

The resemblance of this passage to the last is very clear. In the old dispensation there was a marked division between Jew and Gentile: under the Gospel there is one body in Christ. As in Gal. iii. 16, Christ is the seed (*τὸ σπέρμα*), so here He is the body (*τὸ σῶμα*), into which all Christians become incorporated. All distinctions of Jew and Gentile, bond and free, are abolished. By the grace of the same Spirit (or perhaps "in one spirit" of Christian love and fellowship (comp. Eph. ii. 18), without division or separate interests) all are joined in baptism to the one body of Christ, His universal church. Possibly there is an allusion to both sacraments. "We were baptized into one body, we were made to drink of one Spirit" (*ἐν Πνεύμα ἑποτίσθημεν*: Lachm. and Tisch. omit *εἰς*). Both our baptism and our partaking of the cup in the communion are tokens and pledges of Christian unity. They mark our union with the one body of Christ, and they are means of grace, in which we may look for one Spirit to be present with blessing (comp. 1 Cor. x. 3, 17; see Waterland on the *Eucharist*, ch. x., and Stanley on 1 Cor. xii. 13).

5. Rom. vi. 4 and Col. ii. 12 are so closely parallel that we may notice them together. As the Apostle in the two last-considered passages views baptism as a joining to the mystical body of Christ, so in these two passages he goes on to speak of Christians in their baptism as buried with Christ in His death, and raised again with Him in His resurrection.<sup>b</sup> As the natural body of Christ was laid in the ground and then raised up again, so His mystical body, the Church, descends in baptism into the waters, in which also (*ἐν ᾧ*, sc. *βαπτίσματι*, Col. ii. 12) it is raised up again with Christ, through "faith in the mighty working of God, who raised Him from the dead." Probably, as in the former passages St. Paul had brought forward baptism as the symbol of Christian unity, so in those now before us he refers to it as the token and pledge of the spiritual death to sin and resurrection to righteousness; and moreover of the final victory over death in the last day, through the power of the resurrection of Christ. It is said that it was partly in reference to this passage in Colossians that the early Christians so generally used trine immersion, as signifying thereby the three days in which Christ lay in the grave (see Suicer, s. v. *ἀναδύω* II. α).

IX. *Recipients of Baptism.*—The command to baptize was coextensive with the command to preach the Gospel. All nations were to be evangelized; and they were to be made disciples, admitted into the fellowship of Christ's religion, by baptism (Matt. xxviii. 19). Whosoever believed the preaching of the Evangelists was to be baptized, his faith and baptism placing him in a state of salvation (Mark xvi. 16). On this command the Apostles acted; for the first converts after the ascension were enjoined to repent and be baptized (Acts ii. 47). The Samaritans who believed the preaching of Philip were baptized, men and women (Acts viii. 12). The Ethiopian eunuch, as soon as he professed his faith in Jesus Christ, was baptized (Acts viii. 37, 38). Lydia listened to the things spoken by Paul, and was baptized, she and her house (Acts xvi. 15). The jailor at Philippi, the very night on which he was convinced by the earthquake in the prison, was baptized, he and all his, straightway (Acts xvi. 33).

<sup>b</sup> "Morsio in baptisate, vel certè aqua superfusa, sepulturam refert" (Bengel).

All this appears to correspond with the general character of the Gospel, that it should embrace the world, and should be freely offered to all men. "Him that cometh unto Me I will in no wise cast out" (John vi. 37). Like the Saviour Himself, Baptism was sent into the world "not to condemn the world, but that the world might be saved" (John iii. 17). Every one who was convinced by the teaching of the first preachers of the Gospel, and was willing to enrol himself in the company of the disciples, appears to have been admitted to baptism on a confession of his faith. There is no distinct evidence in the New Testament that there was in those early days a body of catechumens gradually preparing for baptism, such as existed in the ages immediately succeeding the Apostles, and such as every missionary church has found it necessary to institute. The Apostles, indeed, frequently insist on the privileges of being admitted to the fellowship of Christ's Church in the initiatory sacrament, and on the consequent responsibilities of Christians; and these are the grounds on which subsequent ages have been so careful in preparing adults for baptism. But perhaps the circumstances of the Apostles' age were so peculiar as to account for this apparent difference of principle. Conviction at that time was likely to be sudden and strong; the church was rapidly forming; the Apostles had the gift of discerning spirits. All this led to the admission to baptism with but little formal preparation for it. At all events it is evident that the spirit of our Lord's ordinance was comprehensive, not exclusive; that all were invited to come, and that all who were willing to come were graciously received.

The great question has been, whether the invitation extended, not to adults only, but to infants also. The universality of the invitation, Christ's declaration concerning the blessedness of infants and their fitness for His kingdom (Mark x. 14), the admission of infants to circumcision and to the baptism of Jewish proselytes, the mention of whole households, and the subsequent practice of the Church, have been principally relied on by the advocates of infant baptism. The silence of the New Testament concerning the baptism of infants, the constant mention of faith as a pre-requisite or condition of baptism, the great spiritual blessings which seem attached to a right reception of it, and the responsibility entailed on those who have taken its obligations on themselves, seem the chief objections urged against paedobaptism. But here, once more, we must leave ground which has been so extensively occupied by controversialists.

X. *The Mode of Baptism.*—The language of the New Testament and of the primitive fathers sufficiently points to immersion as the common mode of baptism. John the Baptist baptized in the river Jordan (Matt. iii.). Jesus is represented as "coming up out of the water" (*ἀναβαίνων ἀπὸ τοῦ ὕδατος*) after His baptism (Mark i. 10). Again, John is said to have baptized in Aënon because there was much water there (John iii. 23; see also Acts viii. 36). The comparison of baptism to burying and rising up again (Rom. vi.; Col. ii.) has been already referred to as probably derived from the custom of immersion (see Suicer, s. v. *ἀναδύω*; Schoettgen, in Rom. vi.; Vossius, *De Baptismo*, Diss. i. thes. vi.). On the other hand, it has been noticed that the family of the jailor at Philippi were all baptized in the prison on the night of their conversion (Acts xvi. 33) and that

the three thousand converted at Pentecost (Acts ii.) appear to have been baptized at once: it being hardly likely that in either of these cases immersion could have been possible. Moreover the ancient church, which mostly adopted immersion, was satisfied with affusion in case of clinical baptism—the baptism of the sick and dying.

*Questions and Answers.*—In the earliest times of the Christian Church we find the catechumens required to renounce the Devil (see Suicer, *s. v.* ἀποτάσσομαι) and to profess their faith in the Holy Trinity and in the principal articles of the Creed (see Suicer, *i. p.* 653). It is generally supposed that St. Peter (1 Pet. iii. 21), where he speaks of the “answer (or questioning, ἐπερώτημα) of a good conscience toward God” as an important constituent of baptism, refers to a custom of this kind as existing from the first (see, however, a very different interpretation in Bengelii *Gnomon*). The “form of sound words” (2 Tim. i. 13) and the “good profession professed before many witnesses” (1 Tim. vi. 12) may very probably have similar significance.

XI. *The Formula of Baptism.*—It should seem from our Lord’s own direction (Matt. xxviii. 19) that the words made use of in the administration of baptism should be those which the Church has generally retained, “I baptize thee in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost:” yet, wherever baptism is mentioned in the Acts of the Apostles, it is only mentioned as in “the name of the Lord Jesus,” or “in the name of the Lord” (Acts ii. 38, viii. 16, x. 48, xix. 5). The custom of the primitive church, as far as we can learn from the primitive Fathers, was always to baptize in the names of the three Persons of the Trinity (see Suicer, *s. v.* βαπτίζω); and there is little doubt that the expressions in the Book of Acts mean only that those who were baptized with Christian baptism were baptized into the faith of Christ, into the death of Christ, not that the form of words was different from that enjoined by our Lord in St. Matthew.

*Sponsors.*—There is no mention of sponsors in the N. T., though there is mention of the “questioning” (ἐπερώτημα). In very early ages of the Church sponsors (called ἀνάδοχοι, *sponsors, susceptores*) were in use both for children and adults. The mention of them first occurs in Tertullian—for infants in the *De Baptismo* (c. 18), for adults, as is supposed, in the *De Coronâ Militis* (c. 3: “Inde suscepti lactis et mellis concordiam prægustamus.” See Suicer, *s. v.* ἀναδέχομαι). In the Jewish baptism of proselytes two or three sponsors or witnesses were required to be present (see above, Lightfoot on Matt. iii. 6). It is so improbable that the Jews should have borrowed such a custom from the Christians, that the coincidence can hardly have arisen but from the Christians continuing the usages of the Jews.

XII. *Baptism for the Dead.*—1 Cor. xv. 29. “Else what shall they do who are baptized for the dead (ὑπὲρ τῶν νεκρῶν), if the dead rise not at all? Why are they then baptized for the dead” (or, “for them?” Lachmann and Tisch. read αὐτῶν).

1. Tertullian tells us of a custom of vicarious baptism (*vicarium baptismi*) as existing among the Marcionites (*De Resur. Carnis*, c. 48; *Adv. Marcion. lib. v. c.* 10); and St. Chrysostom relates of the same heretics, that, when one of their catechumens died without baptism, they used to put a living person under the dead man’s bed, and asked

whether he desired to be baptized; the living man answering that he did, they then baptized him in place of the departed (Chrys. *Hom. xl. in 1 Cor. xv.*). Epiphanius relates a similar custom among the Cerinthians (*Haeres. xxviii.*), which, he said, prevailed from fear that in the resurrection those should suffer punishment who had not been baptized. The Cerinthians were a very early sect; according to Irenaeus (iii. 11), some of their errors had been anticipated by the Nicolaitans, and St. John is said to have written the early part of his Gospel against those errors; but the Marcionites did not come into existence till the middle of the 2nd century. The question naturally occurs, Did St. Paul in 1 Cor. xv. 29 allude to a custom of this kind, which even in his days had begun to prevail among heretics and ignorant persons? If so, he no doubt adduced it, as an *argumentum ad hominem*. “If the dead rise not at all, what benefit do they expect who baptize vicariously for the dead?” The very heretics, who, from their belief that matter was incorrigibly evil, denied the possibility of a glorious resurrection, yet showed by their superstitious practices that the resurrection was to be expected; for, if there be no resurrection, their baptism for the dead would lose all its significance. It is truly said, that such accommodations to the opinions of others are not uncommon in the writings of St. Paul (comp. Gal. iv. 21-31; and see Stanley, *ad h. l.*). St. Ambrose (in 1 ad Cor. xv.) seems to have acquiesced in this interpretation. His words are, “The Apostle adduces the example of those who were so secure of the future resurrection that they even baptized for the dead, when by accident death had come unexpectedly, fearing that the unbaptized might either not rise or rise to evil.” Perhaps it may be said, that the greater number of modern commentators have adopted this, as the simplest and most rational sense of the Apostle’s words. And—which undoubtedly adds much to the probability that vicarious baptism should have been very ancient—we learn from Lightfoot (on 1 Cor. xv.) that a custom prevailed among the Jews of vicarious ablution for such as died under any legal uncleanness.

It is, however, equally conceivable, that the passage in St. Paul gave rise to the subsequent practice among the Marcionites and Cerinthians. Misinterpretation of Scriptural passages has undoubtedly been a fertile source of superstitious ceremony, which has afterwards been looked on as having resulted from early tradition. It is certain, that the Greek Fathers, who record the custom in question, wholly reject the notion that St. Paul alluded to it.

2. Chrysostom believes the Apostle to refer to the profession of faith in baptism, part of which was “I believe in the resurrection of the dead,” πιστεύω εἰς νεκρῶν ἀνάστασιν. “In this faith,” he says, “we are baptized. After confessing this among other articles of faith, we go down into the water. And reminding the Corinthians of this, St. Paul says, If there be no resurrection, why art thou then baptized for the dead, *i. e.* for the dead bodies (τί καὶ βαπτίζῃ ὑπὲρ τῶν νεκρῶν; τούτῃ ἐστι, τῶν σωμάτων)? For in this faith thou art baptized, believing in the resurrection of the dead” (*Hom. xl. in 1 Cor. xv.*; *c. Hom. xiii. in Epist. ad Corinth.*). St. Chrysostom is followed, as usual, by Theodoret, Theophylacti, and other Greek commentators. Indeed, he had been anticipated by Tertullian among the Latins (*Adv. Marcion. lib. v.*

c. 10), and probably by Epiphanius among the Greeks (*Haer.* xxviii.).

The former of the two interpretations above mentioned commends itself to us by its simplicity; the latter by its antiquity, having almost the general consent of the primitive Christians in its favour (see Suicer, i. p. 642); though it is somewhat difficult, even with St. Chrysostom's comment, to reconcile it wholly with the natural and grammatical construction of the words. In addition to the above, which seem the most probable, the variety of explanations is almost endless. Among them the following appear to deserve consideration.

3. "What shall they do, who are baptized when death is close at hand?" Epiphanius. *Haeres.* xxviii. 6, where, according to Bengel, *ὄπερ* will have the sense of *near, close upon*.

4. "Over the graves of the martyrs." That such a mode of baptism existed in after ages, see Euseb. *H. E.* iv. 15; August. *De Civ. Dei*, xx. 9. Vossius adopted this interpretation; but it is very unlikely that the custom should have prevailed in the days of St. Paul.

5. "On account of a dead Saviour;" where an enallage of number in the word *νεκρῶν* must be understood. See Rosenmüller, *in loc.*

6. "What shall they gain, who are baptized for the sake of the dead in Christ?" *i. e.* that so the *πλήρωμα* of believers may be filled up (comp. Rom. xi. 12, 25; Heb. xi. 40), that "God may complete the number of His elect, and hasten His kingdom." See Olshausen, *in loc.*

7. "What shall they do, who are baptized in the place of the dead?" *i. e.* who, as the ranks of the faithful are thinned by death, come forward to be baptized, that they may fill up the company of believers. See also Olshausen as above, who appears to hesitate between these last two interpretations.

On the subject of Baptism, of the practice of the Jews, and of the customs and opinions of the early Christians with reference to it, much information is to be found in Vossius, *De Baptismo*; Suicer, s. vv. *ἀναδύω, βαπτίζω, ἀναδέχομαι, κληνικός*, &c.; Wetstein, as referred to above; Bingham, *Eccles. Ant.* bk. xi.; Vicecomes, *Dissertationes*, lib. i.; Lightfoot, *Hor. Hebr.*; and Schoettgen, *Hor. Hebr.*, as referred to above. [E. H. B.]

#### SUPPLEMENT TO BAPTISM.

The "Laying on of Hands" was considered in the ancient church as the "Supplement of Baptism."

1. Imposition of hands is a natural form by which benediction has been expressed in all ages and among all people. It is the act of one superior either by age or spiritual position towards an inferior, and by its very form it appears to bestow some gift, or to manifest a desire that some gift should be bestowed. It may be an evil thing that is symbolically bestowed, as when guiltiness was thus transferred by the high-priest to the scapegoat from the congregation (Lev. xvi. 21); but, in general, the gift is of something good which God is supposed to bestow by the channel of the laying on of hands. Thus, in the Old Testament, Jacob accompanies his blessing to Ephraim and Manasseh with imposition of hands (Gen. xlviii. 14); Joshua is ordained in the room of Moses by imposition of hands (Num. xxvii. 18; Deut. xxxiv. 9); cures seem to have been wrought by the pro-

phets by imposition of hands (2 K. v. 11); and the high-priest, in giving his solemn benediction, stretched out his hands over the people (Lev. ix. 22).

The same form was used by our Lord in blessing, and occasionally in healing, and it was plainly regarded by the Jews as customary or befitting (Matt. xix. 13; Mark viii. 23, x. 16). One of the promises at the end of St. Mark's Gospel to Christ's followers is that they should cure the sick by laying on of hands (Mark xvi. 18); and accordingly we find that Saul received his sight (Acts ix. 17) and Publius's father was healed of his fever (Acts xxviii. 8) by imposition of hands.

In the Acts of the Apostles the nature of the gift or blessing bestowed by the Apostolic imposition of hands is made clearer. It is called the gift of the Holy Ghost (viii. 17, xix. 6). This gift of the Holy Ghost is described as the fulfilment of Joel's prediction—"I will pour out my Spirit upon all flesh, and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy, and your young men shall see visions, and your old men shall dream dreams; and on my servants and on my handmaidens I will pour out in those days of my Spirit, and they shall prophesy" (ii. 17, 18, and 38). Accordingly visible supernatural powers were the result of this gift—powers which a Simon Magus could see, the capacity of bestowing which he could covet and propose to purchase (viii. 18). In the case of the Ephesian disciples these powers are stated to be, Speaking with tongues and Prophecy (xix. 6). Sometimes they were granted without the ceremony of imposition of hands, in answer to Apostolic prayer (iv. 31), or in confirmation of Apostolic preaching (x. 44). But the last of these cases is described as extraordinary (xi. 17), and as having occurred in an extraordinary manner for the special purpose of impressing a hardly-learned lesson on the Jewish Christians by its very strangeness.

By the time that the Epistle to the Hebrews was written we find that there existed a practice and doctrine of imposition of hands, which is pronounced by the writer of the Epistle to be one of the first principles and fundamentals of Christianity, which he enumerates in the following order:—1. The doctrine of Repentance; 2. of Faith; 3. of Baptisms; 4. of Laying on of Hands; 5. of the Resurrection; 6. of Eternal Judgment (Heb. vi. 1, 2). Laying on of Hands in this passage can mean only one of three things—Ordination, Absolution, or that which we have already seen in the Acts to have been practised by the Apostles, imposition of hands for the gift of the Holy Ghost on the baptized. The meaning of Ordination is excluded by the context. We have no proof of the existence of the habitual practice of Absolution at this period, nor of its being accompanied by the laying on of hands. Everything points to that laying on of hands which, as we have seen, immediately succeeded Baptism in the Apostolic age, and continued to do so in the ages immediately succeeding the Apostles.

