></sup>John 9:3); *death* (<sup><0016></sup>1 Samuel 2:6; 25:29; <sup><0802></sup>Job 1:21; 12:10; 14:5-6; 34:14-15; <sup><0680></sup>Psalms 68:20; 90:3; 104:29; 118:8); *afflictions* (<sup><0805></sup>Deuteronomy 8:5; <sup><0857></sup>Job 5:17; 10:17; <sup><0660></sup>Psalms 66:10-12; 69:26; 94:12-13; 119:75; <sup><0082></sup>Proverbs 3:12; <sup><2356></sup>Isaiah 26:16; 48:10; <sup><2423></sup>Jeremiah 2:30; <sup><2012></sup>Lamentations 1:12-14; 3:1, 32-33; <sup><0080></sup>Amos 8:10; <sup><0815></sup>Hebrews 12:5-6); *prosperity* (<sup><0808></sup>Deuteronomy 8:18; <sup><0017></sup>1 Samuel 2:78; <sup><0078></sup>2 Samuel 7:8-9; 12:7-8; <sup><0370></sup>1 Chronicles 17:7-8; 29:12, 16; <sup><0585></sup>Ezra 5:5; <sup><0800></sup>Job 1:10; 34:24; <sup><0800></sup>Psalms 30:7; 75:6-8; 113:7-8; <sup><0026></sup>Proverbs 29:26; <sup><2091></sup>Ecclesiastes 9:11, compared with <sup><0043></sup>Proverbs 16:3, 33; <sup><0052></sup>Luke 1:52-53; <sup><0642></sup>1 Corinthians 16:2).

(4.) By a class which aver his government of chance and accident (<sup><0212></sup>Exodus 21:12-13, compared with <sup><0504></sup>Deuteronomy 19:4-5; <sup><1223></sup>1 Kings 22:34, 38, compared with 21:19; <sup><0163></sup>Proverbs 16:33).

(5.) By a class which proclaim his use of noxious animals for the purposes of his government (~~0238~~ Exodus 23:28; ~~0852~~ Leviticus 26:21-22; ~~0872~~ Deuteronomy 7:20; ~~0642~~ Joshua 24:12; ~~0883~~ Job 5:23; ~~0406~~ Jeremiah 5:6; ~~0028~~ Hosea 2:18; ~~0025~~ Joel 2:25; ~~0009~~ Amos 4:9; 7:1).

(6.) By a class which affirm his righteous retributions (~~0800~~ Leviticus 10:1-3; 26:14-39; ~~0657~~ Deuteronomy 25:17-19; 28:23-24; ~~0089~~ 2 Samuel 3:39; ~~0080~~ 2 Kings 9:30-37; 19:25-28; ~~0466~~ 2 Chronicles 6:26-27; ~~0863~~ Job 5:13; 10:14; 34:11; ~~0986~~ Psalm 35:6-8; 75:6-8; 89:30-32; 94:23; 107:33-34; ~~0361~~ Isaiah 5:11-16, 22-25; 9:13-14; 13:11; 28:15. Comp. 29:6; ~~0222~~ Jeremiah 22:21-22; ~~0122~~ Ezekiel 11:21; 26:2-21; 35:1-15; ~~0268~~ Daniel 5:18-30; Amos 4, 5; ~~0000~~ Obadiah 1:10-15; Zephaniah 1:17; 2:8-10; ~~0000~~ Haggai 1:10-11).

(7.) By a class which ascribe deliverances to God (~~0645~~ Joshua 24:5-11; ~~0200~~ 2 Kings 5:1; ~~0342~~ Ezekiel 34:12, 16, 30; 36:22-24; 37:21-23).

(8.) By a class which declare his supreme authority over men (~~0008~~ Psalm 7:8; 9:8; 10:16; 22:28; 47:2, 7, 8; 75:7; 76:10; 96:10, 13; 97:1; 103:19; 139:9-10; ~~0000~~ Ecclesiastes 9:1; ~~0305~~ Isaiah 10:15; 14:26-27; ~~0604~~ Ezekiel 18:4; ~~0005~~ Daniel 4:35; ~~0009~~ Romans 9:19-21).

(9.) By a class which affirm his dominion over national prosperity and adversity (~~0274~~ Exodus 17:14; 23:25-30; ~~0073~~ Deuteronomy 7:13; ~~0225~~ 2 Samuel 22:15; ~~0362~~ Ezra 5:12; ~~0983~~ Psalm 18:13, 14; ~~0203~~ Isaiah 5:3-30; 13:1, 6, 9-22; 45:7; ~~0270~~ Jeremiah 27:2-8, 12, 13; 49:36; ~~0020~~ Daniel 2:20, 21, 25, 37, 38; 5:21; ~~0006~~ Amos 3:6; ~~0000~~ Obadiah 1:1-4; ~~0027~~ Haggai 2:17; ~~0004~~ Zephaniah 1:14-18; 2:1-15; 3:14-20; ~~0476~~ Acts 17:26).

(10.) By a class which declare that he sends bad laws and base rulers, stirs up adversaries, and sends adversity (~~0022~~ Judges 9:22, 23; ~~0004~~ 1 Kings 11:14, 23; 19:15; ~~0082~~ 2 Kings 8:12; 18:25; 19:25; 24:20; ~~0436~~ 2 Chronicles 15:5-6; ~~0925~~ Psalm 105:25; ~~0227~~ Isaiah 22:17-19; 37:26, 27; ~~0276~~ Jeremiah 27:6, 7; 28:14; 48:11, 12; 52:3; ~~0007~~ Lamentations 2:7; ~~0004~~ Ezekiel 20:24-26; ~~0007~~ Daniel 4:17; ~~0000~~ Hosea 13:11; ~~0000~~ Micah 1:12).

The teaching of the more than five hundred passages cited might be confirmed, were it necessary, by nearly as many thousands more, showing with what emphasis the Scriptures proclaim the doctrine of divine providence.

## II. *The Doctrine Explained.* —

**1.** *As Preservation*, or that by which all things are kept in being, with their several essences and faculties, and are enabled to act according to their respective natures (<sup>3003</sup>Hebrews 1:3).

**2.** *As Government*, or the control of all things in their several spheres of being and acting, and directing them to the ends which he proposed to himself in their creation. This government is —

**(1.)** Immediate; as in the direct control of the material universe by those modes of operation called forces of nature, such as gravitation, electricity, etc.

**(2.)** Mediate; as

**(a)** in the vegetable world, by the laws which regulate the germination, growth, and decay of its organizations;

**(b)** in the animal kingdom, by their controlling instincts;

**(c)** in intelligent and moral creatures, by means of motives. This last is evidently the most important, as well as the most incomprehensible field of divine providence.