The Christian dispensation is specially the dispensation of the Spirit. He, if any, is the Vicar whom Christ deputed to fill His place when He departed (John xvi. 7). The Spirit exhibits himself not only by His gifts, but also, and still more, by His graces. His gifts are such as those enumerated in the Epistle to the Corinthians: "the gift of healing, of miracles, of prophecy, of discerning of spirits, of divers kinds of tongues, of interpreta-

tion of tongues" (1 Cor. xii. 10). His graces are, "love, joy, peace, long-suffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance" (Gal. v. 22, 23): the former are classed as the extraordinary, the latter as the ordinary gifts of the Spirit.

It was the will of the Spirit to bestow His gifts in different ways at different times, as well as in different ways and on different persons at the same time (1 Cor. xii. 6). His extraordinary gifts were poured out in great abundance at the time when the Christian Church was being instituted. At no definite moment, but gradually and slowly, these extraordinary gifts were withheld and withdrawn. When the Church was now contemplated as no longer in course of formation, but as having been now brought into being, His miracles of power ceased to be wrought (see Trench, *On the Miracles*, Introduction, and Jeremy Taylor, *On Confirmation*). But He continued His miracles of grace. His ordinary gifts never ceased being dispensed through the Church, although after a time the extraordinary gifts were found no longer.

With the Apostolic age, and with the age succeeding the Apostles, we may suppose that the consequences of the imposition of hands which manifested themselves in visible works of power (Acts viii., xix.) ceased. Nevertheless the practice of the imposition of hands continued. Why? Because, in addition to the visible manifestation of the Spirit, His invisible working was believed to be thereby increased, and His divine strength therein imparted. That this was the belief in the Apostolic days themselves may be thus seen. The ceremony of imposition of hands was even then habitual and ordinary. This may be concluded from the passage already quoted from Heb. vi. 2, where Imposition is classed with Baptisms as a fundamental: it may possibly also be deduced (as we shall show to have been believed) from 2 Cor. i. 21, 22, compared with Eph. i. 13, iv. 30; 1 John ii. 20; and it may be certainly inferred from subsequent universal practice. But although all the baptized immediately after their baptism received the imposition of hands, yet the extraordinary gifts were not given to all. "Are all workers of miracles? have all the gifts of healing? do all speak with tongues? do all interpret?" (1 Cor. xii. 29). The men thus endowed were, and must always have been, few among many. Why then and with what results was imposition of hands made a general custom? Because, though the visible gifts of the Spirit were bestowed only on those on whom He willed to bestow them, yet there were diversities of gifts and operations (ib. 11). Those who did not receive the visible gifts might still receive, in some cases, a strengthening and enlightenment of their natural faculties. "To one is given by the Spirit the word of wisdom, to another the word of knowledge by the same Spirit" (ib. 8): while all in respect to whom no obstacle existed might receive that grace which St. Paul contrasts with and prefers to the "best gifts," as "more excellent" than miracles, healing, tongues, knowledge and prophesying (ib. 31), greater too than "faith and hope" (xiii. 13). This is the grace of "charity," which is another name for the ordinary working of the Holy Spirit in the heart of man. This was doubtless the belief on which the rite of Imposition of Hands became universal in the Apostolic age, and continued to be universally observed in the succeeding ages of the Church. There are numberless references or allusions to it in the early Fathers. There is a possible

allusion to it in Theophilus Antiochenus, A.D. 170 (*Ad Autol.* l. i. c. 12, al. 17). It is spoken of by Tertullian, A.D. 200 (*De Bapt.* c. viii.; *De Resurr. Carn.* c. viii.); by Clement of Alexandria, A.D. 200 (*apud* Euseb. l. iii. c. 17); by Origen, A.D. 210 (*Hom. vii. in Ezek.*); by Cyprian, A.D. 250 (*Ep.* 70, 73); by Firmilian, A.D. 250 (*apud* Cypr. *Ep.* 75, §8); by Cornelius, A.D. 260 (*apud* Euseb. l. vi. c. 43); and by almost all of the chief writers of the 4th and 5th centuries. Cyprian (*loc. cit.*) derives the practice from the example of the Apostles recorded in Acts viii. Firmilian, Jerome, and Augustine refer in like manner to Acts xix. "The Fathers," says Hooker, "everywhere impute unto it that gift or grace of the Holy Ghost, not which maketh us first Christian men, but, when we are made such, assisteth us in all virtue, armeth us against temptation and sin. . . . The Fathers therefore, being thus persuaded, held confirmation as an ordinance Apostolic, always profitable in God's Church, although not always accompanied with equal largeness of those external effects which gave it countenance at the first" (*Eccl. Pol.* v. 66, 4).

II. *Time of Confirmation.*—Originally Imposition of Hands followed immediately upon Baptism, so closely as to appear as part of the Baptismal ceremony or a supplement to it. This is clearly stated by Tertullian (*De Bapt.* vii. viii.), Cyril (*Catech. Myst.* iii. 1), the author of the Apostolical Constitutions (vii. 43), and all early Christian writers; and hence it is that the names *σφραγίς*, *χρίσμα*, *sigillum*, *signaculum*, are applied to Baptism as well as to Imposition of Hands. (See Euseb. *H. E.* iii. 23; Greg. Naz., *Or.* 40; Herm. *Past.* iii. 9, 16; Tertull. *De Spectac.* xxiv.) Whether it were an infant or an adult that was baptized Confirmation and admission to the Eucharist immediately ensued. This continued to be the general rule of the Church down to the ninth century, and is the rule of the Eastern Churches to the present time. The way in which the difference in practice between East and West grew up was the following. It was at first usual for many persons to be baptized together at the great Festivals of Easter, Pentecost, and Epiphany in the presence of the bishop. The bishop then confirmed the newly-baptized by prayer and imposition of hands. But by degrees it became customary for presbyters and deacons to baptize in other places than the cathedrals and at other times than at the great festivals. Consequently, it was necessary either to give to presbyters the right of confirming, or to defer confirmation to a later time when it might be in the power of the bishop to perform it. The Eastern Churches gave the right to the presbyter, reserving only to the bishop the composition of the chrism with which the ceremony is performed. The Western Churches retained it in the hands of the bishop. (See *Conc. Carthag.* iii. can. 36 and iv. can. 36; *Conc. Tolet.* i. can. 20; *Conc. Antiodor.* can. 6; *Conc. Bracar.* i. can. 36 and ii. can. 4; *Conc. Eliber.* can. 38 and 77.) Tertullian says that it was usual for the bishop to make expeditions (*excurrat*) from the city in which he resided to the villages and remote spots in order to lay his hands on those who had been baptized by presbyters and deacons, and to pray for the gift of the Holy Spirit upon them (*Cont. Lucif.* iv.). The result was that, in the West, men's minds became accustomed to the severance of the two ceremonies which were once so closely joined—the more, as it was their practice to receive those who had been

neretically or schismatically baptized, not by re-baptism, but only by imposition of hands and prayer. By degrees the severance became so complete as to be sanctioned and required by authority. After a time this appendix or supplement to the sacrament of baptism became itself erected into a separate sacrament by the Latin Church.

III. *Names of Confirmation.*—The title of "Confirmation" is modern. It is not found in the early Latin Christian writers, nor is there any Greek equivalent for it: for *τελειωσις* answers rather to "consecratio" or "perfectio," and refers rather to baptism than confirmation. The ordinary Greek word is *χρῖσμα*, which, like the Latin "unctio," expresses the gift of the Holy Spirit's grace. In this general sense it is used in 1 John ii. 20, "Ye have an unction from the Holy One," and in 2 Cor. i. 21, "He which hath anointed us is God, who hath also sealed us and given the earnest of the Spirit in our hearts." So early a writer as Tertullian not only mentions the act of anointing as being in use at the same time with the imposition of hands (*De Bapt.* vii. and viii.), but he speaks of it as being "de pristina disciplina," even in his day. It is certain therefore that it must have been introduced very early, and it has been thought by some that the two Scriptural passages above quoted imply its existence from the very beginning. (See Chrysostom, Hilary, Theodoret, *Comm. in loc.* and Cyril in *Catech.* 3.)

Another Greek name is *σφραγίς*. It was so called as being the consummation and seal of the grace given in Baptism. In the passage quoted from the Epistle to the Colossians "sealing" by the Spirit is joined with being "anointed by God." A similar expression is made use of in Eph. i. 13, "In whom also after that ye believed ye were sealed with that Holy Spirit of promise;" and again, "the Holy Spirit of God, whereby ye are sealed unto the day of redemption" (Eph. iv. 30). The Latin equivalents are *sigillum*, *signaculum*, and (the most commonly used Latin term) *consignatio*. Augustine (*De Trin.* xv. 26) sees a reference in these passages to the rite of confirmation.

IV. *Definitions of Confirmation.*—The Greek Church does not refer to Acts viii. xix. and Heb. vi. for the origin of confirmation so much as to 1 John ii. and 2 Cor. i. Regarding it as the consummation of Baptism she condemns the separation which has been effected in the West. The Russian Church defines it as "a mystery in which the baptized believer, being anointed with holy chrism in the name of the Holy Ghost, receives the gifts of the Holy Ghost for growth and strength in the spiritual life" (*Longer Catechism*). The Latin Church defines it as "unction by chrism (accompanied by a set form of words), applied by the Bishop to the forehead of one baptized, by means of which he receives increase of grace and strength by the institution of Christ" (Liguori after Bellarmine). The English Church (by implication) as "a rite by means of which the regenerate are strengthened by the manifold gifts of the Holy Ghost the Comforter, on the occasion of their ratifying the Baptismal vow" (*Confirmation Service*). Were we to criticize these definitions, or to describe the ceremonies belonging to the rite in different ages of the Church, we should be passing from our legitimate sphere into that of a Theological Dictionary.

*Literature.*—Hooker, *Ecclesiastical Polity*, bk. v. §66, Oxf. 1863; Bellarmine, *De Sacramento Confirmationis*, in libro *De Controversiis*, [APPENDIX.]

tom. iii. Col. Agr. 1629; Daille, *De Confirmatione et Extremâ Unctione*, Genev. 1659; Hammond, *De Confirmatione*, Oxon. 1661; Hall, *On Imposition of Hands*, Works, ii. p. 876, Lond. 1661; Pearson, *Lectio V. in Acta Apostolorum*, Minor Works, i. p. 362, Oxf. 1844; Taylor, *A Discourse of Confirmation*, Works, v. p. 619, Lond. 1854; Wheatly, *Illustration of Book of Common Prayer*, c. ix. Oxf. 1846; Bingham, *Ecclesiastical Antiquities*, bk. xii. Lond. 1856; Liguori, *Theologia Moralís*, iii. p. 468, Paris, 1845; Hey, *Lectures on Divinity*, Camb. 1841; Mill, *Praelection on Heb. VI. 2*, Camb. 1843; Palmer, *Origines Liturgicae: On Confirmation*, Lond. 1845; Bates, *Collego Lectures on Christian Antiquities*, Lond. 1845; Bp. Wordsworth, *Catechesis*, Lond. 1857; Dr. Wordsworth, *Notes in Greek Test. on Acts VIII. XIX. and Heb. VI.* Lond. 1860, and *On Confirmation*, Lond. 1861; Wall, *On Confirmation*, Lond. 1862. [F. M.]

**BARUCH 2.** The son of Zabbai, who assisted Nehemiah in rebuilding the walls of Jerusalem (Neh. iii. 20).

**3.** A priest, or family of priests, who signed the covenant with Nehemiah (Neh. x. 6).

**4.** The son of Col-hozei, a descendant of Perez, or Pharez, the son of Judah (Neh. xi. 5).

**BARZELA'I.** 1 Esdr. v. 38, marg.

**BASTARD.** Among those who were excluded from entering the congregation, that is, from intermarrying with pure Hebrews (Selden, *Table Talk*, s. v. "Bastard"), even to the tenth generation, was the *mamzér* (מַמְזֵר, A. V. "bastard"), who was classed in this respect with the Ammonite and Moabite (Deut. xxiii. 2). The term is not, however, applied to any illegitimate offspring, born out of wedlock, but is restricted by the Rabbins to the issue of any connexion within the degrees prohibited by the Law. A *mamzér*, according to the Mishna (*Yebamoth*, iv. 13), is one, says R. Akiba, who is born of relations between whom marriage is forbidden. Simeon the Temanite says, it is every one whose parents are liable to the punishment of "cutting off" by the hands of Heaven; R. Joshua, every one whose parents are liable to death by the house of judgment, as, for instance, the offspring of adultery. The ancient versions (LXX., Vulg., Syr.), add another class, the children of a harlot, and in this sense the term *mamzer* or *manser* survived in Pontifical law (Selden, *De Succ. in Bon. Defunct.*, c. iii.):

"Manzeribus scortum, sed moecha nothis dedit ortum."

The child of a *goi*, or non-Israelite, and a *mamzér* was also reckoned by the Talmudists a *mamzér*, as was the issue of a slave and a *mamzér*, and of a *mamzér* and female proselyte. The term also occurs in Zech. ix. 6, "a bastard shall dwell in Ashdod," where it seems to denote a foreign race of mixed and spurious birth. Dr. Geiger infers from this passage that *mamzér* specially signifies the issue of such marriages between the Jews and the women of Ashdod as are alluded to in Neh. xiii. 23, 24, and applies it exclusively to the Philistine bastard.

**BATTLE-AX.** [MAUL.]

**BAZLUTH** (בַּזְלוּת) Βασιλώθ: BESLUTH.

BAZLITH (Ezr. ii. 52).

**BEDAN 2.** (Badáú; Alex. Βαδάυ.) Son of Ulam, the son of Gilead (1 Chr. vii. 17). H

BEER'OTHITE. [PEEROTH.]

BETH'ELITE, THE (1 K. xvi. 34).  
[BETHEL.]

BETH'LEHEMITE, THE (בֵּית הַלְחֶמִי):  
Βηθλεεμίτης, δ Βαιθλεεμίτης; Alex. Βηθλεεμίτης:  
*Bethlehemites*). A native or inhabitant of Beth-  
lehem. Jesse (1 Sam. xvi. 1, 18, xvii. 58) and  
Elhanan (2 Sam. xxi. 19) were Bethlehemites.  
Another Elhanan, son of Dodo of Bethlehem, was  
one of David's guard (2 Sam. xxiii. 24). [EL-  
HANAN.]

BETHORON (Βαιθωρών: Alex. Βεθωρώ: om.  
in Vulg.). BETH-HORON (Jud. iv. 4).

BETH'SHEMITE, THE (בֵּית-הַשֶּׁמִּי):  
δ Βαιθσαμσίτης; Alex. δ Βαιθθαμσίτης: *Beth-  
samita, Bethsamitis*). Properly "the Beth-shim-  
shite," an inhabitant of Beth-shemesh (1 Sam. vii.  
14, 18). The LXX. in the former passage refer  
the words to the field and not to Joshua (τὸν ἐν  
Βαιθσαύς).

BIK'ATH-A'VEN. Am. i. 5, marg. [AVEN 1.]

BITUMEN. [SLIME.]

BLACK. [COLOURS.]

BOIL. [MEDICINE, ii. pp. 301b-304a.]

BOLSTER. The Hebrew word (מְרֹאֲשֹׁתַי,  
*m'raashóth*) so rendered, denotes, like the English,  
simply a place for the head. Hardy travellers, like  
Jacob (Gen. xxviii. 11, 18) and Elijah (1 K. xix.  
6), sleeping on the bare ground, would make use of  
a stone for this purpose; and soldiers on the march  
had probably no softer resting place (1 Sam. xxvi.  
7, 11, 12, 16). Possibly both Saul and Elijah  
may have used the water-bottle which they carried  
as a bolster, and if this were the case, David's mid-  
night adventure becomes more conspicuously daring.  
The "pillow" of goat's hair which Michal's cunning  
put in the place of the bolster in her husband's  
bed (1 Sam. xix. 13, 16) was probably, as Ewald  
suggests, a net or curtain of goat's hair, to protect  
the sleeper from the mosquitoes (*Gesch.* iii. p. 101,  
note), like the "canopy" of Holofernes.

BONNET. [See HEAD-DRESS.] In old Eng-  
lish, as in Scotch to this day, the word "bonnet"  
was applied to the head-dress of men. Thus in  
Hall's *Rich. III.*, fol. 9a: "And after a lytle season  
puttyng of hys boneth he sayde: O Lorde God cre-  
ator of all thynges, howe muche is this realme of  
Englande and the people of the same bounden to  
thy goodnes." And in Shakspeare (*Hamlet*. v. 2):

"Your bonnet to his right use: 'tis for the head."

BOTCH. [MEDICINE.]

BRIGANDINE. The Hebrew word thus ren-  
dered in Jer. xlvi. 4, li. 3 (סִרְיֹן, *siryón*:  
θώραξ: *lorica*) is closely connected with that  
(שִׁרְיֹן, *shiryón*) which is elsewhere translated  
"coat of mail" (1 Sam. xvii. 5, 38), and "haber-  
geon" (2 Chr. xxvi. 14; Neh. iv. 16 [10]).  
[ARMS, p. 111 b.] Mr. Wedgwood (*Dict. of Eng.  
Etym.* s. v.) says it "was a kind of scale armour,  
also called Briganders, from being worn by the  
light troops called Brigands." The following ex-  
amples will illustrate the usage of the word in Old  
English: "The rest of the armor for his body, he  
had put it on before in his tent, which was a Si-  
cilian cassoche, and vpon that a brigandine made of

many foldes of canuas with oylet-hoes, which was  
gotten among the spoiles at the battell of Issus"  
(North's Plutarch, *Alex.* p. 735, ed. 1595).

"Hymselfe with the Duke of Buckingham stode  
harnessed in olde euil-fauoured Briganders" (Hall,  
*Edw. V.*, fol. 15 b, ed. 1550). The forms *brigant-  
taille* and *brigantine* also occur.

BROOK. Four Hebrew words are thus ren-  
dered in the O. T.

1. אֶפְיָק *áphik* (Ps. xlii. 1 [27]), which pro-  
perly denotes a violent torrent, sweeping through a  
mountain gorge. It occurs only in the poetical  
books, and is derived from a root *áphak*, signifying  
"to be strong." Elsewhere it is rendered "stream,"  
"channel," "river."

2. יְאֹר, *yěór* (Is. xix. 6, 7, 8, xxiii. 3, 10), an  
Egyptian word, generally applied to the Nile, or to  
the canals by which Egypt was watered. The only  
exceptions to this usage are found in Dan. xii. 5,  
6, 7.

3. מִיכָל, *mícal* (2 Sam. xvii. 20), which  
occurs but once, and then, according to the most  
probable conjecture, signifies a "rivulet," or small  
stream of water. The etymology of the word  
is obscure. The Targum erroneously renders it  
"Jordan."

4. נַחַל, *nachal*, a term applied both to the  
dry torrent-bed (Num. xxi. 12; Judg. xvi. 4) and  
to the torrent itself (1 K. xvii. 3). It corresponds  
with the Arabic *wády*, the Greek *χειμάρρους*, the  
Italian *fiumara*, and the Indian *nullah*. For fur-  
ther information, see RIVER.

BU'ZITE (בּוּזִי: Βουζίτης: *Buzites*). A de-  
scendant of Buz. The term is applied to Elibu,  
who was of the kindred of Ram or Aram (Job  
xxxii. 2, 6).

## C

CALEB. "The south of Caleb" is that por-  
tion of the Negeb (נֶגֶב) or "south country" of  
Palestine, occupied by Caleb and his descendants  
(1 Sam. xxx. 14). In the division of Canaan  
Joshua assigned the city and suburbs of Hebron  
to the priests, but the "field" of the city, that is  
the pasture and corn lands, together with the vil-  
lages, were given to Caleb. The south, or Negeb,  
of Caleb, is probably to be identified with the ex-  
tensive basin or plain which lies between Hebron  
and Kurmul, the ancient Carmel of Judah, where  
Caleb's descendant Nabal had his possessions.

CA'NAAN, LANGUAGE OF. See p. 743.

CAPH'THORIM (כַּפְתָּרִים: Vat. omits; Alex.  
*Χαφοριείμ*: *Caphtorim*). 1 Chr. i. 12. [CAPHTOR.]

CAPH'TORIMS (כַּפְתָּרִים: οἱ Καππαδοκες:  
*Cappadoces*). Deut. ii. 23. [CAPHTOR.]

CARMA'NIANS (*Carmonii*). The inhabit-  
ants of Carmania, a province of Asia on the north  
side of the Persian Gulf (2 Esd. xv. 30). They are  
described by Strabo (xv. p. 727) as a warlike race,  
worshipping Ares alone of all the gods, to whom  
they sacrifice an ass. None of them married till  
he had cut off the head of an enemy and presented  
it to the king, who placed it on his palace, having  
first cut out the tongue, which was chopped up into  
small pieces and mixed with meal, and in this con-  
dition, after being tasted by the king, was given to

the warrior who brought it and to his family to eat. Nearchus says that most of the customs of the Carmanians, and their language, were Persian and Median. Arrian gives the same testimony (*Ind.* 38), adding that they used the same order of battle as the Persians.

**CARMELITE** (כַּרְמֶלִי: Καρμήλιος, Καρμαδαί in 1 Chr. xi. 37; Alex. Καρμηλείτης in 2 Sam. ii. 2, Καρμηλί in 1 Chr. xi. 37: Carmeli, de Carmelo, Carmelites). A native of Carmel in the mountains of Judah. The term is applied to Nabal (1 Sam. xxx. 5; 2 Sam. ii. 2, iii. 3) and to Hezrai, or Hezro, one of David's guard (2 Sam. xxiii. 35; 1 Chr. xi. 37). In 2 Sam. iii. 3 the LXX. must have read כַּרְמֶלִית, "Carmelites."

**CARMELITISS** (כַּרְמֶלִית: Καρμήλιος, Καρμήλια: Carmeli, Carmelitis). A woman of Carmel in Judah: used only of Abigail, the favourite wife of David (1 Sam. xxvii. 3; 1 Chr. iii. 1). In the former passage both LXX. and Vulg. appear to have read כַּרְמֶלִי, "Carmelite."

**CARMITES, THE** (כַּרְמִי: δ Χαρμί; Alex. δ Χαρμεί: Charmitae). A branch of the tribe of Reuben, descended from CARM 2 (Num. xxvi. 6).

**CASEMENT.** [LATTICE.]

**CAULS** (שְׁבִיטִים: ἐμπλόκια: torques). The margin of the A. V. gives "networks." The Old English word "caul" denoted a netted cap worn by women. Compare Chaucer (*Wyf of Bathes Tale*, C. T. l. 6599):

"Let se, which is the proudest of hem alle,  
That werith on a coverchief or a caile."

The Hebrew word *shēbīsim* thus rendered in Is. iii. 18, is, like many others which occur in the same passage, the subject of much dispute. It occurs but once, and its root is not elsewhere found in Hebrew. The Rabbinical commentators connect it with שִׁבְיָ, *shibbēts*, rendered "embroider" in Ex. xxviii. 39, but properly "to work in squares, make checker-work." So Kimchi (*Lex. s. v.*) explains *shēbīsim* as "the name of garments wrought in checker-work." Rashi says they are "a kind of network to adorn the head." Abarbanel is more full: he describes them as "headdresses, made of silk or gold thread, with which the women bound their heads about, and they were of checker-work." The word occurs again in the Mishna (*Celim*, xxviii. 10), but nothing can possibly be inferred from the passage itself, and the explanations of the commentators do not throw much light upon it. It there appears to be used as part of a network worn as a headdress by women. Bartenora says it was "a figure which they made upon the network for ornament, standing in front of it and going round from one ear to the other." Beyond the fact that the *shēbīsim* were headdresses or ornaments of the headdress of Hebrew ladies, nothing can be said to be known about them.

Schroeder (*De Vest. Mul.*, cap. ii.) conjectured that they were medallions worn on the necklace, and identified *shēbīsim* with the Arab. شَمَائِسُ, *shomaisēh*, the diminutive of شَمْسٌ, *shams*, the sun, which is applied to denote the sun-shaped ornaments worn by Arab women about their necks.

But to this Gesenius very properly objects (*Jes. l.* p. 209), as well as to the explanation of *Jude* (*Archæol.* i. 2, 139), who renders the word "gruze veils."

The Versions give but little assistance. The LXX. render ἐμπλόκια "plaited work," to which κοσύμβους, "fringes," appears to have been added originally as a gloss, and afterwards to have crept into the text. Aquila has τελαμώνας, "belts." The Targum merely adopts the Hebrew word without translating it, and the Syriac and Arabic vaguely render it "their ornaments."

**CHAMBERLAIN** (οἰκονόμος: *arcarius*). Erastus, "the chamberlain" of the city of Corinth, was one of those whose salutations to the Roman Christians are given at the end of the Ep. addressed to them (Rom. xvi. 23). The office which he held was apparently that of public treasurer, or *arcarius*, as the Vulgate renders his title. These *arcarii* were inferior magistrates, who had the charge of the public chest (*arca publica*), and were under the authority of the senate. They kept the accounts of the public revenues. In the Glossary of Philoxenus the word οἰκονόμος is explained ὁ ἐπὶ τῆς δημοσίας τραπέζης, and in the Pandects the term *arcarius* is applied to any one who attends to public or private money. It is, as Grotius remarks, one of those words which have been transferred from the house to the state. In old glosses quoted by Suicer (*Thesaur.*) we find *arcarius* explained by ὑποδεκτῆς χρυσοῦ, and in accordance with this the translators of the Geneva Version have placed "receiver" in the margin. Erasmus interpreted the word *quaestor aerarum*. St. Ambrose thought that the office of the *oeconomus* principally consisted in regulating the prices of the markets, and hence Pancirollus was erroneously led to interpret the term of the *aedile*. Theophylact rendered it ὁ διοικητῆς, ὁ προνοητῆς τῆς πόλεως Κορίνθου, and is followed by Beza, who gives *procurator*.

In an inscription in the *Marm. Oxon.* (p. 85, ed. 1732) we find Νεῖλω οἰκονόμῳ Ἀσίας; and in another, mention is made of Miletus, who was *oeconomus* of Smyrna (*Ins.* xxx. p. 26; see Prideaux's note, p. 477). Another in Gruter (p. mxcii. 7, ed. Scaliger, 1616) contains the name of "Secundus *Arkarius* Reipublicae Amerinorum;" but the one which bears most upon our point is given by Orellius (No. 2821), and mentions the "*arcarius* provinciae Achaiae."

For further information see Reinesius, *Syntagm. Inscr.* p. 431, La Cerda, *Advers. Sacr.* cap. 56, Elsner, *Obs. Sacr.* ii. p. 68, and a note by Reinesius to the *Marmora Oxoniensia*, p. 515, ed. 1732.

Our translators had good reason for rendering οἰκονόμος by "chamberlain." In Stow's *Survey of London* (b. v. p. 162, ed. Strype) it is said of the Chamberlain of the city of London: "His office may be termed a publick treasury, collecting the customs, monies, and yearly revenues, and all other payments belonging to the corporation of the city."

The office held by Blastus, "the king's chamberlain (τὸν ἐπὶ τοῦ κοιτῶνος τοῦ βασιλέως)," was entirely different from that above mentioned (Acts xii. 20). It was a post of honour which involved great intimacy and influence with the king. The margin of our version gives "that was over the king's bedchamber," the office thus corresponding to that of the *praefectus cubiculo* (Suet. Dom. 16).

For CHAMBERLAIN as used in the O. T., see EUNUCH, p. 590 b.

**CHELOIAS** (Χελκίας: *Helcias*). 1. Ancestor of Baruch (Bar. i. 1).

2. Hilkiah the high priest in the time of Isaiah (Bar. i. 7)

**CHEM'ARIMS, THE** (חֵמָרִים: *oi Χωμαρίμ*; Alex. *oi Χομαρείμ*: *aruspices, aeditui*). This word only occurs in the text of the A. V. in Zeph. i. 4. In 2 K. xxiii. 5 it is rendered "idolatrous priests," and in Hos. x. 5 "priests," and in both cases "chemarim" is given in the margin. So far as regards the Hebrew usage of the word it is exclusively applied to the priests of the false worship, and was in all probability a term of foreign origin. In Syriac the word ܚܡܪܐ, *cûmrô*, is found without the same restriction of meaning, being used in Judg. xvii. 5, 12, of the priest of Micah, while in Is. lxi. 6 it denotes the priests of the true God, and in Heb. ii. 17 is applied to Christ himself. The root in Syriac signifies "to be sad," and hence *cûmrô* is supposed to denote a mournful, ascetic person, and hence a priest or monk (compare Arab.

ܐܒܝܝܠ, *abil*, and Syr. ܐܒܝܠܐ, *abîlô*, in the same sense). Kimchi derived it from a root signifying "to be black," because the idolatrous priests wore black garments; but this is without foundation. [IDOLATRY, p. 858.] In the Peshito-Syriac of Acts xix. 35 the feminine form of the word is used to render the Greek νεωκόρον, "a temple keeper." Compare the Vulg. *aeditui*, which is the translation of Chemarim in two passages.

**CHE'TTIIM** (Χεττειείμ; Alex. Χεττειείμ: *Cethim*), 1 Macc. i. 1. [CHITTIM.]

**CHIN'NEROTH** (כְּנֶרֶת, כְּנֶרֶת: *Κενερώθ, Χενερέθ*; Alex. *Χενερεθί, Χεννερέθ*: *Ceneroth*), Josh. xi. 2, xii. 3. [CHINNERETH.]

**CHRISTIAN** (Χριστιανός: *Christianus*). The disciples, we are told (Acts xi. 26), were first called Christians at Antioch on the Orontes, somewhere about A.D. 43. The name, and the place where it was conferred, are both significant. It is clear that the appellation "Christian" was one which, though eagerly adopted and gloried in by the early followers of Christ, could not have been imposed by themselves. They were known to each other as brethren of one family, as disciples of the same Master, as believers in the same faith, and as distinguished by the same endeavours after holiness and consecration of life; and so were called *brethren* (Acts xv. 1, 23; 1 Cor. vii. 12), *disciples* (Acts ix. 26, xi. 29), *believers* (Acts v. 14), *saints* (Rom. viii. 27, xv. 25). But the outer world could know nothing of the true force and significance of these terms, which were in a manner esoteric; it was necessary therefore that the followers of the new religion should have some distinctive title. To the contemptuous Jew they were Nazarenes and Galilaeans, names which carried with them the infamy and turbulence of the places whence they sprung, and from whence nothing good and no prophet might come. The Jews could add nothing to the scorn which these names expressed, and had they endeavoured to do so they would not have defiled the glory of their Messiah by applying his title to those whom they could not but regard as the followers of a pretender. The name "Christian," then, which, in the only

other cases where it appears in the N. T. (Acts xxvi. 28; 1 Pet. iv. 16; comp. Tac. *Ann.* xv. 44), is used contemptuously, could not have been applied by the early disciples to themselves, nor could it have come to them from their own nation the Jews; it must, therefore, have been imposed upon them by the Gentile world, and no place could have so appropriately given rise to it as Antioch, where the first Church was planted among the heathen. It was manifest by the preaching of the new teachers that they were distinct from the Jews, so distinct as to be remarked by the heathen themselves; and as no name was so frequently in their mouths as that of Christ,<sup>a</sup> the Messiah, the Anointed, the people of Antioch, ever on the alert for a gibe or mocking taunt, and taking Christ to be a proper name and not a title of honour, called his followers *Χριστιανοί*, Christians, the partisans of Christ, just as in the early struggles for the Empire we meet with the Caesariani, Pompeiani, and Octavianiani. The Latin form of the name is what would be expected, for Antioch had long been a Roman city. Its inhabitants were celebrated for their wit and a propensity for conferring nicknames (Procop. *Pers.* ii. 8, p. 105). The Emperor Julian himself was not secure from their jests (Amm. Marc. xxii. 14). Apollonius of Tyana was driven from the city by the insults of the inhabitants (Philostr. *Vit. Apoll.* iii. 16). Their wit, however, was often harmless enough (Lucian, *De Saltat.* 76), and there is no reason to suppose that the name "Christian" of itself was intended as a term of scurrility or abuse, though it would naturally be used with contempt.

Suidas (*s. v.* *Χριστιανοί*) says the name was given in the reign of Claudius, when Peter appointed Evodius bishop of Antioch, and they who were formerly called Nazarenes and Galilaeans had their name changed to Christians. According to Malalas (*Chronog.* x.) it was changed by Evodius himself, and William of Tyre (iv. 9) has a story that a synod was held at Antioch for the purpose. Ignatius, or the author of the Epistle to the Magnesians (c. x.), regards the prophecy of Isaiah (lxii. 2, 12) as first fulfilled in Syria, when Peter and Paul founded the Church at Antioch. But reasons have already been given why the name did not originate within the Church.

Another form of the name is *Χρηστιανοί*, arising from a false etymology (Lact. iv. 7; Tertullian, *Apol.* c. 3; Suet. *Claud.* 25), by which it was derived from *χρηστός*.

**CHURCH** (Ἐκκλησία).—(I.) The derivation of the word Church is uncertain. It is found in the Teutonic and Slavonian languages (Anglo-Saxon, *Circ, Circe, Cyric, Cyricea*; English, *Church*; Scottish, *Kirk*; German, *Kirche*; Swedish, *Kyrka*; Danish, *Kyrke*; Dutch, *Karke*; Swiss, *Kilche*; Frisian, *Tzierk*; Bohemian, *Cyrkew*; Polish, *Cerkiew*; Russian, *Zerkow*), and answers to the derivatives of *ἐκκλησία*, which are naturally found in the Romance languages (French, *Eglise*; Italian, *Chiesa*; old Vaudois, *Gleisa*; Spanish, *Iglesia*), and by foreign importation elsewhere (Gothic, *Aih-klésjô*; Gaelic, *Eaglais*; Welsh, *Eglwys*; Cornish, *Eglos*). The word is generally said to be derived from the Greek *κυριακόν* (Walafrid Strabo, *De Rebus Ecclesiast.* c. 7; Suicer, *s. v.* *κυριακόν*; Glossarium, *s. v.* "Dominicum"; Casaubon, *Exercit.*

<sup>a</sup> "Christ," and not "Jesus," is the term most commonly applied to our Lord in the Epistles.