The motives which a righteous and benevolent Being places before his creatures can be only those which will directly tend to secure their holiness and happiness. But, as freedom of the will, in the sense of possible alternative moral action, is one of the endowments of such creatures, and as preservation, secures the functional activity of such will, whatever may result; hence it follows that those holy motives may be disregarded, and, in such an event, moral government must be abandoned, or punitive and reformatory measures must be instituted that will originate a different class of motives to reinforce those which have proved insufficient. Hence, the system of *natural evil* is placed over against creature-freedom, both as a check and a corrective, and is in itself no arraignment of God's goodness, since it is a necessary means to a higher good. But the problem of God's concurrence in moral evil is the vexed question of the ages; yet, in point of principle, it is settled in the fact of the *creation* of intelligent beings with a capacity to sin and liability to become sinners. Hence the vindication of the divine character is legitimately the work of *Theodicy*, while the doctrine of providence need only explain God's conduct.

All moral evil consists in a wrong determination of a free will. God's purpose to preserve his creatures pledges his concurrence in such action of the will only so far as such concurrence may be necessary to enable the will to act according to its freedom. The moral character of the determination is fixed by the creature and he alone is responsible for it. But when the choice is made, the moral character of the determination is complete; and neither the occurrence nor non-occurrence of a resulting outward action can change, add to, or take from the moral quality of the original volition wherein the sin originated and was completed. As soon, however, as the execution of a determination is attempted, the creature steps outside of his own independent and responsible sphere, and enters the realm of God's providence, where *he* assumes the control of all events. The actions of men (in distinction from their determinations), his control of the Church and of nations, special providences, the course of nature, and the works of grace are all included under the general term *events*, for which God takes the absolute responsibility. Hence it will be seen that the distinction often drawn between the permissive and active providences of God is of no practical value; and if any such distinction be allowed, it must be by confining the word "permissive" strictly to the free volitions of the will, and extending the word "active" to all *events*, as explained above.

In this way alone can the emphatic statements of the Scriptures, as classified above, be explained in harmony with other passages which distinctly deny his complicity with evil, i.e. in the sense of moral wrong. We first bring fully into view the seeming impeachment of his attributes contained in the classes of passages above referred to, which may be epitomized, in principle, as follows: <sup><102></sup>Exodus 4:21; 7:13; 10:1, 20; 14:7; <sup><103></sup>Deuteronomy 2:30; 13:1-3; Josh. 11:20; <sup><104></sup>1 Samuel 16:14; 18:10; 19:9; <sup><1125></sup>1 Kings 12:15; 22:20-22; <sup><1482></sup>2 Chronicles 18:22; 25:20; <sup><1789></sup>Psalms 78:49; 105:25; <sup><200></sup>Isaiah 6:9, 10; 19:14; 44:18; 66:4; <sup><2421></sup>Jeremiah 6:21; <sup><2430></sup>Ezekiel 3:20; 14:9; <sup><3006></sup>Amos 3:6; <sup><3800></sup>Zechariah 8:10; <sup><3211></sup>2 Thessalonians 2:11, 12; <sup><4008></sup>1 Peter 2:8; <sup><6677></sup>Revelation 17:17. In striking contrast with these stands the revelation of his character and works in the following: <sup><1145></sup>Leviticus 11:45; <sup><6504></sup>Deuteronomy 32:4; <sup><1001></sup>1 Samuel 6:20; <sup><8008></sup>Job 8:3; 34:10, 12, 23; 36:3; <sup><10704></sup>Psalms 5:4; 11:7; 33:5; 89:14; 92:15; 97:2; 119:137; <sup><2156></sup>Isaiah 5:16; <sup><2689></sup>Ezekiel 18:29; <sup><3013></sup>Habakkuk 1:13; <sup><3005></sup>Zephaniah 3:5; <sup><8102></sup>Romans 2:2, 5, 6; <sup><3013></sup>James 1:13; <sup><1015></sup>1 Peter 1:15, 16; <sup><6607></sup>Revelation 16:7.



Truth cannot be inharmonious, much less contradictory; therefore, there must be some possible reconciliation of these apparently conflicting statements. We find that reconciliation in the divided sovereignty which allows man to be supreme within the sphere of his volition, and attributes all outside of the mere mental fact of free-will determinations to the will and operation or co-operation of God. Upon any other hypothesis it is not possible to draw the dividing line between divine and human responsibility; and therefore, if this be denied, the hope of constructing any consistent doctrine of divine providence must be abandoned.

### III. *Some Objections Considered.* —

**Objection 1.** If providence be the care exercised over his creatures by a God of infinite goodness and purity, he cannot be implicated in the wicked actions of men. *Answer.* As a matter of fact, he is concerned in them. else they could not exist; for, were he to refuse the concurrence of his upholding power, men would drop into non-existence. Again, the objection is destroyed by considering that *actions* have no *moral character whatever*, as between the creature and the Creator, such character being vested entirely in the volitions of the will from which the actions result. Therefore, God can use the wicked actions of men as he does any other indifferent thing, provided that his own *purpose* in using them be right, which no one disputes.

**Objection 2.** God's majesty is degraded by the assumption contained in the doctrine of providence, viz. that he is interested in all the minutiae of nature. *Answer.* If he has created faculties or forces, nothing that they can evolve can be unworthy of his care; besides, things which seem to men most insignificant are often causatively linked with stupendous results. Again, the revelations of the microscope prove that the infinitesimal are embraced within the sweep of the same laws that pervade the infinite, and hence are under the same benign care. Further, the impression of the grandeur of the Infinite Intelligence, comprehensive as it may be, from the contemplation of the rolling spheres and interlocking systems of the universe, is, after all, less profound than that which results from tracing his handiwork in the conformation of the beautifully wrought shells of the animalcula, and their exquisite life-appliances and adjustments, which only the most powerful glasses can reveal to human sight.

**Objection 3.** The prosperity of the wicked and the afflictions of the righteous are inconsistent with the supposition of a just and holy providence. *Answer.* The equal dispensation which the objection assumes to be necessary under the government of God is an impossibility; for the affections and interests of men are so interlocked that exact justice could rarely, if ever, be meted to the transgressor without involving consequences to others which would be undeserved. Again, the prosperity of the wicked, if they continue in their evil courses, is always a curse to them in the end; and God's processes should not be condemned until their final issue is known. On the other hand, the adversities of the righteous have attending or following compensations which satisfy *them* that all is right; and if those who are chiefly interested are content, the objection of the mere observer should be esteemed of little weight.

**Objection 4.** It is alleged that the laws of nature sufficiently account for the order of nature; therefore, a providence is not necessary. *Answer.* The laws of nature are only the regular order which is found to subsist, termed laws because of the uniformity of the changes which occur, and signify certain results of power, but not power itself — effects, but not their causes. These uniformities are, therefore, only modes in which the self-existent controls the contingent, the manner in which God manipulates his material creation.