Baron. xiii. § xviii.; Hooker, *Eccl. Pol.* v. xiii. 1; Pearson, *On the Creed*, Art. ix.; Beveridge, *On the Thirty-Nine Articles*, Art. xix.; Wordsworth, *Theophilus Anglicanus*, c. 1; Gieseler, *Eccles. History*, c. 1; Trench, *Study of Words*, p. 75). But the derivation has been too hastily assumed. The arguments in its favour are the following: (1.) a similarity of sound; (2.) the statement of Walafrid Strabo; (3.) the fact that the word *κυριακόν* was undoubtedly used by Greek ecclesiastics in the sense of "a Church," as proved by a reference to the Canons of the Council of Ancyra (Can. xiv.), of Neocaesarea (Can. v., xiii.), of Laodicea (Can. xxviii.), and of the Council in Trullo (Can. lxxiv.), to Maximin's Edict (in Euseb. *H. E.* ix. 10), to Eusebius' Oration in praise of Constantine (c. xviii.), to the Apostolical Constitutions (ii. 59), to Cyril of Jerusalem (*Catech.* xviii.), and to a similar use of "Dominicum" by Cyprian, Jerome, Rufinus, &c. (4.) The possibility of its having passed as a theological term from the Greek into the Teutonic and Slavonian languages. (5.) The analogous meaning and derivation of the Ethiopic word for Church, which signifies "the house of Christ." On the other hand it requires little acquaintance with philology to know that (1.) similarity of sound proves nothing, and is capable of raising only the barest presumption. (2.) A mediaeval writer's guess at an etymology is probably founded wholly on similarity of sound, and is as worthless as the derivations with which St. Augustine's works are disfigured (Moroni derives Chiesa from *κυριακόν* in his *Dizionario Storico ecclesiastico*, and Walafrid Strabo derives the words *vater*, *mutter*, from the Greek through the Latin, *herr* from *heros*, *moner* and *monath* from *μήνη*, in the same breath as *kirche* from *κυριακόν*). (3.) Although *κυριακόν* is found, signifying "a church," it is no more the common term used by Greeks, than *Dominicum* is the common term used by Latins. It is therefore very unlikely that it should have been adopted by the Greek missionaries and teachers, and adopted by them so decidedly as to be thrust into a foreign language. (4.) Nor is there any probable way pointed out by which the importation was effected. Walafrid Strabo, indeed (*loc. cit.*), attributes it, not obscurely, so far as the Teutonic tongues are concerned, to Ulfilas; and following him, Trench says (*loc. cit.*), "These Goths, the first converted to the Christian faith, the first therefore that had a Christian vocabulary, lent the word in their turn to the other German tribes, among others to our Anglo-Saxon forefathers." Had it been so introduced, Ulfilas' "peaceful and populous colony of shepherds and herdsmen on the pastures below Mount Haemus" (Milman, i. 272) could never have affected the language of the whole Teutonic race in all its dialects. But in matter of fact we find that the word employed by Ulfilas in his version of the Scriptures is not any derivative of *κυριακόν*; but, as we should have expected, *ekklēsijō* (Rom. xvi. 23; 1 Cor. xvi. 19 *et passim*). This theory therefore falls to the ground, and with it any attempt at showing the way in which the word passed across into the Teutonic languages. No special hypothesis has been brought forward to account for its admission into the Slavonic tongues, and it is enough to say that, unless we have evidence to the contrary, we are justified in assuming that the Greek missionaries in the 9th century did not adopt a term in their intercourse with strangers, which they hardly, if at all, used in ordinary conversation

amongst themselves. (5.) Further, there is no reason why the word should have passed into these two languages rather than into Latin. The Roman Church was in its origin a Greek community, and it introduced the Greek word for Church into the Latin tongue; but this word was not *cyriacum*; it was *ecclesia*; and the same influence would no doubt have introduced the same word into the northern languages, had it introduced any word at all. (6.) Finally, it is hard to find examples of a Greek word being adopted into the Teutonic dialects, except through the medium of Latin. On the whole, this etymology must be abandoned. It is strange that Strabo should have imposed it on the world so long. It is difficult to say what is to be substituted. There was probably some word which, in the language from which the Teutonic and Slavonic are descended, designated the old heathen places of religious assembly, and this word, having taken different forms in different dialects, was adopted by the Christian missionaries. It was probably connected with the Latin *circus*, *circulus*, and with the Greek *κύκλος*, possibly also with the Welsh *cylch*, *oyl*, *cynchle*, or *caer*. Lipsius, who was the first to reject the received tradition, was probably right in his suggestion, "Credo et a circo Kirck nostrum esse, quia veterum templa instar Circi rotunda" (*Epist. ad Belgas*, Cent. iii. Ep. 44).

II. The word *ἐκκλησία* is no doubt derived from *ἐκκαλεῖν*, and in accordance with its derivation it originally meant an assembly called out by the magistrate, or by legitimate authority. This is the ordinary classical sense of the word. But it throws no light on the nature of the institution so designated in the New Testament. For to the writers of the N. T. the word had now lost its primary signification, and was either used generally for any meeting (Acts xix. 32), or more particularly, it denoted (1) the religious assemblies of the Jews (Deut. iv. 10, xviii. 16, *ap.* LXX.); (2) the whole assembly or congregation of the Israelitish people (Acts vii. 38; Heb. ii. 12; Ps. xxii. 22; Deut. xxxi. 30, *ap.* LXX.). It was in this last sense, in which it answered to *קהל יִשְׂרָאֵל*, that the word was adopted and applied by the writers of the N. T. to the Christian congregation. The word *ἐκκλησία*, therefore, does not carry us back further than the Jewish Church. It implies a resemblance and correspondence between the old Jewish Church and the recently established Christian Church, but nothing more. Its etymological sense having been already lost when adopted by and for Christians, is only misleading if pressed too far. The chief difference between the words "ecclesia" and "church," would probably consist in this, that "ecclesia" primarily signified the Christian body, and secondarily the place of assembly, while the first signification of "church" was the place of assembly, which imparted its name to the body of worshippers.

III. *The Church as described in the Gospels.*—The word occurs only twice. Each time in St. Matthew (Matt. xvi. 18, "On this rock will I build my Church;" xviii. 17, "Tell it unto the Church"). In every other case it is spoken of as the kingdom of heaven by St. Matthew, and as the kingdom of God by St. Mark and St. Luke. St. Mark, St. Luke, and St. John, never use the expression kingdom of heaven. St. John once uses the phrase kingdom of God (iii. 3). St. Matthew occasionally speaks of the kingdom of God (vi. 33, xii. 31, 43), and sometimes simply of the kingdom (iv.

23, xiii. 19, xxiv. 14). In xiii. 41 and xvi. 28, it is the Son of Man's kingdom. In xx. 21, thy kingdom, i. e. Christ's. In the one Gospel of St. Matthew the Church is spoken of no less than thirty-six times as the Kingdom. Other descriptions or titles are hardly found in the Evangelists. It is Christ's household (Matt. x. 25), the salt and light of the world (v. 13, 15), Christ's flock (Matt. xxvi. 31; John. x. 1), its members are the branches growing on Christ the Vine (John xv.): but the general description of it, not metaphorically but directly, is, that it is a kingdom. In Matt. xvi. 19, the kingdom of heaven is formally, as elsewhere virtually, identified with ἐκκλησία. From the Gospel then, we learn that Christ was about to establish His heavenly kingdom on earth, which was to be the substitute for the Jewish Church and kingdom, now doomed to destruction (Matt. xxi. 43). Some of the qualities of this kingdom are illustrated by the parables of the tares, the mustard seed, the leaven, the hid treasure, the pearl, the draw-net: the spiritual laws and principles by which it is to be governed, by the parables of the talents, the husbandmen, the wedding feast, and the ten virgins. It is not of this world though in it (John xviii. 36). It is to embrace all the nations of the earth (Matt. xxviii. 19). The means of entrance into it is Baptism (Matt. xxviii. 19). The conditions of belonging to it are faith (Mark xvi. 16) and obedience (Matt. xxviii. 20). Participation in the Holy Supper is its perpetual token of membership, and the means of supporting the life of its members (Matt. xxvi. 26; John vi. 51; 1 Cor. xi. 26). Its members are given to Christ by the Father out of the world, and sent by Christ into the world; they are sanctified by the truth (John xvii. 19); and they are to live in love and unity, cognizable by the external world (John xiii. 34, xvii. 23). It is to be established on the Rock of Christ's Divinity, as confessed by Peter, the representative (for the moment) of the Apostles (Matt. xvi. 18). It is to have authority in spiritual cases (Matt. xviii. 17). It is to be never deprived of Christ's presence and protection (xxviii. 20), and to be never overthrown by the power of hell (xviii. 19).

IV. *The Church as described in the Acts and in the Epistles—its Origin, Nature, Constitution, and Growth.*—From the Gospels we learn little in the way of detail as to the kingdom which was to be established. It was in the great forty days which intervened between the Resurrection and the Ascension that our Lord explained specifically to His Apostles "the things pertaining to the kingdom of God" (Acts i. 3), that is, his future Church.

*Its Origin.*—The removal of Christ from the earth had left his followers a shattered company with no bond of external or internal cohesion, except the memory of the Master whom they had lost, and the recollection of his injunctions to unity and love, together with the occasional glimpses of His presence which were vouchsafed them. They continued together, meeting for prayer and supplication, and waiting for Christ's promise of the gift of the Holy Ghost. They numbered in all some 140 persons, namely, the eleven, the faithful women, the Lord's mother, his brethren, and 120 disciples. They had faith to believe that there was a work before them which they were about to be called to perform; and that they might be ready to do it, they filled up the number of the Twelve by the appointment of Matthias "to be a true witness" with the eleven "of the Resurrection." The Day of Pentecost is the birth-day of the Christian Church. The Spirit,

who was then sent by the Son from the Father, and rested on each of the Disciples, combined them once more into a whole—combined them as they never had before been combined, by an internal and spiritual bond of cohesion. Before they had been individual followers of Jesus, now they became his mystical body, animated by His Spirit. The nucleus was formed. Agglomeration and development would do the rest.

*Its Nature.*—St. Luke explains its nature by describing in narrative form the characteristics of the society formed by the union of the original 140 Disciples with the 3000 souls who were converted on the Day of Pentecost. "Then they that gladly received his word were baptized... and they continued stedfastly in the Apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread and in prayers" (Acts ii. 41). Here we have indirectly exhibited the essential conditions of Church Communion. They are (1) Baptism, Baptism implying on the part of the recipient repentance and faith; (2) Apostolic Doctrine; (3) Fellowship with the Apostles; (4) the Lord's Supper; (5) Public Worship. Every requisite for church-membership is here enumerated not only for the Apostolic days, but for future ages. The conditions are exclusive as well as inclusive, negative as well as positive. St. Luke's definition of the Church, then, would be the congregation of the baptized, in which the faith of the Apostles is maintained, connexion with the Apostles is preserved, the Sacraments are duly administered, and public worship is kept up. The earliest definition (virtually) given of the Church is likewise the best. To this body St. Luke applies the name of "The Church" (the first time that the word is used as denoting an existing thing) and to it, constituted as it was, he states that there were daily added οἱ σωζόμενοι (ii. 47). By this expression he probably means those who were "saving themselves from their untoward generation" (ii. 40), "added," however, "to the Church" not by their own mere volition, but "by the Lord," and so become the elect people of God, sanctified by His Spirit, and described by St. Paul as "delivered from the power of darkness and translated into the kingdom of His dear Son" (Col. i. 13). St. Luke's treatise being historical, not dogmatical, he does not directly enter further into the essential nature of the Church. The community of goods, which he describes as being universal amongst the members of the infant society (ii. 44, iv. 32), is specially declared to be a voluntary practice (v. 4), not a necessary duty of Christians as such (comp. Acts ix. 36, 39, xi. 29).

From the illustrations adopted by St. Paul in his Epistles, we have additional light thrown upon the nature of the Church. Thus (Rom. xi. 17), the Christian Church is described as being a branch grafted on the already existing olive-tree, showing that it was no new creation, but a development of that spiritual life which had flourished in the Patriarchal and in the Jewish Church. It is described (Rom. xii. 4; 1 Cor. xii. 12) as one body made up of many members with different offices, to exhibit the close cohesion which ought to exist between Christian and Christian; still more it is described as the body, of which Christ is the Head (Eph. i. 22), so that members of His Church are members of Christ's body, of His flesh, of His bones (Eph. v. 23, 30; Col. i. 18, ii. 19), to show the close union between Christ and His people. Again, as the temple of God built upon the foundation

stone of Jesus Christ (1 Cor. iii. 11), and, by a slight change of metaphor, as the temple in which God dwells by His Spirit, the Apostles and prophets forming the foundation, and Jesus Christ the chief corner-stone, *i. e.* probably the foundation corner-stone (Eph. ii. 22). It is also the city of the saints and the household of God (Eph. ii. 19). But the passage which is most illustrative of our subject in the Epistles is Eph. iv. 3, 6. "Endeavouring to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace. There is one body and one Spirit even as ye are called in one hope of your calling; one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God, and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all." Here we see what it is that constitutes the unity of the Church in the mind of the Apostle: (1) unity of Headship, "one Lord;" (2) unity of belief, "one faith;" (3) unity of Sacraments, "one baptism;" (4) unity of hope of eternal life, "one hope of your calling" (comp. Tit. i. 2); (5) unity of love, "unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace;" (6) unity of organisation, "one body." The Church, then, at this period was a body of baptized men and women who believed in Jesus as the Christ, and in the revelation made by Him, who were united by having the same faith, hope, and animating Spirit of love, the same Sacraments, and the same spiritual invisible Head.

What was the Constitution of this body?—On the evening of the Day of Pentecost, the 3140 members of which it consisted were (1) Apostles, (2) previous Disciples, (3) converts. We never afterwards find any distinction drawn between the previous disciples and the later converts; but the Apostles throughout stand apart. Here, then, we find two classes, Apostles and converts—Teachers and taught. At this time the Church was not only morally but actually one congregation. Soon, however, its numbers grew so considerably that it was a physical impossibility that all its members should come together in one spot. It became, therefore, an aggregate of congregations. But its essential unity was not affected by the accidental necessity of meeting in separate rooms for public worship; the bond of cohesion was still the same. The Apostles, who had been closest to the Lord Jesus in his life on earth would doubtless have formed the centres of the several congregations of listening believers, and besides attending at the Temple for the national Jewish prayer (Acts iii. 1), and for the purpose of preaching Christ (ii. 42), they would have gone round to "every house" where their converts assembled "teaching and preaching," and "breaking bread," and "distributing" the common goods "as each had need" (ii. 46, iv. 35, v. 42). Thus the Church continued for apparently some seven years, but at the end of that time "the number of disciples was" so greatly "multiplied" (Acts vi. 1) that the Twelve Apostles found themselves to be too few to carry out these works unaided. They thereupon for the first time exercised the powers of mission intrusted to them (John xx. 21), and by laying their hands on the Seven who were recommended to them by the general body of Christians, they appointed them to fulfil the secular task of distributing the common stock, which they had themselves hitherto performed, retaining the functions of praying, and preaching, and administering the sacraments in their own hands. It is a question which cannot be certainly answered whether the office of these Seven is to be identified with that of the *διάκονοι* elsewhere

found. They are not called deacons in Scripture, and it has been supposed by some that they were extraordinary officers appointed for the occasion to see that the Hellenistic widows had their fair share of the goods distributed amongst the poor believers, and that they had no successors in their office. If this be so, we have no account given us of the institution of the Diaconate: the Deacons, like the Presbyters, are found existing, but the circumstances under which they were brought into existence are not related. We incline, however, to the other hypothesis which makes the Seven the originals of the Deacons. Being found apt to teach, they were likewise invested, almost immediately after their appointment, with the power of preaching to the unconverted (vi. 10) and of baptizing (viii. 38). From this time therefore, or from about this time, there existed in the Church—(1) the Apostles; (2) the Deacons and Evangelists; (3) the multitude of the faithful. We hear of no other Church-officer till the year 44, seven years after the appointment of the deacons. We find that there were then in the Church of Jerusalem officers named Presbyters (xi. 30) who were the assistants of James, the chief administrator of that Church (xii. 17). The circumstances of their first appointment are not recounted. No doubt they were similar to those under which the Deacons were appointed. As in the year 37 the Apostles found that the whole work of the ministry was too great for them, and they therefore placed a portion of it, *viz.* distributing alms to the brethren and preaching Christ to the heathen, on the deacons, so a few years later they would have found that what they still retained was yet growing too burdensome, and consequently they devolved another portion of their ministerial authority on another order of men. The name of Presbyter or Elder implies that the men selected were of mature age. We gather incidentally that they were ordained by Apostolic or other authority (xiv. 23, Tit. i. 5). We find them associated with the Apostles as distinguished from the main body of the Church (Acts xv. 2, 4), and again as standing between the Apostles and the brethren (xv. 23). Their office was to pasture the Church of God (xx. 28), to rule (1 Tim. v. 17) the flocks over which the Holy Ghost had made them overseers or bishops (Acts xx. 28, Phil. i. 1; 1 Tim. iii. 1, 2; Tit. i. 7), and to pray with and for the members of their congregations (Jam. v. 14). Thus the Apostles would seem to have invested these Presbyters with the full powers which they themselves exercised, excepting only in respect to those functions which they discharged in relation to the general regimen of the whole Church as distinct from the several congregations which formed the whole body. These functions they still reserved to themselves. By the year 44, therefore, there were in the Church of Jerusalem—(1) the Apostles holding the government of the whole body in their own hands; (2) Presbyters invested by the Apostles with authority for conducting public worship in each congregation; (3) Deacons or Evangelists similarly invested with the lesser power of preaching and of baptizing unbelievers, and of distributing the common goods among the brethren. The same order was established in the Gentile Churches founded by St. Paul, the only difference being that those who were called Presbyters in Jerusalem bore indifferently the name of Bishops (Phil. i. 1; 1 Tim. iii. 1, 2; Tit. i. 7) or of Presbyters (1 Tim. v. 17; Tit. i. 5) elsewhere.

It was in the Church of Jerusalem that another

order of the ministry found its exemplar. The Apostles, we find, remained in Jerusalem (Acts viii. 1) or in the neighbourhood (viii. 14) till the persecution of Herod Agrippa in the year 44. The death of James the son of Zebedee, and the imprisonment and flight of Peter, were the signal for the dispersion of the Apostles. One remained behind—James the brother of the Lord, whom we identify with the Apostle, James the son of Alphaeus [JAMES]. He had not the same cause of dread as the rest. His Judaical asceticism and general character would have made him an object of popularity with his countrymen, and even with the Pharisaical Herod. He remained unmolested, and from this time he is the acknowledged head of the Church of Jerusalem. A consideration of Acts xii. 17; xv. 13, 19; Gal. ii. 2, 9, 12; Acts xxi. 18, will remove all doubt on this head. Indeed, four years before Herod's persecution he had stood, it would seem, on a level with Peter (Gal. i. 18, 19; Acts ix. 27), and it has been thought that he received special instructions for the functions which he had to fulfil from the Lord Himself (1 Cor. xv. 7; Acts i. 3). Whatever his pre-eminence was, he appears to have borne no special title indicating it. The example of the Mother Church of Jerusalem was again followed by the Pauline Churches. Timothy and Titus had probably no distinctive title, but it is impossible to read the Epistles addressed to them without seeing that they had an authority superior to that of the ordinary bishops or priests with regard to whose conduct and ordination St. Paul gives them instruction (1 Tim. iii.; v. 17, 19; Tit. i. 5). Thus, then, we see that where the Apostles were themselves able to superintend the Churches that they had founded, the Church-officers consisted of—(1) Apostles; (2) Bishops or Priests; (3) Deacons and Evangelists. When the Apostles were unable to give personal superintendence, they delegated that power which they had in common to one of themselves, as in Jerusalem, or to one in whom they had confidence, as at Ephesus and in Crete. As the Apostles died off, these Apostolic Delegates necessarily multiplied. By the end of the first century, when St. John was the only Apostle that now survived, they would have been established in every country, as Crete, and in every large town where there were several bishops or priests, such as the seven towns of Asia mentioned in the Book of Revelation. These superintendents appear to be addressed by St. John under the name of Angels. With St. John's death the Apostolic College was extinguished, and the Apostolic Delegates or Angels were left to fill their places in the government of the Church, not with the full unrestricted power of the Apostles, but with authority only to be exercised in limited districts. In the next century we find that these officers bore the name of Bishops, while those who in the first century were called indifferently Presbyters or Bishops had now only the title of Presbyters. We conclude, therefore, that the title bishop was gradually dropped by the second order of the ministry, and applied specifically to those who represented what James, Timothy, and Titus had been in the Apostolic age. Theodoret says expressly, "The same persons were anciently called promiscuously both bishops and presbyters, whilst those who are now called bishops were called apostles, but shortly after, the name of apostle was appropriated to such as were apostles indeed, and then the name bishop was given to those before called apostles" (*Com. in I. Tim. iii. 1*).

There are other names found in the Acts and in the Epistles which the light thrown backward by early ecclesiastical history shows us to have been the titles of those who exercised functions which were not destined to continue in the Church, but only belonging to it while it was being brought into being by help of miraculous agency. Such are prophets (Acts xiii. 1; Rom. xii. 6; 1 Cor. xii. 28; Eph. iv. 11), whose function was to proclaim and expound the Christian revelation, and to interpret God's will, especially as veiled in the Old Testament; teachers (Acts xiii. 1; Rom. xii. 7; 1 Cor. xii. 28; Eph. iv. 11) and pastors (Eph. iv. 11) whose special work was to instruct those already admitted into the fold, as contrasted with the evangelists (*ibid.*) who had primarily to instruct the heathen. Prophecy is one of the *extraordinary* *χαρίσματα* which were vouchsafed, and is to be classed with the gifts of healing, of speaking ecstatically with tongues, of interpretation of tongues, *i. e.* explanation of those ecstatic utterances, and discernment of spirits, *i. e.* a power of distinguishing between the real and supposed possessors of spiritual gifts (1 Cor. xii.). Teaching (*χάρισμα διδασκαλίας*, Rom. xii. 6; 1 Cor. xii. 28) is one of the *ordinary* gifts, and is to be classed with the word of wisdom and the word of knowledge (1 Cor. xii. 8), perhaps with "faith" (*ib.* 9), with the gift of government (*χάρισμα κυβερνήσεως*, *ib.* 28), and with the gift of ministration (*χάρισμα διακονίας* or *ἀντιλήψεως*, Rom. xii. 6; 1 Cor. xii. 28). These *χαρίσματα*, whether extraordinary or ordinary, were "divided to every man as the Spirit willed," according to the individual character of each, and not officially. Those to whom the gifts of prophecy, teaching, and government were vouchsafed were doubtless selected for the office of Presbyter, those who had the gift of ministration for the office of Deacon. In the Apostles they all alike resided.

*Its external Growth.*—The 3000 souls that were added to the Apostles and to the 120 brethren on the day of Pentecost were increased daily by new converts (Acts ii. 47, v. 14). These converts were without exception Jews residing in Jerusalem, whether speaking Greek or Hebrew (vi. 1). After seven or eight years a step was made outwards. The persecution which followed the martyrdom of Stephen drove away the adherents of the new doctrines, with the exception of the Apostles, and "they that were scattered abroad went everywhere preaching the word" to the Jews of the Dispersion. Philip, in his capacity of Evangelist, preached Christ to the Samaritans, and admitted them into the Church by baptism. In Philistia he made the first Gentile convert, but this act did not raise the question of the admission of the Gentiles, because the Ethiopian eunuch was already a proselyte (viii. 27), and probably a proselyte of Righteousness. Cornelius was a proselyte of the Gate (x. 2). The first purely Gentile convert that we hear of by name is Sergius Paulus (xiii. 7), but we are told that Cornelius' companions were Gentiles, and by their baptism the admission of the Gentiles was decided by the agency of St. Peter, approved by the Apostles and Jewish Church (xi. 18), not, as might have been expected, by the agency of St. Paul. This great event took place after the peace caused by Caligula's persecution of the Jews, which occurred A.D. 40 (ix. 31), and more than a year before the famine, in the time of Claudius, A.D. 44 (xi. 26, 29). Galilee had already been evangelized as well

as Judæa and Samaria, though the special agent in the work is not declared (ix. 31).

The history of the growth of the Gentile Church, so far as we know it, is identical with the history of St. Paul. In his three journeys he carried Christianity through the chief cities of Asia Minor and Greece. His method appears almost invariably to have been this: he presented himself on the Sabbath at the Jewish synagogue, and having first preached the doctrine of a suffering Messiah, he next identified Jesus with the Messiah (xvii. 3). His arguments on the first head were listened to with patience by all, those on the second point wrought conviction in some (xvii. 4), but roused the rest to persecute him (xvii. 5). On finding his words rejected by the Jews he turned from them to the Gentiles (xviii. 6, xxviii. 28). His captivity in Rome, A.D. 63-65, had the effect of forming a Church out of the Jewish and Greek residents in the imperial city, who seem to have been joined by a few Italians. His last journey may have spread the Gospel westward as far as Spain (Rom. xv. 28; Clemens, Eusebius, Jerome, Chrysostom). The death of James at Jerusalem and of Peter and Paul at Rome, A. D. 67, leaves one only of the Apostles presented distinctly to our view. In the year 70 Jerusalem was captured, and before St. John fell asleep, in 98, the Petrine and Pauline converts, the Churches of the circumcision and of the uncircumcision, had melted into one harmonious and accordant body, spreading in scattered congregations at the least from Babylon to Spain, and from Macedonia to Africa. How far Christian doctrine may have penetrated beyond these limits we do not know.

*Its further Growth.*—As this is not an ecclesiastical history, we can but glance at it. There were three great impulses which enlarged the borders of the Church. The first is that which began on the day of Pentecost, and continued down to the conversion of Constantine. By this the Roman Empire was converted to Christ, and the Church was, speaking roughly, made conterminous with the civilized world. The second impulse gathered within her borders the hitherto barbarous nations formed by the Teutonic and Celtic tribes, thus winning, or in spite of the overthrow of the Empire, retaining the countries of France, Scotland, Ireland, England, Lombardy, Germany, Denmark, Sweden, Norway. The third impulse gathered in the Slavonian nations. The first of these impulses lasted to the fourth century—the second to the ninth century—the third (beginning before the second had ceased) to the tenth and eleventh centuries. We do not reckon the Nestorian missionary efforts in the seventh century in Syria, Persia, India, and China, nor the post-Reformation exertions of the Jesuits in the East and West Indies, for these attempts have produced no permanent results. Nor again do we speak of the efforts now being made in Africa, India, Australia, New Zealand, because it has not yet been proved, except perhaps in the case of New Zealand, whether they will be successful in bringing these countries within the fold of Christ.

*V. Alterations in its Constitution.*—We have said that ecclesiastical authority resided (1) in the Apostles; (2) in the Apostles and the Deacons; (3) in the Apostles, the Presbyters, and the

Deacons; (4) in the Apostolic Delegates, the Presbyters, and the Deacons; (5) in those who succeeded the Apostolic Delegates, the Presbyters, and the Deacons. And to these successors of the Apostolic Delegates came to be appropriated the title of Bishop, which was originally applied to Presbyters. At the commencement of the second century and thenceforward Bishops, Presbyters, and Deacons are the officers of the Church wherever the Church existed. Ignatius' Epistles (in their unadulterated form) and the other records which are preserved to us are on this point decisive. (See Pearson's *Vindiciae Ignatianae*, part ii. c. xiii. p. 534, ed. Churton.) Bishops were looked on as Christ's Vicegerents (Cyprian, *Ep.* 55 (or 59) with Rigaltius' notes), and as having succeeded to the Apostles (Id. *Ep.* 69 (or 66) and 42 (or 45) Firmilian, Jerome), every bishop's see being entitled a "sedes apostolica." They retained in their own hands authority over presbyters and the function of ordination, but with respect to each other they were equals whether their see was "at Rome or at Eugubium."

Within this equal college of bishops there soon arose difference of rank though not of order. Below the city-bishops there sprang up a class of country-bishops (chorepiscopi) answering to the archdeacons of the English Church, except that they had received episcopal consecration (Hammond, Beveridge, Cave, Bingham), and were enabled to perform some episcopal acts with the sanction of the city-bishops. Their position was ambiguous, and in the fifth century they began to decay and gradually died out. Above the city-bishops there were, in the second century apparently, Metropolitans, and in the third, Patriarchs or Exarchs. The metropolitan was the chief bishop in the civil division of the empire which was called a province (*ἐπαρχία*). His see was at the metropolis of the province, and he presided over his suffragans with authority similar to, but greater than, that which is exercised in their respective provinces by the two archbishops in England. The authority of the patriarch or exarch extended over the still larger division of the civil empire which was called a diocese. The ecclesiastical was framed in accordance with the exigencies and after the model of the civil polity. When Constantine, therefore, divided the empire into 13 dioceses, "each of which equalled the just measure of a powerful kingdom" (Gibbon, c. xviii.), the Church came to be distributed into 13 (including the city and neighbourhood of Rome, 14) diocesan, or, as we should say, national churches. There was no external bond of government to hold these churches together. They were independent self-ruled wholes, combined together into one greater whole by having one invisible Head and one animating Spirit, by maintaining each the same faith and exercising each the same discipline. The only authority which they recognised as capable of controlling their separate action, was that of an Oecumenical Council composed of delegates from each; and these Councils passed canon after canon forbidding the interference of the bishop of any one diocese, that is, district, or country, with the bishop of any other diocese. "Bishops outside a 'diocese' are not to invade the Churches across the borders, nor bring confusion into the Churches," says the second canon of the Council of Constan-

\* An attempt was made to resuscitate this class in England, under the title of suffragan bishops, by the still unrepealed 26th Henry VIII c. 14. by which twenty-six

towns were named as the seats of bishops, who were to act under the bishops of the diocese in which they were situated.

tinople, "lest," says the eighth canon of the Council of Ephesus, "the pride of worldly power be introduced under cover of the priestly function, and by little and little we be deprived of the liberty which our Lord Jesus Christ, the deliverer of all men, has given us by his own blood." But there was a stronger power at work than any which could be controlled by canons. Rome and Constantinople were each the seats of imperial power, and symptoms soon began to appear that the patriarchs of the imperial cities were rival claimants of imperial power in the Church. Rome was in a better position for the struggle than Constantinople, for, besides having the prestige of being *Old Rome*, she was also of Apostolic foundation. Constantinople could not boast an Apostle as her founder, and she was but *New Rome*. Still the imperial power was strong in the East when it had fallen in the West, and furthermore the Council of Chalcedon had so far dispensed with the canons and with precedent in respect to Constantinople as to grant the patriarch jurisdiction over three dioceses, to establish a right of appeal to Constantinople from any part of the Church, and to confirm the decree of the second Council, which elevated the see of Constantinople above that of Alexandria and of Antioch. It was by the Pope of Constantinople that the first overt attempt at erecting a Papal Monarchy was made; and by the Pope of Rome, in consequence, it was fiercely and indignantly denounced. John of Constantinople, said Gregory the Great, was destroying the patriarchal system of government (lib. v. 43; ix. 68); by assuming the profane appellation of Universal Bishop he was anticipating Antichrist (lib. vii. 27, 33), invading the rights of Christ, and imitating the devil (lib. v. 18). John of Constantinople failed. The successors of Gregory adopted as their own the claims which John had not been able to assert, and on the basis of the False Decretals of Isidore, and of Gratian's Decretum, Nicholas I., Gregory VII., and Innocent III. reared the structure of the Roman in place of the Constantinopolitan Papal Monarchy. From this time the federal character of the constitution of the Church was overthrown. In the West it became wholly despotic, and in the East, though the theory of aristocratical government was and is maintained, the still-cherished title of Oecumenical Patriarch indicates that it is weakness which has prevented Constantinople from erecting at least an Eastern if she could not an Universal Monarchy. In the sixteenth century a further change of constitution occurred. A great part of Europe revolted from the Western despotism. The Churches of England and Sweden returned to, or rather retained, the episcopal form of government after the model of the first centuries. In parts of Germany, of France, of Switzerland, and of Great Britain a Presbyterian, or still less defined, form was adopted, while Rome tightened her hold on her yet remaining subjects, and by destroying all peculiarities of national liturgy and custom, and by depressing the order of bishops except as interpreters of her decrees, converted that part of the Church over which she had sway into a jealous centralized absolutism.

VI. *The existing Church.*—Its members fall into three broadly-marked groups, the Greek Churches, the Latin Churches, the Teutonic Churches. The orthodox Greek Church consists of the Patriarchate

<sup>b</sup> See Canons v., vi. of Nicaea; ii., iii., vi. of Constantinople; i., viii., of Ephesus; ix., xvii., xxvii., xxx., of Chalcedon.

of Constantinople with 135 sees, of Alexandria with 4 sees, of Antioch with 16 sees, of Jerusalem with 13 sees, of the Russian Church with 65 sees; besides which, there are in Cyprus 4 sees, in Austria 11 sees, in Mount Sinai 1 see, in Montenegro 1 see, in Greece 24 sees. To these must be added—(1.) the Nestorian or Chaldaean Church, once spread from China to the Tigris, and from Lake Baikal to Cape Comorin, and ruled by twenty-five Metropolitans and a Patriarch possessing a plenitude of power equal to that of Innocent III. (Neale, *Eastern Church*, i. 143), but now shrunk to 16 sees. (2.) The Christians of St. Thomas under the Bishop of Malabar. (3.) The Syrian Jacobites under the Patriarch of Antioch resident at Caramit or Diarbekir. (4.) The Maronites with 9 sees. (5.) The Copts with 15 sees. (6.) The savage, but yet Christian Abyssinians, and (7.) the Armenians, the most intelligent and active minded, but at the same time the most distracted body of Eastern believers.

The Latin Churches are those of Italy with 262 sees, of Spain with 54, of France with 81, of Portugal with 17, of Belgium and Holland with 11, of Austria with 64, of Germany with 24, of Switzerland with 5. Besides these, the authority of the Roman See is acknowledged by 63 Asiatic bishops, 10 African, 136 American, 43 British, and 36 Prelates scattered through the countries where the Church of Greece is predominant.

The Teutonic Churches consist of the Anglican communion with 48 sees in Europe, 51 in Canada, America, and the West Indies, 8 in Asia, 8 in Africa, and 15 in Australia and Oceanica; of the Church of Norway and Sweden, with 17 sees; of the Churches of Denmark, Prussia, Holland, Scotland, and scattered congregations elsewhere. The members of the Greek Churches are supposed to number 80,000,000, of the Teutonic and Protestant Churches 90,000,000, of the Latin Churches 170,000,000, making a total of 25 per cent. of the population of the globe.