**IV. History of the Doctrine.** — The idea of a superintending or controlling Providence has appeared under various forms, sometimes scarcely recognisable, depending largely upon the culture of the age and the state of philosophical speculation at the time.

**1.** The primitive view, held during the childhood of superstition, identified the gods with the elements of nature. Thus Zeus, or Dis, originally meant *sky*, and was worshipped as a god, afterwards known as Jupiter, or Jove, and by the Canaanites and Babylonians called Baal, Bel, or Belus. The *earth* was also worshipped as Demeter and Cybele, called by the Anglo-Saxons Hertha; the *sea* as Neptune; the *sun* as Phaebus, or Apollo; the *moon* as Diana; *light* as Indra. Fire as Agni and summer heat as Dormer, or Thor, are other instances, in various localities, of the worship paid to the elements or forces of nature as gods, each being accredited a providence of its own. In the childhood of Occidental philosophy also, the Ionian philosophical physicists of Greece, in their search for the principle whose existence should give a rational explanation of all things (called the

Beginning, or First Cause), identified it with some elements of nature, as the “Water” of Thales and Hippo of Samos; the “Air” of Anaximenes; the “Air-Intelligence” of Diogenes of Apollonia and Idaeus of Himera. Her mathematical philosophers, the Pythagoreans, looked for this first cause in incorporeal elements, as in the “Numbers” of Pythagoras and the “Infinite” of Anaximander. The Eleatics — metaphysical philosophers — regarded the *world* as the manifestation of God, as ill the “Sphere” of Xenophanes, Parmenides, and Zeno; while the dualism of the “Fire-ether” of Heraclitus, and the “Love-mingler” of Empedocles and Anaxagoras, and the materialism of the “Atoms” of Leucippus and Democritus were similar in their pantheistic notions, and contained the idea of a providence in but a very crude and unsatisfactory form. The Stoics taught that the working force in the universe is God; the consciousness of the universe is Deity; the human soul is a part of the Deity, or an emanation from him.

**2.** When the distinction between irregular and fortuitous “phenomena and the uniformities of nature became clear, the last were regarded as independent processes, broken in upon by the interferences of the gods, who were *endowed with human passions*; such interferences being the chances, accidents, irregularities, etc., of nature.” Thus Minerva was the goddess of wisdom; Mars, the god of war; Mercury, the god of eloquence and traffic; Pan, the god of terror; Laverna, the goddess of thieves; Venus the goddess of beauty; Cupid, the god of love; Nemesis, of vengeance, etc.

**3.** The next advance was to the conception of one supreme God, infinite in his perfections and works; a sovereign Ruler bestowing rewards and inflicting penalties by using nature as the instrument of his will, he being a power above nature, and interfering with its processes at his pleasure. This seems to have been in part the view of Socrates, and was the Judaical notion modified into special or general providences according to personal interest in the event. That the Christian Church adopted this view in the main is evident from the fact that the Apostles’ Creed, and the confessions of faith of Irenaeus and Tertullian, and the NiceenoConstantinopolitan symbol (A.D. 325 and 381. the only general confession covering the whole field of systematic divinity during 1500 years), contain no restatement of the doctrine.

The Catholic Church added to this view the dogma of Church infallibility, for which the Protestants substituted that of the infallibility of the Scriptures, both presupposing special providential watchfulness.

- 4.** The doctrine of determinate *concursum* advocated by John Scotus Erigena in the middle of the 9th century holds that there are two causes in all effects, the first being in and not merely with the second, so that the first cause, and not the second, makes the act what it is. Augustine, the Schoolmen, the Thomists, and Dominicans in the Latin Church, the Lutherans, Reformed, and most Calvinistic divines in the Protestant Church have supported it, but in such sense that the moral quality of a sinful act is referred to the creature, and the effectual cause of the act only to God. *General concursum* is a modification of the foregoing view, and holds that God sustains creatures and their powers, and excites them to act according to their nature. The Franciscans and Jesuits, among the Romanists, and the Remonstrants and later Arminians, among the Protestants, have advocated this theory.
- 5.** Cartesius, Malebranche, and Bayle developed the concursum into the *occasionalism* of philosophers, which represents God as the sole actor, the creature only furnishing him an occasion to act, and being merely the instrument by which he absolutely and irresistibly accomplishes his own designs. The dependence of the creature upon the Creator, superseding all efficiency of second causes, as held by Schleiermacher and the school to which he belongs, Schweizer and Dr. Emmons, classifies them practically with the Occasionalists.
- 6.** Leibnitz rejected the concursum and Cartesian views, and propounded the theory of *Pre-established Harmony*, somewhat akin in its radical idea to the “Anima Mundi” of Pythagoras, Plato. and the Alexandrian School; the “Archaeus” of Cornelius Agrippa, Paracelsus, and Von Helmont; the “principium hylarchicum” of Henry More; the “plastic nature” of Cudworth, and the “unconscious organizing intelligence” lately advocated by Dr. Laycock and Mr. Murphy. This theory holds that there are two worlds, matter and mind, each incapable of acting upon the other, yet both so adjusted to each other by a divinely pre-arranged harmony that volition and muscular contraction are contemporaneous. The volition would exist just the same without the contraction, and the muscular movement would take place just the same without the volition, each being moved by a force within, but the prearranged harmony secures that they shall seemingly stand related as cause and effect. God is a being of infinite perfections, and the imperfections of creation are accounted for by the nature of the monads of which souls and bodies are composed.

**7.** Durandus, in the 14th century, proposed the *mechanical* theory, which affirms the independent activity of God's creatures in the use of powers given to them at their creation — like a wound-up clock which goes of itself. It has been advocated by Scotus, Richard Baxter, and others. Closely akin to this is the theory of such writers as Prof. Tyndall, Dr. H. Bence Jones, and Dr. Bastian, concerning “molecular attractions and repulsions communicated to matter at the creation.” Its extreme pantheistic development is found in the “self-evolving powers of nature” of Owen, Huxley, and Baden Powell.

**8.** Another view represents God as an all-perfect being, the upholder of all things, but denies his interference with the laws of nature in miracles, and maintains that his only interposition is by using natural causes to effect his purposes. Thus providence is law, and no interpositions are possible unless provided for in the nature of the uniformities. Thus Hippocrates, the contemporary of Socrates, regarded all phenomena as both divine and scientifically determinable. Anaxagoras, in his “Arranging Intelligence,” held substantially to this view. Duncanson (*Providence of God*) is a strong modern advocate of this theory.