VII. *Definitions of the Church.*—The Greek Church gives the following: "The Church is a divinely instituted community of men, united by the orthodox faith, the law of God, the hierarchy, and the Sacraments" (*Full Catechism of the Orthodox, Catholic, Eastern Church*, Moscow, 1839). The Latin Church defines it "the company of Christians knit together by the profession of the same faith and the communion of the same sacraments, under the government of lawful pastors, and especially of the Roman bishop as the only Vicar of Christ upon earth" (Bellarm. *De Eccl. Mil.* iii. 2; see also *Devoti Inst. Canon.* 1, §iv. Romae, 1818). The Church of England, "a congregation of faithful men in which the pure word of God is preached, and the Sacraments be duly ministered according to Christ's ordinance in all those things that of necessity are requisite to the same" (Art. xix.). The Lutheran Church, "a congregation of saints in which the Gospel is rightly taught and the sacraments rightly administered" (*Confessio Augustana*, 1631, Art. vii.). The *Confessio Helvetica*, "a congregation of faithful men called, or collected out of the world, the communion of all saints" (Art. xvii.). The *Confessio Saxonica*, "a congregation of men embracing the Gospel of Christ, and rightly using the Sacraments" (Art. xii.). The *Confessio Belgica*, "a true congregation, or assembly of all faithful Christians who look for the whole of their salvation from Jesus Christ alone, as being washed by His blood, and sanctified and sealed by His Spirit" (Art. xxvii.).

These definitions show the difficulty in which the different sections of the divided Church find themselves in framing a definition which will at once accord with the statements of Holy Scripture, and be applicable to the present state of the Christian world. We have seen that according to the Scriptural view the Church is a holy kingdom, established by God on earth, of which Christ is the invisible King—it is a divinely organized body, the members of which are knit together amongst themselves, and joined to Christ their Head, by the Holy Spirit, who dwells in and animates it; it is a spiritual but visible society of men united by constant succession to those who were personally united to the Apostles, holding the same faith that the Apostles held, administering the same sacraments, and like them forming separate, but only locally separate, assemblies, for the public worship of God. This is the Church according to the Divine intention. But as God permits men to mar the perfection of His designs in their behalf, and as men have both corrupted the doctrines and broken the unity of the Church, we must not expect to see the Church of Holy Scripture actually existing in its perfection on earth. It is not to be found, thus perfect, either in the collected fragments of Christendom, or still less in any one of these fragments; though it is possible that one of those fragments more than another may approach the Scriptural and Apostolic ideal which existed only until sin, heresy, and schism, had time sufficiently to develop themselves to do their work. It has been questioned by some whether Hooker, in his anxious desire after charity and liberality, has not founded his definition of the Church upon too wide a basis; but it is certain that he has pointed out the true principle on which the definition must be framed (*Eccl. Pol.* v. 68, 6). As in defining a man, he says, we pass by those qualities wherein one man excels another, and take only those essential properties whereby a man differs from creatures of other kinds, so in defining the Church, which is a technical name for the professors of the Christian religion, we must fix our attention solely on that which makes the Christian religion differ from the religions which are not Christian. This difference is constituted by the Christian religion having Jesus Christ, his revelation, and his precepts for the object of its contemplations and the motive of its actions. The Church, therefore, consists of all who acknowledge the Lord Jesus Christ the blessed Saviour of mankind, who give credit to His Gospel, and who hold His sacraments, the seals of eternal life, in honour. To go further, would be not to define the Church by that which makes it to be what it is, *i. e.* to declare the *being* of the Church, but to define it by accidents, which may conduce to its *well being*, but do not touch its innermost nature. From this view of the Church the important consequence follows, that all the baptized belong to the visible Church, whatever be their divisions, crimes, misbeliefs, provided only they are not plain apostates, and directly deny and utterly reject the Christian faith, as far as the same is professedly different from infidelity. “Heretics as touching those points of doctrine in which they fail; schismatics as touching the quarrels for which or the duties in which they divide themselves from their brethren; loose, licentious, and wicked persons, as touching their several offences or crimes, have all forsaken the true Church of God—the Church which is sound and sincere in the doctrine which they corrupt, the Church that keepeth the bond of unity which they violate, the

Church that walketh in the laws of righteousness which they transgress, this very true Church of Christ they have left—howbeit, not altogether left nor forsaken simply the Church, upon the foundation of which they continue built notwithstanding these breaches whereby they are *rent at the top asunder*” (v. 68, 7).

VIII. *The Faith, Attributes, and Notes of the Church.*—The Nicene Creed is the especial and authoritative exponent of the Church’s faith, having been adopted as such by the Oecumenical Councils of Nicaea and Constantinople, and ever afterwards regarded as the sacred summary of Christian doctrine. We have the Western form of the same Creed in that which is called the Creed of the Apostles—a name probably derived from its having been the local Creed of Rome, which was the chief Apostolic see of the West. An expansion of the same Creed, made in order to meet the Arian errors, is found in the Creed of St. Athanasius. The Confessions of Faith of the Synod of Bethlehem (A.D. 1672), of the Council of Trent (commonly known as Pope Pius’ Creed, A.D. 1564), of the Synod of London (A.D. 1562), of Augsburg, Switzerland, Saxony, &c., stand on a lower level, as binding on the members of certain portions of the Church, but not being the Church’s Creeds. The *attributes* of the Church are drawn from the expressions of the Creeds. The Church is described as One, Holy, Catholic, Apostolic. Its Unity consists in having one object of worship (Eph. iv. 6), one Head (Eph. iv. 15), one body (Rom. xii. 5), one Spirit (Eph. iv. 4), one faith (ib. 13), hope (ib. 12), love (1 Cor. xiii. 13), the same sacraments (ib. x. 17), discipline and worship (Acts ii. 42). Its Holiness depends on its Head and Spirit, the means of grace which it offers, and the holiness that it demands of its members (Eph. iv. 24). Its Catholicity consists in its being composed of many national Churches, not confined as the Jewish Church to one country (Mark xvi. 15); in its enduring to the end of time (Matt. xxviii. 20); in its teaching the whole truth, and having at its disposal all the means of grace vouchsafed to man. Its Apostolicity in being built on the foundation of the Apostles (Eph. ii. 20), and continuing in their doctrine and fellowship (Acts ii. 42). The *notes* of the Church are given by Bellarmine and theologians of his school, as being the title “Catholic,” antiquity, succession, extent, papal succession, primitive doctrine, unity, sanctity, efficacy of doctrine, holiness of its authors, miracles, prophecy, confession of foes, unhappy end of opponents, temporal good-fortune (Bellarm. *Contr.* tom. ii. lib. iv. p. 1293, Ingoldst. 1580): by Dean Field as (1) the complete profession of the Christian faith; (2) the use of certain appointed ceremonies and sacraments; (3) the union of men in their profession and in the use of these sacraments under lawful pastors (*Of the Church*, bk. ii. c. ii. p. 65). It is evident that the notes by which the Church is supposed to be distinguished must differ according to the definition of the Church accepted by the theologian who assigns them, because the true notes of a thing must necessarily be the essential properties of that thing. But each theologian is likely to assume those particulars in which he believes his own branch or part of the Church to excel others as the notes of the Church Universal.

IX. *Distinctions.*—“For lack of diligent observing the differences first between the Church of God mystical and visible, then between the visible sound and corrupted, sometimes more sometimes less, the oversights are neither few nor light that

have been committed" (Hooker, *Eccles. Pol.* iii. 1, 9). The word Church is employed to designate (1) the place in which Christians assemble to worship (possibly 1 Cor. xiv. 19); (2) a household of Christians (Col. iv. 15); (3) a congregation of Christians assembling from time to time for worship, but generally living apart from each other (Rom. xvi. 1); (4) a body of Christians living in one city assembling for worship in different congregations and at different times (1 Cor. i. 1); (5) a body of Christians residing in a district or country (1 Cor. xiii.); (6) the whole visible Church, including sound and unsound members, that is, all the baptised professors of Christianity, orthodox, heretical, and schismatical, moral or immoral; (7) the visible Church exclusive of the manifestly unsound members, that is, consisting of those who appear to be orthodox and pious; (8) the mystical or invisible Church, that is, the body of the elect known to God alone who are in very deed justified and sanctified, and never to be plucked out of their Saviour's hands, composed of the Church Triumphant and of some members of the Church Militant (John x. 28; Heb. xii. 22); (9) the Church Militant, that is, the Church in its warfare on earth—identical therefore with the Church visible; (10) the Church Triumphant, consisting of those who have passed from this world, expectant of glory now in Paradise, and to be glorified hereafter in heaven. The word may be fairly used in any of these senses, but it is plain that if it is employed by controversialists without a clear understanding in which sense it is used, inextricable confusion must arise. And such in fact has been the case.

X. *Literature.*—On the *Nature* of the Church the following books may be consulted:—Cyprian, *De Unitate Ecclesiae*, Op. p. 75, Amst. 1700. Vincentius Lininensis, *Commonitorium*, Vien. 1809; in English, Oxf. 1841. Cranmer, *Works*, i. 376, ii. 11, Cambr. 1843. Ridley, *Conference with Latimer*, p. 122, Cambr. 1843. Hooper, *Works*, ii. 41, Cambr. 1852. Becon, *Works*, i. 293, ii. 41, Cambr. 1843. Hooker, *Eccles. Polity*, iii. 1, v. 68, §6 and 78, Oxf. 1865. Belharminé, *De Conciliis et Ecclesia Disputat.* i. 1084, Ingolds. 1580. Andrewes, *Works*, viii. Oxf. 1854. Field, *Of the Church*, Cambr. 1847. Laud, *Conference with Fisher*, Oxf. 1849. Jeremy Taylor, *Works*, v. Lond. 1849. Bramhall, *Works*, i. ii. iii. Oxf. 1842. Thorndike, *Works*, i.-vi. Oxf. 1844. Beveridge, *On Art. XIX.*, *Works*, vii. 357, and *De Metropolitanis*, xii. 38, Oxf. 1848. Hammond, *Works*, ii. Oxf. 1849. Pearson, *Exposition of the Creed, Art. IX.* Oxf. 1833. Bingham, *Antiquities of the Christian Church*, Lond. 1856; and in Latin, Halae, 1751. De Marca, *De Concordia Sacerdotii et Imperii*, Paris, 1663. Thomassini, *Vetus et Nova Ecclesiae Disciplina*, Lucae, 1728. Palmer, *Treatise on the Church*, Lond. 1842. Gladstone, *The State in its relations with the Church*, Lond. 1839; *Church Principles considered in their results*, Lond. 1840. Wordsworth, *Theophilus Anglicanus*, Lond. 1857, and in French, 1861. Harold Browne, *Exposition of the XXXIX. Articles, On Art. XIX.* Lond. 1862. Bates, *Lectures on Christian Antiquities*, Lond. 1845. Hook, *Church Dictionary*, Lond. 1852. Coxe, *Calendar of the Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church*, New York, 1863.

On the *History* of the Catholic Church. Eusebius, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, Oxon. 1838, and (together with his continuators, Socrates, Sozomen,

Theodoret, Evagrius, Philostorgius, and Theodorus Lector) Cantab. 1720. Mansi, *Conciliarum Collectio*, Florence, 1759; *Centuriae Magdeburgenses*, Basil, 1559. Baronius, *Annales Ecclesiastici*, Lucae, 1738. Gibbon, *Roman Empire*, c. xv. Fleury, *Histoire Ecclésiastique*, Brux. 1713. Tillemont, *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire ecclésiastique des six premiers siècles*, Paris, 1701. Mosheim, *Inst. Histor. Ecclesiast.* Helmst. 1755, and in revised translation by Stubbs, Lond. 1863. Neander, *Allgem. Geschichte der Christl. Relig. u. Kirche*, Hamb. 1825; and in T. T. Clark's translation, Edinb. 1854. Döllinger, *Geschichte der Christl. Kirche*, 1833, and in Cox's translation, Lond. 1840. Gieseler, *Compendium of Ecclesiastical History*; Kurtz, *History of the Christian Church*; Baumgarten, *Apostolic History*, all in T. T. Clark's series, Edinb. 1854-1860. Cave, *Lives of the Fathers*, Oxf. 1840; and *Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Historia Literaria*, Oxf. 1740; D'Aubigné, *History of the Reformation*, London, 1838. Bates, *Lectures on Ecclesiastical History*, Lond. 1852. Blunt, *Church in the Three first Centuries*, Lond. 1856. Hardwick, *History of the Christian Church*, Cambr. 1853-1856. Robertson, *History of the Christian Church*, Lond. 1854. Bright, *History of the Church*, Oxf. 1860. De Pressensé, *Histoire Ecclésiastique*, Paris, 1858.

On the *History* of the Eastern Church.—Le Quien, *Oriens Christianus*, Paris, 1732. Assemani, *Bibliotheca Orientalis*, Rome, 1765. Renaudot, *Liturgiarum Orientalium Collectio*, Paris, 1720. Mouravieff, *Church of Russia*, Oxf. 1842. Neale, *Holy Eastern Church*, Lond. 1847, and 1850. Badger, *The Nestorians and their Ritual*, Lond. 1852. Palmer, *Dissertations on the Orthodox Communion*, Lond. 1853. Stanley, *Lectures on the Eastern Church*, Lond. 1862.

On the *History* of the Latin Church.—Milman, *Latin Christianity*, Lond. 1854. Greenwood, *Cathedra Petri*, Lond. 1858. Ranke, *History of the Popes*, translated by Sarah Austin, Lond. 1851.

On the *History* of the Church of England.—Bede, *Histor. Ecclesiast. Gentis Anglorum*, Oxf. 1846. Ussher, *Britannicarum Ecclesiarum Antiquitates*, *Works*, v. vi. Collier *Ecclesiastical History of Great Britain*, Lond. 1845. Burnet, *History of the Reformation of the Church of England*, Ox. 1829. Southey, *Book of the Church*, Lond. 1837. Wordsworth, *Ecclesiastical Biography*, Lond. 1839. Short, *Sketch of the History of the Church of England*, Lond. 1840. Churton, *Early English Church*, Lond. 1841. Massingberd, *History of the English Reformation*, Lond. 1842; and in French, 1861. Stubbs, *Registrum Sacrum Anglicanum*, Oxf. 1858. Hook, *Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury*, Lond. 1860. Debary, *History of the Church of England, from 1635 to 1717*, Lond. 1860. Wilkins, *Concilia Magnae Britanniae* (a new edition is in preparation by the Oxford University Press). Skinner, *Ecclesiastical History of Scotland*, Lond. 1788. Russell, *History of the Church in Scotland*, Lond. 1834. Mant, *History of the Church of Ireland*, Lond. 1841. King, *Church History of Ireland*, Dublin, 1845. Anderson, *History of the Colonial Church*, Lond. 1845. Wilberforce, *History of the Protestant Episcopal Church in America*, Lond. 1844. [F. M.]

COLLEGE, THE (הַמְּוֹשֵׁנָה: ἡ μαρτυρία; *secunda*). In 2 K. xxii. 14 it is said in the A. V. that Huldah the prophetess 'dwelt in Jerusalem



in the *college*," or, as the margin has it, "in the second part." The same part of the city is undoubtedly alluded to in Zeph. i. 10 (A. V. "the second"). Our translators derived their rendering "the college" from the Targum of Jonathan, which has "house of instruction," a schoolhouse supposed to have been in the neighbourhood of the Temple. This translation must have been based upon the meaning of the Hebrew *mishneh*, "repetition," which has been adopted by the Peshito-Syriac, and the word was thus taken to denote a place for the repetition of the law, or perhaps a place where copies of the law were made (comp. Deut. xvii. 18; Josh. viii. 32). Rashi, after quoting the rendering of the Targum, says, "there is a gate in the Temple] court, the name of which is the gate of Huldah in the treatise Middoth [i. 3], and some translate *הַשְּׁנִי* without the wall, between the two walls, which was a second part (*mishneh*) to the city." The latter is substantially the opinion of the author of *Quaest. in Libr. Reg.* attributed to Jerome. Keil's explanation (*Comm. in loc.*) is probably the true one, that the *Mishneh* was the "lower city," called by Josephus *ἡ ἄλλη πόλις* (*Ant.* xv. 11, §5), and built on the hill Akra. Ewald (*on Zeph.* i. 10) renders it *Neustadt*, that is, Bezetha, or New Town.

Others have explained the word as denoting the quarter of the city allotted to the Levites, who were a second or inferior order as compared with the priests, or to the priests who were second in rank as compared with the high-priest. Junius and Tremellius render "in parte secunda ab eo," that is, from the king, the position of Huldah's house, next the king's palace, accounting for the fact that she was first appealed to. Of conjectures like these there is no end.

**CYPRILIANS** (Κυπρίοι: *Cyprii*). Inhabitants of the island of Cyprus (2 Macc. iv. 29). At the time alluded to (that is during the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes), they were under the dominion of Egypt, and were governed by a viceroy who was possessed of ample powers, and is called in the inscriptions *στρατηγὸς καὶ ναύαρχος καὶ ἀρχιερεὺς ὁ κατὰ τὴν νῆσον* (comp. Boeckh, *Corp. Insc.* No. 2624). Crates, one of these viceroys, was left by Sostratus in command of the castle, or acropolis, of Jerusalem while he was summoned before the king.