**9.** The Mind-efficiency Theory denies that there are any physical forces apart from mind, either divine or created. The only efficiency in the material universe is the ever-operating will of God. Dr. Samuel Clarke, Dugald Stewart, John Wesley, Nitzsch. Muller, Chalmers, Harris, Young, Whedon, Channing, Martineau, Hedge, Whewell, Bascom. Prof. Tulloch, Sir John Herschel, the duke of Argyll, Mr. Wallace, Proctor, Crocker, and many among the ablest recent writers have defended this view.

**10.** The true doctrine represents God as a being of infinite perfections, upholding all things by a direct exercise of his potency; the uniformities of nature as his *ordinary* method of working; its *irregularities* his method upon occasional conditions; its *interferences*, his method under the pressure of a higher law, which law is the necessary manifestation of his own nature. It thus adopts the Judaic view of God's perfections, and the complete subservience of nature to his will; admits the *general concursus*, especially as relates to the freedom of the finite will, accepts the Law theory in its application to miracles, and sustains the Mind-efficiency theory, with the distinct disclaimer of pantheistic leanings in the admission of the separate existence of material substance.

**V. *Special or Particular Providence.*** — Providence has been defined as the wisdom and power which God continually exercises in the preservation and government of the world for the ends which he proposes to accomplish. Special providence consists in such particular exhibitions of his wisdom and power in emergencies as are calculated to awaken the conviction of his interest in and guardianship over his creatures.

**1. *Proof.*** — The doctrine in question is proved by the following considerations:

**(1.)** It is necessarily included in the general providence already established. (See above.) The whole is made up of parts. If God has no care of the whole, he has none of the parts. If he has for the whole, the parts are included. Further the *end* which he proposes to accomplish in providence is the revelation of himself as infinitely worthy of the love of his creatures. This needs a special providence. Moreover, a God who does not care for us as individuals is tantamount to no God.

**(2.)** Special providence is implied in the doctrine of prayer. Prayer is an instinct. The Scriptures direct that instinct by coupling with the encouragement to pray the announcement of a special providence that watches over the very hairs of our heads, thus making special providence the complement of prayer. Prayer without a special providence to note and reward would be a mere mockery of our impotence. Moreover, the enlarged charter of prayer-privilege given to believers under the (Gospel dispensation is a *personal application* of the Old-Test. doctrine of special providence over the Jewish *nation*. That providence had relation to the covenant detailed in Deuteronomy 26-30; this privilege is conveyed in such promises as <sup><407></sup>Matthew 7:7-11; 18:19; 21:22; <sup><412></sup>Mark 11:24; <sup><617></sup>John 15:7; <sup><3416></sup>Hebrews 4:16; <sup><315></sup>James 5:15; <sup><614></sup>1 John 5:14, 15; and, being such, it necessarily implies such special watch-care as was involved in the Mosaic covenant cited above. *SEE PRAYER.*

**(3.)** The same doctrine is inferred from the fatherhood of God. The denial of his fatherhood changes him into a desolate abstraction, the contemplation of which pours an ice-floe over the tide of human trusts, and causes us to feel that we are “orphaned children in a godless world.” But “As a father pitieth his children, so the Lord pitieth them that fear him” comes to us genial with the warmth of a sympathy and care that we can appreciate and confide in.

(4.) It is involved in the atonement of Christ. The propitiatory sacrifice — as prefigured in the separate sacrifices for each — was for men, not *en masse*, but as individuals, thus furnishing the greatest possible evidence of care in the interests of utmost moment to the soul. The agency by which this sacrifice is conveyed to the mind — the Holy Spirit — is likewise personal in his ministry of impression, and as personal in his communication of the remedial efficacy of the one atonement, thus demonstrating in appeal and in succor the loving care of God.

(5.) It is revealed in the Scriptures as clearly as the biographies of its noted characters, such as Joseph, Samuel, Elijah, Ruth, Esther, Daniel, etc., can illustrate it, and proclaimed as strongly as such texts as <sup><076</sup>Luke 12:6-7, 22-31 can express it, and enforced as powerfully as such prayer-examples as *The friend seeking bread* and *The unjust judge* can impress it.

(6.) It is illustrated in the experiences of Christians of every age, until George Neumark's hymn "Leave God to order all thy ways,

*And hope in him, whate'er betide;  
Thou'lt find him in the evil days  
An all-sufficient strength and guide.  
Who trusts in God's unchanging love,  
Builds on the rock that naught can move" —*

has become a type of a distinct class of literature both in verse and prose that is inexpressibly sweet to the experienced believer, and of untold value to those who are weak in faith.

2. The moral *uses* of the doctrine are —

(1.) It deters from sin. Theon of Alexandria taught that "a full persuasion of God's seeing everything we do is the strongest incentive to virtue;" and he advised the civil magistrate to place the inscription at the corners of the streets "God seeth thee, O sinner!"

A full belief in special providence places that inscription not upon the corners of the streets, but within the chambers of the memory.

(2.) It excites watchfulness for his interpositions. Abraham, after Mount Moriah; the three Hebrews, after the fiery furnace; Daniel, after the lions' den; Elijah, after Cherith's cave, never failed to look for other deliverances in the time of need.

- (3.) It gives the assurance that all is right in our present circumstances, in view of the discipline needed, and the final adjustment of rewards and penalties.
- (4.) It leads to cheerful *trust* in all trials, and thus sweetens the bitter draughts of life.
- (5.) It inspires with hope in emergencies, and thus enables the believer to meet unforeseen exigencies with all his resources of mind and faith at hand, confident, buoyant, and if possible conquering.
- (6.) It imparts a patience that outlasts adversities, a fortitude that yields to no disaster, and a confidence that emerges unscathed from all furnaces of trial.

**VII. Literature.** — We cite in alphabetical order a portion only of the very numerous works extant on this subject: Aquinas, *Summa Theol.* p. i, q. 15, art. iii; Backerus, *De Dei Providentia circa Mal.*; Bairus, *De Proverbs Dei circa Peccata liominum*; Beza, *De Proverbs Dei circa Res Temporales*; Bormann, *Lehre der Vorsehung*; the same, *Betrachtungen iiber die wichtigsten Warheiten der Religion*; Chrysostom, *De Providentia Dei*; Clement, *Strom.* 6:17, p. 821 sq.; De Maree, *Gottesvertheidigung iiber die Zulassung des Bosenm*; De Vries, *Exercitationes Rationales*; Feldmann, *Moirra oder iiber die ygttliche Vorsehung; Fur Anbeter Gottes* (Loud. 1780); Gomari *Conciliatio Doct. Orthodoxac de Providentia*; Hugo of St. Victor, *De Sacram.* c. 19-21; Jacobi, *Betrachtungen iiber die weisen Absichten Gottes*; Jerome, *Comment. in Abacuc*, c. 1; Junilius, *De Partibus Legis Divince*, bk. ii, c. 3 sq.; Koppen, *Die Bibel ein Werk der gottlichen Weisheit*; Lactantius, *De Via Dei*, c. 13; the same, *De Opificio Dei, vel Formatione Hom1inis*, c. 5-17; Leibnitz, *Essais de Theodicee*; Martinii *Corn. de Gubernatione Munci*; Muller, *Briefe uber das Studium der Wissenschaften, besonders der Geschichie* (Ziirich, 1798); Nemesius, *De Natura Hominis*, c. 42 sq.; Plutarch, *De Sera Numinius Vindicta*; Rechenbergius, *De Proverbs Dei circa Minima*; Salvianus Massiliensis, *De Gubernatione Dei sive de Proverbs*; Sanders, *Ueber die Vorsehung*; Schrickh, *Disp. Historica circa Providentiamn Divinuum, quando et quam cldare loquatur* (Vitembergge, 1776); Seneca, *De Providentia, De Beneficiis*; Theodoret, *Sermones de Providentia*; ‘Turretini *Dissertationes*, diss. 4, 5, 6; Twisse, *Vindicatio Providentice Dei*; Viret,



*De la Providence*; Weismannus, *De Proverbs Dei contra Malum*; Zollikofer, *Betrachtungem iber das Uebel in der Welt*. (S. H. P.)

## Providence, Nuns of

a community of young women at Paris, established about the year 1647 by Madame Polailon for the reception of poor virgins who might otherwise be exposed, through poverty, to the temptations of the world. This pious lady, having formed the design, was discouraged from prosecuting it by several persons, who represented to her that she had not a fund sufficient to carry it on; to whom she replied that *Providence* should be her fund; and accordingly, having succeeded in her undertaking, she gave to her community the name of *The Nuns of Providence*.

## Province

properly an outlying portion of an extended empire, such as the Persian or Roman. It is not intended here to do more than indicate the points of contact which this word presents with Biblical history and literature.

1. (**hnydæ**) *medinah*; Sept. **χώρα**; Vulg. *provincia*.) In the Old Test. this term first appears in connection with the wars between Ahab and Benhadad (**1** Kings 20:14, 15, 19). The victory of the former was gained chiefly “by the young men of the princes of the provinces,” i.e. probably of the chiefs of tribes in the Gilead country, recognising the supremacy of Ahab, and having a common interest with the Israelites in resisting the attacks of Syria. They are specially distinguished in ver. 15 from “the children of Israel.” Not the hosts of Ahab. but the youngest warriors (“armor-bearers,” Keil, *ad loc.*) of the land of Jephthah and Elijah, fighting with a fearless faith, were to carry off the glory of the battle (comp. Ewald, *Gesch.* 3, 492).

More commonly the word is used of the divisions of the Chaldaean (**2** Daniel 2:49; 3:1, 30) and the Persian kingdom (**1** Ezra 2:1; **2** Nehemiah 7:6; **3** Esther 1:1, 22; 2:3, etc.). The occurrence of the word in **1** Ecclesiastes 2:8; 5:8, has been noted as an indication of the later date now frequently ascribed to that book. The facts as to the administration of the Persian provinces which come within our view in these passages are chiefly these: Each province had its own governor, who communicated more or less regularly with the central authority for instructions (Ezra 4 and 5). Thus Tatnai, governor of the provinces on the

right bank of the Euphrates, applied to Darius to know how he was to act as to the conflicting claims of the Apharsachites and the Jews (Ezra 5). Each province had its own system of finance, subject to the king's direction (Herodotus 3, 89). The "treasurer" was ordered to spend a given amount upon the Israelites (<sup><1572></sup>Ezra 7:22), and to exempt them from all taxes (<sup><1574></sup>Ezra 7:24). **SEE TAX**. The total number of the provinces is given at 127 (<sup><1001></sup>Esther 1:1; 8:9). Through the whole extent of the kingdom there was carried something like a postal system. The king's couriers (**βιβλιόφοροι**, the **ἄγγαροι** of Herod. 8:98) conveyed his letters or decrees (<sup><1012></sup>Esther 1:22; 3:13). From all provinces concubines were collected for his harem (<sup><1018></sup>Esther 2:3). Horses, mules, or dromedaries were employed on this service (<sup><1080></sup>Esther 8:10). (Comp. Herod. 8:98; Xenoph. *Cyrop.* 8:6; Heeren's *Persians*, ch. 2.) The word is used, it must be remembered, of the smaller sections of a satrapy rather than of the satrapy itself. While the provinces are 127, the satrapies are only 20 (Herod. iii, 89). The Jews who returned from Babylon are described as "children of the province" (<sup><1511></sup>Ezra 2:1; <sup><1676></sup>Nehemiah 7:6), and had a separate governor [**SEE TIRSHATHA**] of their own race (<sup><1513></sup>Ezra 2:63; <sup><1654></sup>Nehemiah 5:14; 8:9); while they were subject to the satrap (**tj P**) of the whole province west of the Euphrates (<sup><1387></sup>Ezra 5:7; 6:6).

**2. (Ἐπαρχία)** In the New Test. we are brought into contact with the administration of the provinces of the Roman empire. The classification given by Strabo (17, p. 840) of provinces (**ἐπαρχίαι**) supposed to need military control, and therefore placed under the immediate government of the Caesar, and those still belonging theoretically to the republic, and administered by the senate, and of the latter again into proconsular (**ὑπατικαί**) and praetorian (**στρατηγικαί**), is recognised, more or less distinctly, in the Gospels and the Acts. **SEE PROCURATOR**. Cyrenius (Quirinus) was the **ἡγεμών** of Syria (<sup><1012></sup>Luke 2:2), the word being in this case used for *præses* or proconsul. Pilate was the **ἡγεμών** of the sub-province of Judæa (<sup><1011></sup>Luke 3:1; <sup><1072></sup>Matthew 27:2, etc.), as procurator with the power of a legatus; and the same title is given to his successors, Felix and Festus (<sup><1024></sup>Acts 23:24; 25:1; 26:30). The governors of the senatorial provinces of Cyprus, Achaia, and Asia, on the other hand, are rightly described as **ἀνθύπατοι**, proconsuls (<sup><1137></sup>Acts 13:7; 18:12; 19:38). In the two former cases the province had been originally an imperial one, but had been transferred-Cyprus by Augustus (Dio Cass. liv, 4), Achaia by Claudius (Sueton. *Claud.* 25)-to the senate. The **στρατηγοί** of <sup><1162></sup>Acts