**D**

**DAN** (דָּן: om. in LXX.: *Dan*). Apparently the name of a city, associated with Jason, as one of the places in Southern Arabia from which the Phoenicians obtained wrought iron, cassia, and calamus (Ez. xxvii. 19). Ewald conjectures that it is the same as the Keturahite Dedan in Gen. xxv. 3, but his conjecture is without support, though it is adopted by Fürst (*Handw.*). Others refer it to the tribe of Dan, for the Danites were skilful workmen, and both Aholiab (Ex. xxxv. 34) and Hiram (2 Chr. ii. 13) belonged to this tribe. But for this view also there appears to be as little foundation, if we consider the connexion in which the name occurs.

**DANITES, THE** (דְּנָיִם: δ Δανί, Δάν, δ Δάν, οἱ Δανῖται, Alex. δ Δάν, οἱ Δανῖται: *Dan*). The descendants of Dan, and members of his tribe (Judg. xiii. 2, xviii. 1, 11; 1 Chr. xii. 35).

**DARI'US.** 4. (Δαρείος; Alex. Δαρίος *Arius*). Areus, king of the Lacedaemonians (1 Macc. xii. 7). [AREUS.]

**DED'ANIM** (דְּדָנִים: Δαιδάν: *Dedanim*, Is. xxi. 13. [DEDAN.]

**DEPUTY.** The uniform rendering in the A. V. of ἀνθύπατος, "proconsul" (Acts xiii. 7, 8, 12, xix. 38). The English word is curious in itself, and to a certain extent appropriate, having been applied formerly to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland. Thus Shaks. *Hen.* VIII. iii. 2:

"Plague of your policy,  
You sent me *deputy* for Ireland."

**DO'RA** (Δωρᾶ: *Dora*). 1 Macc. xv. 11, 13, 25. [DOR.]

**DOSITH'EUS** (Δωσίθεος: *Dositheus, Dositheus*). 1. One of the captains of Judas Maccabeus in the battle against Timotheus (2 Macc. xii. 19, 24).

2. A horse-soldier of Bacenor's company, a man of prodigious strength, who, in attempting to capture Gorgias, was cut down by a Thracian (2 Macc. xii. 35).

3. The son of Drimylus, a Jew, who had renounced the law of his fathers, and was in the camp of Ptolemy Philopater at Raphia (3 Macc. i. 3). He appears to have frustrated the attempt of Theodotus to assassinate the king. According to the Syriac Version he put in the king's tent a man of low rank (ἄσημόν τινα), who was slain instead of his master. Polybius (v. 81) tells us it was the king's physician who thus perished. Dositheus was perhaps a chamberlain.

**E**

**E'BAL** (עֵבֶל: Γαιβήλ, Ταιβήλ; Alex. Γαιβήλ in 1 Chr.: *Ebal*). 1. One of the sons of Shobal the son of Seir (Gen. xxxvi. 23; 1 Chr. i. 40).

2. (om. in Vat. MS.; Alex. Γεμιάν: *Hebal*). OBAL the son of Joktan (1 Chr. i. 22; comp. Gen. x. 28). Eleven of Kennicott's MSS. read עֵבֶל in 1 Chr. as in Gen.

**E'BER** (עֵבֶר: Ὠβήδ: *Heber*). 1. Son of Elpaal and descendant of Shaharaim of the tribe of Benjamin (1 Chr. viii. 12). He was one of the founders of Ono and Lod with their surrounding villages.

2. (Ἀβέδ). A priest, who represented the family of Amok, in the days of Joiakim the son of Jeshua (Neh. xii. 20).

**E'DEN** (עֵדֶן: Ἰωαδάμ; Alex. Ἰωαδάν: *Eden*). 1. A Gershonite Levite, son of Joah, in the days of Hezekiah (2 Chr. xxix. 12). He was one of the two representatives of his family who took part in the purification of the Temple.

2. (Ὀδόμ). Also a Levite, contemporary and probably identical with the preceding, who under Kore the son of Imnah was over the freewill offerings of God (2 Chr. xxxi. 15).

**EGYPTIAN** (מִצְרַיִם, masc.; מִצְרַיִת, fem.: Αἰγύπτιος, Αἰγυπτία, *Aegyptius*), **EGYPTIANS** (מִצְרַיִם, masc.; מִצְרַיִת, fem.; מִצְרַיִם: Αἰγύπτιοι, γυναῖκες Αἰγύπτου: *Aegyptii, Aegyptiae mulieres*). Natives of Egypt. The word most

commonly rendered Egyptians (*Mitsraim*) is the name of the country, and might be appropriately so translated in many cases.

**EKRONITES, THE** (הַעֲקֹרְנִים, הַעֲקֹרְנִי: δ'Ακκαρωνίτης, οἱ Ἀσκαλωνῖται: *Accaronitae*). The inhabitants of Ekron (Josh. xiii. 3; 1 Sam. vii. 10). In the latter passage the LXX. read "Eshkalonites."

**EL-PARAN** (אֵיל פָּרָן: ἡ τερεβίνθος τῆς Φαράν; Alex. ἡ τερεμίνθος τ. Φ: *campestris Pharan*). Literally "the terebinth of Paran" (Gen. xiv. 6). [PARAN.]

**ENOS** (עֵנוֹשׁ: Ἐνώσ: *Enos*). The son of Seth; properly called Enosh, as in 1 Chr. i. 1 (Gen. iv. 26, v. 6, 7, 9, 10, 11; Luke iii. 38).

**ENOSH**. The same as the preceding (1 Chr. i. 1).

**EPHRAIMITE** (אֶפְרַיִם: Ἐφραθίτης; Alex. ἐκ τοῦ Ἐφραΐμ: *Ephrathæus*). Of the tribe of Ephraim; elsewhere called "Ephrathite" (Judg. xii. 5). [EPHRAIM, p. 566, note c.]

**ERAS'TUS** (Ἐραστός: *Erastus*). 1. One of the attendants or deacons of St. Paul at Ephesus, who with Timothy was sent forward into Macedonia while the Apostle himself remained in Asia (Acts xix. 22). He is probably the same with Erastus who is again mentioned in the salutations to Timothy (2 Tim. iii. 20), though not, as Meyer maintains, the same with Erastus the chamberlain of Corinth (Rom. xvi. 23).

2. Erastus the chamberlain, or rather the public treasurer (οἰκονόμος, *arcarius*) of Corinth, who was one of the early converts to Christianity (Rom. xvi. 23). According to the traditions of the Greek Church (*Menol. Graecum*, i. p. 179), he was first oeconomus to the Church at Jerusalem, and afterwards Bishop of Paneas. He is probably not the same with Erastus who was with St. Paul at Ephesus, for in this case we should be compelled to assume that he is mentioned in the Ep. to the Romans by the title of an office which he had once held and afterwards resigned.

**ERI** (עֵרִי: Ἀηδείς, Ἀδδί; Alex. Ἀηδείς in Gen.: *Heri, Her*). Son of Gad (Gen. xlvi. 16; Num. xxvi. 16).

**ERITES, THE** (הַעֲרִי: ὁ Ἀδδί, *Heritæ*). A branch of the tribe of Gad, descended from Eri (Num. xxvi. 16).

**ETHIOPIAN** (אֶתְיוֹפִי: Αἰθίοψ: *Aethiops*). Properly "Cushite" (Jer. xiii. 23); used of Zerah (2 Chr. xiv. 9 [8]), and Ebedmelech (Jer. xxxviii. 7, 10, 12, xxxix. 16).

**ETHIOPIAN WOMAN** (אֶתְיוֹפִיָּה: Αἰθιοπίσσα: *Aethiopissa*). Zipporah, the wife of Moses, is so described in Num. xii. 1. She is elsewhere said to have been the daughter of a Midianite, and in consequence of this Ewald and others have supposed that the allusion is to another wife whom Moses married after the death of Zipporah.

**ETHIOPIANS** (אֶתְיוֹפִי, Is. xx. 4, Jer. xlvi. 9, אֶתְיוֹפִי: Αἰθίοπες: *Aethiopia, Aethiopes*). Properly "Cush" or "Ethiopia" in two passages (Is. xx. 4; Jer. xlvi. 9). Elsewhere "Cushites," or inhabitants of Ethiopia (2 Chr. xii. 3, xiv. 12 [11], 13 [12], xvi. 8, xxi. 16; Dan. xi. 43; Am. ix. 7; Zeph. ii. 12). [ETHIOPIA.]

**EXCOMMUNICATION** (Ἀφορισμός: *Excommunicatio*). Excommunication is a power founded upon a right inherent in all religious societies, and is analogous to the powers of capital punishment, banishment, and exclusion from membership, which are exercised by political and municipal bodies. If Christianity is merely a philosophical idea thrown into the world to do battle with other theories, and to be valued according as it maintains its ground or not in the conflict of opinions, excommunication, and ecclesiastical punishments, and penitential discipline are unreasonable. If a society has been instituted for maintaining any body of doctrine, and any code of morals, they are necessary to the existence of that society. That the Christian Church is an organized polity, a spiritual "Kingdom of God" on earth, is the declaration of the Bible [CHURCH]; and that the Jewish Church was at once a spiritual and a temporal organization is clear.

I. *Jewish Excommunication*.—The Jewish system of excommunication was threefold. For a first offence a delinquent was subjected to the penalty of נִדְּוִי (*Niddui*). Rambam (quoted by Lightfoot, *Horæ Hebraicæ*, on 1 Cor. v. 5), Mornus (*De Poenitentia*, iv. 27), and Buxtorf (*Lexicon*, s. v. נִדְּוִי) enumerate the twenty-four offences for which it was inflicted. They are various, and range in heinousness from the offence of keeping a fierce dog to that of taking God's name in vain. Elsewhere (*Bab. Moed Katon*, fol. 16, 1) the causes of its infliction are reduced to two, termed money and epicurism, by which is meant debt and wanton insolence. The offender was first cited to appear in court, and if he refused to appear or to make amends, his sentence was pronounced—"Let M., or N., be under excommunication." The excommunicated person was prohibited the use of the bath, or of the razor, or of the convivial table; and all who had to do with him were commanded to keep him at four cubits' distance. He was allowed to go to the Temple, but not to make the circuit in the ordinary manner. The term of this punishment was thirty days; and it was extended to a second, and to a third thirty days when necessary. If at the end of that time the offender was still contumacious, he was subjected to the second excommunication termed חֶרֶם (*cherem*), a word meaning something devoted to God (Lev. xxvii. 21, 28; Ex. xxii. 20 [19]; Num. xviii. 14). Severer penalties were now attached. The offender was not allowed to teach or to be taught in company with others, to hire or to be hired, nor to perform any commercial transactions beyond purchasing the necessaries of life. The sentence was delivered by a court of ten, and was accompanied by a solemn malediction, for which authority was supposed to be found in the "Curse ye Meroz" of Judg. v. 23. Lastly followed שְׁמַתָּה (*Shammâthâ*), which was an entire cutting off from the congregation. It has been supposed by some that these two latter forms of excommunication were undistinguishable from each other.

The punishment of excommunication is not appointed by the Law of Moses. It is founded on the natural right of self-protection which all societies enjoy. The case of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram (Num. xvi.), the curse denounced on Meroz (Judg. v. 23), the commission and proclamation of Ezra (vii. 26, x. 8), and the reformation of Nehemiah (xiii. 25), are appealed to by the Talmudists as

precedents by which their proceedings are regulated. In respect to the principle involved, the "cutting off from the people" commanded for certain sins (Ex. xxx. 33, 38, xxxi. 14; Lev. xvii. 4), and the exclusion from the camp denounced on the leprous (Lev. xiii. 46; Num. xii. 14) are more apposite.

In the New Testament, Jewish excommunication is brought prominently before us in the case of the man that was born blind and restored to sight (John ix.). "The Jews had agreed already that if any man did confess that He was Christ, he should be put out of the synagogue. Therefore said his parents, He is of age, ask him" (22, 23). "And they cast him out. Jesus heard that they had cast him out" (34, 35). The expressions here used, ἀποσυνάγωγος γένηται—ἐξέβαλον αὐτὸν ἔξω, refer, no doubt, to the first form of excommunication or *Niddui*. Our Lord warns his disciples that they will have to suffer excommunication at the hands of their countrymen (John xvi. 2); and the fear of it is described as sufficient to prevent persons in a respectable position from acknowledging their belief in Christ (John xii. 42). In Luke vi. 22, it has been thought that our Lord referred specifically to the three forms of Jewish excommunication—"Blessed are ye when men shall hate you, and when they shall separate you from their company [ἀφορίσωσιν], and shall reproach you [ὀνειδίσωσιν], and cast out your name as evil [ἐκβάλωσιν], for the Son of Man's sake." The three words very accurately express the simple separation, the additional malediction, and the final exclusion of *niddui*, *cherem*, and *shammáthá*. This verse makes it probable that the three stages were already formally distinguished from each other, though, no doubt, the words appropriate to each are occasionally used inaccurately.

II. *Christian Excommunication*.—Excommunication, as exercised by the Christian Church, is not merely founded on the natural right possessed by all societies, nor merely on the example of the Jewish Church and nation. It was instituted by our Lord (Matt. xviii. 15, 18), and it was practised by and commanded by St. Paul (1 Tim. i. 20; 1 Cor. v. 11; Tit. iii. 10).

*Its Institution*.—The passage in St. Matthew has led to much controversy, into which we do not enter. It runs as follows:—"If thy brother shall trespass against thee, go and tell him his fault between thee and him alone; if he shall hear thee, thou hast gained thy brother. But if he will not hear thee, then take with thee one or two more, that in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word may be established. And if he shall neglect to hear them, tell it unto the Church; but if he neglect to hear the Church, let him be unto thee as a heathen man and a publican. Verily I say unto you, Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven." Our Lord here recognizes and appoints a way in which a member of his Church is to become to his brethren as a heathen man and a publican—i. e. be reduced to a state analogous to that of the Jew suffering the penalty of the third form of excommunication. It is to follow on his contempt of the censure of the Church passed on him for a trespass which he has committed. The final excision is to be preceded, as in the case of the Jew, by two warnings.

*Apostolic Example*.—In the Epistles we find St. Paul frequently claiming the right to exercise discipline over his converts (comp. 2 Cor. i. 23, xiii. 10).

In two cases we find him exercising this authority to the extent of cutting off offenders from the Church. One of these is the case of the incestuous Corinthian:—"Ye are puffed up, and have not rather mourned, that he that hath done this deed might be taken away from among you. For I verily, as absent in body, but present in spirit, have judged already, as though I were present, concerning him that hath so done this deed, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, when ye are gathered together, and my spirit, with the power of our Lord Jesus Christ, to deliver such an one unto Satan for the destruction of the flesh, that the spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus" (1 Cor. v. 2-5). The other case is that of Hymenaeus and Alexander:—"Holding faith, and a good conscience; which some having put away concerning faith have made shipwreck: of whom is Hymenaeus and Alexander; whom I have delivered unto Satan, that they may learn not to blaspheme" (1 Tim. i. 19, 20). It seems certain that these persons were excommunicated, the first for immorality, the others for heresy. What is the full meaning of the expression, "deliver unto Satan," is doubtful. All agree that excommunication is contained in it, but whether it implies any further punishment, inflicted by the extraordinary powers committed specially to the Apostles, has been questioned. The strongest argument for the phrase meaning no more than excommunication may be drawn from a comparison of Col. i. 13. Addressing himself to the "saints and faithful brethren in Christ which are at Colosse," St. Paul exhorts them to "give thanks unto the Father which hath made us meet to be partakers of the inheritance of the saints in light: who hath delivered us from the power of darkness, and hath translated us into the kingdom of his dear Son: in whom we have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins." The conception of the Apostle here is of men lying in the realm of darkness, and transported from thence into the kingdom of the Son of God, which is the inheritance of the saints in light, by admission into the Church. What he means by the power of darkness is abundantly clear from many other passages in his writings, of which it will be sufficient to quote Eph. vi. 12:—"Put on the whole armour of God, that ye may be able to stand against the wiles of the devil; for we wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high places." Introduction into the Church is therefore, in St. Paul's mind, a translation from the kingdom and power of Satan to the kingdom and government of Christ. This being so, he could hardly more naturally describe the effect of excluding a man from the Church than by the words, "deliver him unto Satan," the idea being, that the man ceasing to be a subject of Christ's kingdom of light, was at once transported back to the kingdom of darkness, and delivered therefore into the power of its ruler Satan. This interpretation is strongly confirmed by the terms in which St. Paul describes the commission which he received from the Lord Jesus Christ, when he was sent to the Gentiles:—"To open their eyes, and to turn them from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God, that they may receive forgiveness of sins, and inheritance among them which are sanctified by faith that is in Me" (Acts xxvi. 18). Here again the act of being placed in Christ's kingdom, the Church, is pronounced to be a translation from darkness to light, from the

power of Satan unto God. Conversely, to be cast out of the Church would be to be removed from light to darkness, to be withdrawn from God's government, and delivered into the power of Satan (so Balsamon and Zonaras, in *Basil. Can.* 7; Estius, in *I. Cor.* v.; Beveridge, in *Can. Apost.* x.). If, however, the expression means more than excommunication, it would imply the additional exercise of a special Apostolical power, similar to that exerted on Ananias and Sapphira (Acts v. 1), Simon Magus (viii. 20), and Elymas (xiii. 10). (So Chrysostom, Ambrose, Augustine, Hammond, Grotius, Lightfoot.)