16:22 (A.V. “magistrates”), on the other hand, were the *duumviri*, or praetors, of a Roman colony. The duty of the legati and other provincial governors to report special cases to the emperor is recognised in <sup><423f></sup>Acts 25:26, and furnished the groundwork for the spurious *Acta Pilati*. **SEE PILATE**. The right of any Roman citizen to appeal from a provincial governor to the emperor meets us as asserted by Paul (<sup><4251></sup>Acts 25:11). In the council (**συμβούλιον**) of <sup><4252></sup>Acts 25:12 we recognise the assessors who were appointed to take part in the judicial functions of the governor. The authority of the legatus, proconsul, or procurator, extended, it need hardly be said, to capital punishment (subject, in the case of Roman citizens, to the right of appeal), and, in most cases, the power of inflicting it belonged to him exclusively. It was necessary for the Sanhedrim to gain Pilate’s consent to the execution of our Lord (<sup><4285></sup>John 18:31). The strict letter of the law forbade governors of provinces to take their wives with them, but the cases of Pilate’s wife (<sup><4279></sup>Matthew 27:19) and Drusilla (<sup><424></sup>Acts 24:24) show that it had fallen into disuse. Tacitus (*Ann.* 3, 33, 34) records an unsuccessful attempt to revive the old practice. **SEE PROCONSUL**.

PROVINCE is, in ecclesiastical language, the jurisdiction of an archbishop. **SEE DIOCESE**.

## Provincial

The local superior of the monasteries (abbot, guardian, prior, etc.) stands under the supervision of the district superiors, or *definitors*; these are subordinated to the superiors of the province, or *provincials*, who are themselves under the direction of the *general of the order*, the head of the whole community.

## Provincial Councils

is the name given to the synods held by the bishops of a single ecclesiastical province, and presided over by the metropolitan. The ecclesiastical superior of the province convokes the council. The resolutions of provincial councils in matters of discipline have legal force only within the limits of their own province. In respect to matters of faith, their resolutions, like those of the national councils, are decisive only when they have been confirmed by the pope and accepted by the whole Church.

## Provincial Synod

*SEE SYNOD.*

## Provisio Canonica

*SEE PROVISION.*

## Provision

(Lat. *provisio*) is, in canon law, the bestowal of an ecclesiastical *benefice* (q.v.).

**I.** *In the Roman Catholic Church* it involves the regular collation (q.v.) of the ecclesiastical functions. Any of its ecclesiastical offices can only be thus lawfully obtained from a competent superior.

**1.** *Extent and Classification.* —

**(1.)** The “provision” includes three stages

**(a)** the designation of the person on whom the benefice is bestowed (*designatio personae*);

**(b)** the collation of the office itself (*collatio sive institutio canonica*), for higher offices by papal confirmation, for inferior functions by episcopal institution; and

**(c)** the act of putting the nominee in possession of the office or the prebend, called, when he is bishop, *intronization*, when he is a canon or other prebendary, *installation*. The election or designation confers on the candidate only a right of priority: the complete lawful possession can only be acquired by the canonic confirmation or institution.

**(2.)** There are an ordinary and an extraordinary, a free and an obligatory, a full and a partial provision.

**(a)** When, as the rule requires, higher functions are conferred by the pope, lower ones by the bishop, this is called ordinary provision (*provisio ordinaria*); but if by some special lawful title, a third person, or by the law of devolution the next superior clerical functionary, or in consequence of special reservation the pope is possessed of the right of collation, this is an extraordinary provision (*provisio extraordinaria*).

**(b)** If the ordinary collator is free and bound by no obligation as to the person of the nominee, the collation is free (*provisio sive collatio libera*); but if he is bound by the right of designation enjoyed by a third person, the provision is restricted, and inasmuch as the collator, if all canonic requirements are met, is held to admit the proposed person, it is an obligatory one (*provisio necessaria*).

**(c)** If the collator is entitled to all three acts of a full collation, his right of provision is called a full one (*jus provisionis plenum*); but if he enjoys only one or the other of these attributes, he has only a partial right (*jus provisionis minus plenum*).

**2. Requisites.** — An ecclesiastic function can only be bestowed on a person possessing certain qualities, and must be occupied within a certain period and in a canonic way.

**(1.)** In regard to the qualifications of the candidate, the canons require that he be capable and worthy (*idoneus et dignus*); that not only he have all untarnished reputation, but also the required age, the necessary orders, and the instruction demanded by the office.

**(a)** The required age varies with the functions. It is an extraordinary rule which, in Hanover, even for simple canonries, requires thirty years of age.

**(b)** The candidate must belong to the clergy, and, in consequence, must be at least tonsured, and be advanced enough to be able to get the necessary orders within a year (Clem. c. 2," De Act. et Qual." i, 6; *Cone. Trid.* sess. 22 c. 4, "De Ref."). In ancient law the candidate, if his office required higher orders than those of a subdeacon, could receive a dispensation for seven years, to give him time to complete his scientific education, and the benefice meanwhile might be administered by a vicar (Sext. c. 34, "De Elect." i, 6). The modern law reduces this term to one year, which runs from the day of possession fully obtained (Sext. c. 35, "De Elect." i, 6). If during this period the orders have not been conferred, the benefice is lost, if it is a curacy, *eo ipso* (Sext. c. 14, 35:" De Elect." i, 6), otherwise only after previous warning (c. 7, 10:" De Elect." i, 6; Sext. c. 22, cod. i, 6); but in the latter case the bishop may grant a second dispensation of one year (*Cone. Trid.* sess. 7:c. 12, "De Ref."). To get into possession of a bishopric, the elected person or nominee must have obtained the subdeaconate six months before his election or nomination (*Conc. Trid.* sess. 12:c. 2, "De Ref."). Abbots, holders of dignities, and functions with

which jurisdiction and charge of souls are connected must be priests (c. 9, 10 “De Act. et Qual.” i, 14), and especially in cathedral chapters half at least of the canons must be presbyters (*Conc. Trid.* sess. 24:c. 12, “De Ref.”), although in the time of the Council of Trent already many chapters — for instance, those of Cologne, Treves, etc. — were exclusively composed of priests, which is now always the case. (c) The candidate must possess the scientific acquirements required by the office. The Tridentine rule decrees that the bishop must have shown his capacity at some university (or lyceum) as a teacher, or by degrees obtained in theology or canon law, or other academical testimonies (*Conc. Trid.* sess. 22:c. 2, “De Ref.”). The functions of cathedral scholastics, of penitentiaries, and in general of all dignities and half of the canonries, can only be bestowed upon graduates (*ibid.* sess. 23 c. 18, sess. 24 c. 8, 12, “De Ref.”). For candidates to prebends implying charge of souls (curates, preachers) a trial is instituted, and held by the bishop or his vicar-general and at least three other examiners chosen by the diocesan synod and put under special oath (*Conc. Trid.* sess. 24:c. 18, “De Ref.,” comp. Pii V “In Conferendis,” d. 18 Maj. 1566, and Benedicti XIV “Cum illud,” d. 14 Dec. 1742). As the diocesan synods, after a long interruption, have only been revived of late, the papal see has conferred full powers on the bishop (*modo provisorio*), and, until the regular synods should be reestablished, to nominate, himself, these synodal examiners and take their oath. Besides this examination required by the Church, most civil governments in Germany prescribe a similar examination for the candidates to the functions of curate or preacher.

**(2.)** In regard to the *time* and *manner* of the provision, the following principles prevail:

**(a)** A newly established clerical function must first be endowed; an office subsisting already must be not only really, but lawfully vacant. Even to give *expectancies*, or promises of provision in case of vacancy, is prohibited. Every clerical office must be filled in a given period of time—higher offices within three months; inferior offices, the provision of which is left to the free collation of the bishops or chapters, six months (c. 2, 10:” De Concess. Preb.” iii, 8) from the day their vacancy was first known (c. 3, 10:” De Suppl. Negl. Prael.” i, 10). If the offices to be filled are patronal benefices, the lay patron is allowed a term of four months (c. 3, 10:” De Jure Patron.” iii, 38) for making his presentation. the clerical patron a term of six months; the latter being lawful even in cases where a layman has

transferred his right of presentation to a church or ecclesiastical corporation (Sext. c. un. “De Jur. Patron.” iii, 19), or where the patronate is nixed. However, the civil legislation of several countries disagrees in many cases with these rules. If the election, postulation, nomination, or presentation have not taken place within the allotted term, it is, for this case, lost to the patron, and devolves upon the superior clerical authority.

**(b)** The benefice must be filled according to the canons; consequently, with complete independence both of the collator and the receiver (c. 2, 10 “De his quae Vi,” i, 40), without diminution or heavier taxation of the prebend (c. un. 10 “Ut Benef. sine Diminut.” iii, 12), and without simony. The admission of the state, and often of individuals, to a share in the provision of ecclesiastical benefices gave rise in the mediaeval Church to the contention for *investiture* (q.v.), and remains as yet unsettled. In some countries it was set at rest by concordat; in others it is still unregulated, though the right of final and complete provision is admitted to belong to the pope. In most Roman Catholic countries the crown elects to bishoprics, and the pope is bound to confirm the nominee of the crown, unless canonical cause of rejection should appear. In Germany, the contest with the papacy has on this account left vacant several important provisions.

### 3. *Form of the Provision.* —

#### (1.) Concerning the ordinary collation

**(a)** of higher offices. Archiepiscopal and episcopal sees, abbeys, and other prelatures are filled by election, postulation, or nomination.

**(b)** The other clerical functions are disposed of by the bishop in the whole extent of his diocese. This right of filling the vacant places is either entirely free, or it is more or less circumscribed by the rights of third persons or by the peculiar situation of the chapter, especially by the right of presentation of the patrons.

#### (2.) An extraordinary provision takes place

**(a)** either *jure devoluto*, when the person entitled to fill the vacant office does not fulfil the canonic conditions of the provision, or

**(b)** *jure reservato*, when the prebend is one of those the collation of whom is reserved to the pope.

### 4. *Institution or Installation.* —

(1.) The lawful collation of the office in question by the competent clerical superior, which alone entitles to the possession of the office and to the exercise of the rights of consecration and jurisdiction connected with it, is made, for episcopates and prelatures, by the pope, by confirmation of the elected or postulated person or nominee; for other functions, by the bishop (c. 3, 10 "De Instit." iii, 7; *Conc. Trid.* sess. 24:c. 13, "De Ref."), through canonical institution. The phrase *institutio canonica* appears in Sext. c. 1, "De Reg. Jur." 5:12, and has since prevailed; the expressions *collatio*, *institutio collativa*, *institutio verbalis*, *institutio auctorisabilis*, *investitura*, are somewhat erroneously employed as synonymous with it. *Collatio beneficii* ought to be used only for prebends freely conferred by the clerical superior, as here the collation of the office makes one with the *designatio persone*, both being included in the decree of collation. If the office belongs to that class to which third persons (physically and morally qualified) have a right of election or presentation, then *institutio* is the right word, and, better, *institutio canonica*, to indicate that this institution made by the competent clerical superior is alone the lawful collation; or *institutio collativa*, to indicate that the office is really conferred only by the institution; *institutio verbalis*, to distinguish this verbal delivery of the office from the act of putting a person in possession of it (*installatio*). While the *libera collatio* was always, and is still, an absolutely personal right of the bishop, neither the vicargeneral (*sede plena*) can perform it without special powers, nor the chapter, nor the capitular vicar appointed by them (*sede vacante*). The *institutio canonica*, or *collativa*, or *verbalis*, was formerly a regular official right of the archdeacon (c. 6, 10 "De Instit." iii, 7), and is still a right comprised in the general powers of the vicargeneral. This right of institution to offices connected with no charge of souls can exceptionally belong even to other ecclesiastical persons or corporations, either in consequence of special favor or of prescription (c. 18, 10 "De Praeser." ii, 26; c. 2, § 2, "De Privil." 5:33). By this canonical institution the nominee obtains the full right to his office and to the attributes of jurisdiction and honorary distinctions connected with it, but no right to take charge of souls: for this he needs a special authorization, for which he must apply within a period of two months from the day when the decree of presentation or collation has been received (Pii V "In Conferendis," d. 8 Mart. 1867); and this is called the *institutio*, in a narrower sense, or *institutio auctorisabilis*, i.e. the special collation of the charge of souls. The collation of the *cura animarum* is, again, so exclusively a right of the bishop that neither the archdeacon nor formerly



the vicar-general, unless specially empowered, could confer it (c. 4, 10 “De Off. Archidiacon.” i, 23), nor, in general, any third person even possessed of the full right of provision. Now the *institutio auctorisabilis* goes regularly together with the *institutio collativa*, and is given at the episcopal residence after previous examination (*Cone. Trid.* sess. vii; c. 13, “De Ref.”) and approbation, by means of symbolical performances, by dressing the candidate in the chasuble and barret (hence the name *investiture*), receiving his profession of faith and oath of obedience, and delivering the beneficiary a deed thereof, called “letter of investiture.” This *institutio auctorisabilis* can be made by the bishop himself or his vicar-general, who needs no longer a special mandate for it (Benedicti XIV “De Syn. Dic.” lib. ii, c. 8), and, *sede vacante*, the chapter, or the capitular vicar appointed by them (Sext. c. 1, “De Instit.” iii, 6).

**(2.)** The *introduction* into the office and prebend, or putting into possession (*institutio corporalis*), is called

**(a)** for the bishop *intronization*, and consists in this, that the consecrated bishop, in his badges, takes solemn possession of his cathedral and assigned residence. It is combined, if the bishop be consecrated in his own church, into one act with the consecration; but if the consecration take place *extra diocesis* — in the metropolitan church, or cathedral, of the consecrator delegated by the pope — then, according to the traditional custom, the bishop in pastoral habit, with crosier and mitre, is received at his arrival in the *ban/ieue* of his seat by the chapter and the clergy of the city and surrounding country, and escorted to some church situated in the neighborhood, where, after a short prayer, he is clothed in the pontifical robes and badges, hence to be led in solemn procession, all bells ringing, into his cathedral. Here he is greeted with the hymn *Ecce sacerdos magnus*, and while the clergy and the people sing the *Te Deum*, he takes his seat, gives the episcopal benediction, and is then escorted to his residence, the cross being carried before him.

**(b)** The solemn admission of a canon of a cathedral or collegiate chapter is called *installation*. The beneficiary, in the house of the chapter, is clothed in the choir garments, and the capitular cross is appended to his neck, whereupon he recites the Credo and swears the capitular oath. He is then led to his seat in the chapter (*sedes in capitulo*), escorted to the church, and here, also, shown his place in the choir (*staltum in choro*, hence *installatio*).

(c) With curates and other beneficiaries, the *institutio corporalis* (now also called *installatio*) is performed at the place of the prebend, the introduction into the office (*immissio in spiritualia beneficii*) by a legate of the bishop, and the putting in possession of the prebend (*immissio in temporalia*) by a commissary of the civil government.

In Austria, every ecclesiastic, upon getting into office, after receiving spiritual investiture at the hands of the bishop, has, before his installation, to sign a written declaration to the effect that he does not belong, nor will ever belong, to any secret society. The spiritual installation is performed, in the name of the ordinariate, by the vicar of the district or dean the first holyday after the arrival of the ecclesiastic at the place of his benefice; the worldly installation, in the name of the government, by a higher functionary commissioned thereto; in patronal prebends by the patron, according to the prevailing custom. In Prussia, the prebendary is generally put into possession by the archpriest (dean), in common with the patron or with the *Landrath*, if the curacy be one of those to which the government has the right of nomination. The deed of confirmation is read in the presence of the community, the curate is introduced, and put in possession of his residence with appurtenances. In Bavaria the oath is exacted, after which the dean proceeds to the spiritual performance in the church, where he introduces the new curate to his community. From the church he is led again to his residence, where he is introduced to the community by the royal commissary. Then the people are dismissed, and the same commissary, in the presence of the episcopal plenipotentiary and the civil functionaries and church trustees, delivers the keys of the house to the new curate. In Baden, the curate is put in possession, in the name of the grandduke, by the grandducal dean and the functionaries of the district, but only mediately, by a written order of these officers; but a solemn *institutio corporalis* takes place in the church in the presence of the archiepiscopal dean. Similar dispositions prevail in Wurtemberg, in the kingdom of Saxony, the grandduchy of Hesse, and in Nassau. — Wetzler u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lex. s.v.*

**II.** *In the Church of England*, the bishop is nominally elected by the chapter; but, in reality, the members of the chapter are only permitted to name the particular person whom the crown presents to them for election with the *conge d'elire*. In the Roman Catholic Church of England and of Ireland, the parochial clergy, together with the canons, recommend three candidates, one of whom is commonly, although not necessarily, appointed by the pope.

**III.** *In the Russo-Greek Church*, the candidates are presented by the holy synod, and the czar names the bishop from among them. See Hardwick, *Hist. of the Reformation*, 1, 350.

### Provisor

- (1) a chamberlain;
- (2) the Clugniac bailiff of the ville or manor and receiver of rents. Walcott, *Sacred Archeology*, s.v.

### Provisors, Statute Of.

Clement V, in the beginning of the 14th century, went beyond all his predecessors by declaring that the disposal of all ecclesiastical benefices belonged to the pope. The pope accordingly made reversionary grants, or *provisions*, as they were called, during the lives of the incumbents; and he reserved such benefices as he thought fit for his own peculiar patronage. England in particular suffered greatly from these papal encroachments during the reign of Henry III. The parliament assembled at Carlisle in the thirty-fifth year of Edward I sent a strong remonstrance to pope Clement V against the papal encroachments. But this remonstrance produced no effect. The first prince who was bold enough to assert the power of the legislature to restrain these encroachments was Edward III. After complaining ineffectually to Clement VI of the heinous abuse of papal reservations, he procured the famous statute of Provisors (25 Edw. III, stat. 6) to be passed (A.D. 1350). This act ordained that all elections and collations should be free according to law; and that in case any provision, collation, or reservation should be made by the court of Rome of any archbishopric, bishopric, dignity, or other benefice, the king should for that turn have the collation of such archbishopric or other dignities elective. This statute was fortified by several others in this and the succeeding reigns down to the 3 Henry V, c. 4.

### Provoost, Samuel, D.D.

an American prelate of the Protestant Episcopal Church, was born in New York Feb. 26, 1742, and passed A.B. in King's College in 1758. Though educated in the Dutch Reformed Church, he early became a convert to Episcopacy, and, having entered Cambridge College, was ordained in 1766. On his return from England he became assistant minister of Trinity

Church, also of St. George's and St. Paul's, New York. He subsequently retired to East Camp till the close of the Revolution, engaging chiefly in literary pursuits. In 1784 he was elected rector of Trinity Church, New York, and a regent of the university. He next acted as chaplain of Congress, and in 1786 was raised to the episcopate. He served also as chaplain to the United States, and died Sept. 6, 1815. He wrote a copious Index to the *Historia Plantarum* of John Bauhin. See Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, v, 240; *Amer. Ch. Rev.* Jan. 1872, p. 35, 46; July, 1862, p. 668.

### Provost

(Lat. *praepositus*, set over) is, in ecclesiastical language, the chief dignitary of a cathedral or collegiate church, from which use the title has been transferred to the heads of other similar bodies, whether religious, literary, or administrative. Properly, however, the name is given to the highest dignitary in the metropolitan or diocesan chapter, and is often held conjointly with the archdeaconry. The provost is the next in dignity after the archbishop or bishop, a position which is also the right of the provost of a collegiate chapter. The name is also given to the superiors of certain religious houses of lesser rank, and the relation of which to the more important houses is analogous to that of the priory to the abbey. It was also given to certain lay officials, whose duties, in relation to the Church and the maintenance of its material condition, were similar to those of the modern churchwarden. In the Protestant Church in Germany, the name provost is sometimes used as synonymous with that of dean or archpriest; and occasionally, where several minor churches or chapels are attached to one chief church, the minister of the latter is called "provost." In England, the heads of several colleges in the University of Oxford, and the head of King's College, Cambridge, are designated provost. The head of Eton College is also so called.