*Apostolic Precept.*—In addition to the claim to exercise discipline, and its actual exercise in the form of excommunication, by the Apostles, we find Apostolic precepts directing that discipline should be exercised by the rulers of the Church, and that in some cases excommunication should be resorted to:—"If any man obey not our word by this epistle, note that man, and have no company with him, that he may be ashamed. Yet count him not as an enemy, but admonish him as a brother," writes St. Paul to the Thessalonians (2 Thess. iii. 14). To the Romans: "Mark them which cause divisions and offences contrary to the doctrine which ye have heard, and avoid them" (Rom. xvi. 17). To the Galatians: "I would they were even cut off that trouble you" (Gal. v. 12). To Timothy: "If any man teach otherwise, . . . from such withdraw thyself" (1 Tim. vi. 3). To Titus he uses a still stronger expression: "A man that is an heretic, after the first and second admonition, reject" (Tit. iii. 10). St. John instructs the lady to whom he addresses his Second Epistle, not to receive into her house, nor bid God speed to any who did not believe in Christ (2 John 10); and we read that in the case of Cerinthus he acted himself on the precept that he had given (Euseb. *H. E.* iii. 28). In his Third Epistle he describes Diotrephes, apparently a Judaizing presbyter, "who loved to have the pre-eminence," as "casting out of the Church," i. e. refusing Church communion to the stranger brethren who were travelling about preaching to the Gentiles (3 John 10). In the addresses to the Seven Churches the angels or rulers of the Church of Pergamos and of Thyatira are rebuked for "suffering" the Nicolaitans and Balaamites "to teach and to seduce my servants to commit fornication, and to eat things sacrificed unto idols" (Rev. ii. 20). There are two passages still more important to our subject. In the Epistle to the Galatians, St. Paul denounces, "Though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed [*ἀνάθεμα ἔστω*]. As I said before, so say I now again, If any man preach any other gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be accursed" (*ἀνάθεμα ἔστω*, Gal. i. 8, 9). And in the Second Epistle to the Corinthians: "If any man love not the Lord Jesus Christ, let him be Anathema Maran-atha" (1 Cor. xvi. 22). It has been supposed that these two expressions, "let him be Anathema," "let him be Anathema Maran-atha," refer respectively to the two later stages of Jewish excommunication—the *cherem* and the *shammáthá*. This requires consideration.

The words *ἀνάθεμα* and *ἀνάθημα* have evidently the same derivation, and originally they bore the same meaning. They express a person or thing set apart, laid up, or devoted. But whereas a thing may be set apart by way of honour or for destruc-

tion, the words, like the Latin "sacer" and the English "devoted," came to have opposite senses—*τὸ ἀπηλλοτριωμένον Θεοῦ*, and *τὸ ἀφωρισμένον Θεῷ*. The LXX. and several ecclesiastical writers use the two words almost indiscriminately, but in general the form *ἀνάθημα* is applied to the votive offering (see 2 Macc. ix. 16; Luke xxi. 5; and Chrys. *Hom.* xvi. in *Ep. ad Rom.*), and the form *ἀνάθεμα* to that which is devoted to evil (see Deut. vii. 26; Josh. vi. 17, vii. 13). Thus St. Paul declares that he could wish himself an *ἀνάθεμα* from Christ, if he could thereby save the Jews (Rom. ix. 3). His meaning is that he would be willing to be set apart as a vile thing, to be cast aside and destroyed, if only it could bring about the salvation of his brethren. Hence we see the force of *ἀνάθεμα ἔστω* in Gal. i. 8. "Have nothing to do with him," would be the Apostle's injunction, "but let him be set apart as an evil thing, for God to deal with him as he thinks fit." Hammond (in *loc.*) paraphrases it as follows:—"You are to disclaim and renounce all communion with him, to look on him as on an excommunicated person, under the second degree of excommunication, that none is to have any commerce with in sacred things." Hence it is that *ἀνάθεμα ἔστω* came to be the common expression employed by Councils at the termination of each Canon which they enacted, meaning that whoever was disobedient to the Canon was to be separated from the communion of the Church and its privileges, and from the favour of God, until he repented (see Bingham, *Ant.* xvi. 2, 16).

The expression *Ἀνάθεμα μαρναθά*, as it stands by itself without explanation in 1 Cor. xvi. 22, is so peculiar, that it has tempted a number of ingenious expositions. Parkhurst hesitatingly derives it from *מְהָרָם אָתָּה*, "Cursed be thou." But this derivation is not tenable. Buxtorf, Morinus, Hammond, Bingham, and others identify it with the Jewish *shammáthá*. They do so by translating *shammáthá*, "The Lord comes." But *shammáthá* cannot be made to mean "The Lord comes" (See Lightfoot, in *loc.*). Several fanciful derivations are given by Rabbinical writers, as "There is death," "There is desolation;" but there is no mention by them of such a signification as "The Lord comes." Lightfoot derives it from *שָׁמַת*, and it probably means a thing excluded or shut out. Maranatha, however peculiar its use in the text may seem to us, is a Syro-Chaldaic expression, signifying "The Lord is come" (Chrysostom, Jerome, Estius, Lightfoot), or "The Lord cometh." If we take the former meaning, we may regard it as giving the reason why the offender was to be anathematized; if the latter, it would either imply that the separation was to be in perpetuity, "donec Dominus redeat" (Augustine), or, more properly, it would be a form of solemn appeal to the day on which the judgment should be ratified by the Lord (comp. Jude, 14). In any case, it is a strengthened form of the simple *ἀνάθεμα ἔστω*. And thus it may be regarded as holding towards it a similar relation to that which existed between the *shammáthá* and the *cherem*, but not on any supposed ground of etymological identity between the two words *shammáthá* and *maran-atha*. Perhaps we ought to interpunctuate more strongly between *ἀνάθεμα* and *μαρναθά*, and read *ἦτω ἀνάθεμα μαρναθά*, i. e. "Let him be anathema. The Lord will come." The *anathema* and the *cherem* answer very exactly to each other (see Lev. xxvii. 28; Num. xxi. 3; Is. xliii. 28).

*Restoration to Communion.*—Two cases of excommunication are related in Holy Scripture; and in one of them the restitution of the offender is specially recounted. The incestuous Corinthian had been excommunicated by the authority of St. Paul, who had issued his sentence from a distance without any consultation with the Corinthians. He had required them publicly to promulgate it and to act upon it. They had done so. The offender had been brought to repentance, and was overwhelmed with grief. Hereupon St. Paul, still absent as before, forbids the further infliction of the punishment, pronounces the forgiveness of the penitent, and exhorts the Corinthians to receive him back to communion, and to confirm their love towards him.

*The Nature of Excommunication* is made more evident by these acts of St. Paul than by any investigation of Jewish practice or of the etymology of words. We thus find, (1) that it is a spiritual penalty, involving no temporal punishment, except accidentally; (2) that it consists in separation from the communion of the Church; (3) that its object is the good of the sufferer (1 Cor. v. 5), and the protection of the sound members of the Church (2 Tim. iii. 17); (4) that its subjects are those who are guilty of heresy (1 Tim. i. 20), or gross immorality (1 Cor. v. 1); (5) that it is inflicted by the authority of the Church at large (Matt. xviii. 18), wielded by the highest ecclesiastical officer (1 Cor. v. 3; Tit. iii. 10); (6) that this officer's sentence is promulgated by the congregation to which the offender belongs (1 Cor. v. 4), in deference to his superior judgment and command (2 Cor. ii. 9), and in spite of any opposition on the part of a minority (*Ib.* 6); (7) that the exclusion may be of indefinite duration, or for a period; (8) that its duration may be abridged at the discretion and by the indulgence of the person who has imposed the penalty (*Ib.* 8); (9) that penitence is the condition on which restoration to communion is granted (*Ib.* 7); (10) that the sentence is to be publicly reversed as it was publicly promulgated (*Ib.* 10).

*Practice of Excommunication in the Post-Apostolic Church.*—The first step was an admonition to the offender, repeated once, or even more than once, in accordance with St. Paul's precept (Tit. iii. 10). (See S. Ambr. *De Offic.* ii. 27; Prosper, *De Vit. Contempl.* ii. 7; Synesius, Ep. lviii.) If this did not reclaim him, it was succeeded by the Lesser Excommunication (ἀφορισμός), by which he was excluded from the participation of the Eucharist, and was shut out from the Communion-service, although admitted to what was called the Service of the Catechumens (see Theodoret, Ep. lxxvii. *ad Eulal.*). Thirdly followed the Greater Excommunication or Anathema (παντελής ἀφορισμός, ἀνάθεμα), by which the offender was debarred, not only from the Eucharist, but from taking part in all religious acts in any assembly of the Church, and from the company of the faithful in the ordinary concerns of life. In case of submission, offenders were received back to communion by going through the four stages of public penance, in which they were termed, (1) προσκλαίοντες, *flentes*, or weepers; (2) ἀκροώμενοι, *audientes*, or hearers; (3) ὑποπίπτοντες, *substrati*, or kneelers; (4) συνεστῶτες, *consistentes*, or co-standers; after which they were restored to communion by absolution, accompanied by imposition of hands. To trace out this branch of the subject more minutely would carry us beyond our

[APPENDIX.]

legitimate sphere. Reference may be made to Suicer's *Thesaurus Ecclesiasticus*, s. vv. πρόσκλαυσις, ἀκρόασις, ὑπόπτωσις, σύστασις.

*References.*—Tertullian, *De Poenitentia*. Op. I. 139, Lutet. 1634; S. Ambrose, *De Poenitentia*. Paris, 1686; Morinus, *De Poenitentia*. Antv., 1682; Hammond, *Power of the Keys*. Works I. 406. Lond. 1684; Selden, *De jure Naturali et Gentium juxta Disciplinam Hebraeorum*. Lips. 1695; Lightfoot, *Horae Hebraicae. On I. Cor.* v. 5. Works II., 746. Lond. 1634; Bingham, *Antiquities of the Christian Church*. Books xvi., xviii. Lond. 1862; Marshall, *Penitential Discipline of the Primitive Church*. Oxf. 1844; Thorndike, *The Church's Power of Excommunication, as found in Scripture*. Works, vi. 21 (see also i. 55, ii. 157). Oxf. 1856; Waterland, *No Communion with Impugners of Fundamentals*. Works, iii. 456. Oxf. 1843; Hey, *Lectures in Divinity. On Art.* xxxiii. Camb. 1822; Palmer, *Treatise on the Church*, ii. 224. Lond. 1842; Browne, *Exposition of the Articles. On Art.* xxxiii. Lond. 1863. [F. M.]

EZ'RA. 3. (עֶזְרָא: 'Esra; *Ezra*). A name which occurs in the obscure genealogy of 1 Chr. iv. 17. According to the author of the *Quaestiones in Paral.* Ezra is the same as Amram, and his sons Jether and Mered are Aaron and Moses.

## F

FLUTE (לִילִי: χορὸς: *tibia*). 1 K. i. 4 marg. [PIPE.]

## G

GAD (גַּד: δαιμόνιον; Cod. Sin. δαίμων: *Fortuna*). Properly "the Gad," with the article. In the A. V. of Is. lxv. 11 the clause "that prepare a table for that troop" has in the margin instead of the last word the proper name "Gad," which evidently denotes some idol worshipped by the Jews in Babylon, though it is impossible positively to identify it. Huetius would understand by it Fortune as symbolized by the Moon, but Vitranga, on the contrary, considers it to be the Sun. Millius (*Diss. de Gad et Meni*) regards both Gad and Meni as names of the Moon. That Gad was the deity Fortune, under whatever outward form it was worshipped, is supported by the etymology, and by the common assent of commentators. It is evidently connected with the Syriac ܓܕܘܘܬܐ, *gádô*, "fortune, luck," and with the Arabic ܓܕܘܬܐ, *jad*, "good fortune," and Gesenius is probably right in his conjecture that Gad was the planet Jupiter, which was regarded by the astrologers of the East (Pococke, *Spec. Hist. Ar.* p. 130) as the star of greater good fortune. Movers (*Phoen.* i. 650) is in favour of the planet Venus. Some have supposed that a trace of the Syrian worship of Gad is to be found in the exclamation of Leah, when Zilpah bare a son (Gen. xxx. 11), ܓܕܘܬܐ, *bâgâd*, or as the *Keri* has it ܓܕܘܬܐ, "Gad, or good fortune cometh." The Targum of Pseudo-Jonathan and the Jerusalem Targum both give "a lucky planet cometh," but it is most probable that

this is an interpretation which grew out of the astrological beliefs of a later time; and we can infer nothing from it with respect to the idolatry of the inhabitants of Padan Aram in the age of Jacob. That this later belief in a deity Fortune existed, there are many things to prove. Buxtorf (*Lex. Talm.* s. v.) says that anciently it was a custom for each man to have in his house a splendid couch, which was not used, but was set apart for "the prince of the house," that is, for the star, or constellation Fortune, to render it more propitious. This couch was called the couch of Gada, or good-luck (*Talm. Babl. Sanhed. f. 20 a, Nedarim, f. 56 a*). Again in Bereshith Rabba, sect. 65, the words **יְקִים אֱלֹהִים**, in Gen. xxvii. 31 are explained as an invocation to Gada or Fortune. Rabbi Moses the Priest, quoted by Aben Ezra (on Gen. xxx. 11) says "that **לֵגַל** (Is. lxxv. 11) signifies the star of luck, which points to everything that is good; for thus is the language of Kedar (Arabic): but he says that **גַּד נֶאֱמַר** (Gen. xxx. 11) is not used in the same sense."

Illustrations of the ancient custom of placing a banqueting table in honour of idols will be found in the table spread for the sun among the Ethiopians (*Her. iii. 17, 18*), and in the feast made by the Babylonians for their god Bel, which is described in the Apocryphal history of Bel and the Dragon (comp. also *Her. i. 181, &c.*). The table in the temple of Belus is described by Diodorus Siculus (ii. 9) as being of beaten gold, 40 feet long, 15 wide, and weighing 500 talents. On it were placed two drinking cups (*καρχήσια*) weighing 30 talents, two censers of 300 talents each, and three golden goblets, that of Jupiter or Bel weighing 1200 Babylonian talents. The couch and table of the god in the temple of Zeus Triphylius at Patara in the island of Panchaea are mentioned by Diodorus (v. 46). Compare also *Virg. Aen. ii. 763*:

"Huc undique Troia gaza  
Incensis erepta adytis, mensaeque deorum  
Crateresque auro solidi, captivaeque vestis  
Congeritur."

In addition to the opinions which have been referred to above may be quoted that of Stephen Le Moynes (*Var. Sacr.* p. 363) who says that Gad is the goat of Mendes, worshipped by the Egyptians as an emblem of the sun; and of Le Clerc (*Comm. in Is.*) and Lakemacher (*Obs. Phil.* iv. 18, &c.) who identify Gad with Hecate. Macrobius (*Sat. i. 19*) tells us that in the later Egyptian mythology **Τύχην** was worshipped as one of the four deities who presided over birth, and was represented by the Moon. This will perhaps throw some light upon the rendering of the LXX. as given by Jerome. [*MENI, note a.*]

Traces of the worship of Gad remain in the proper names Baal Gad and Giddeneme (*Plaut. Poen. v. 3*), the latter of which Gesenius (*Mon. Phoen.* p. 407) renders **גַּד נְעֻמָה**, "favouring fortune."

**GAD'ITES, THE** (**גַּדִּי**: **δ Γάδ, δ Γαδδί**, **οἱ υἱοὶ Γάδ**: *Gad, Gaditae, Gaddi*). The descendants of Gad and members of his tribe. Their character is described under **GAD**, p. 648 b. In 2 Sam. xxiii. 36 for "the Gadite" the LXX. have **Γαλααδδί**, and the Vulg. *de Gadi*.

**GENNE'SARET, LAND OF** (**ἡ γῆ Γεννησαρέτ**: *terra Genesar, terra Genesareth*). After the miracle of feeding the five thousand, our Lord

and His disciples crossed the Lake of Gennesaret and came to the other side, at a place which is called "the land of Gennesaret" (*Matt. xiv. 34; Mark vi. 54*). It is generally believed that this term was applied to the fertile crescent-shaped plain on the western shore of the lake, extending from Khan Minyeh on the north to the steep hill behind Mejdal on the south, and called by the Arabs *el-Ghuweir*, "the little Ghor." The description given by Josephus (*B. J. iii. 10, §8*) would apply admirably to this plain. He says that along the lake of Gennesaret there extends a region of the same name, of marvellous nature and beauty. The soil was so rich that every plant flourished, and the air so temperate that trees of the most opposite natures grew side by side. The hardy walnut, which delighted in cold, grew there luxuriantly; there were the palm-trees that were nourished by heat, and fig-trees and olives beside them, that required a more temperate climate. Grapes and figs were found during ten months of the year. The plain was watered by a most excellent spring called by the natives Capharnaum, which was thought by some to be a vein of the Nile, because a fish was found there closely resembling the *coracinus* of the lake of Alexandria. The length of the plain along the shore of the lake was thirty stadia, and its breadth twenty. Making every allowance for the colouring given by the historian to his description, and for the neglected condition of *el-Ghuweir* at the present day, there are still left sufficient points of resemblance between the two to justify their being identified. The dimensions given by Josephus are sufficiently correct, though, as Dr. Thomson remarks (*The Land and the Book*, p. 348), the plain "is a little longer than thirty, and not quite twenty furlongs in breadth." Mr. Porter (*Handb.* p. 429) gives the length as three miles, and the greatest breadth as about one mile. It appears that Professor Stanley either assigns to "the land of Gennesaret" a wider signification, or his description of its extent must be inaccurate, for, after calling attention to the tropical vegetation and climate of the western shores of the lake, he says: "This fertility . . . reaches its highest pitch in the one spot on the western shore where the mountains, suddenly receding inland, leave a level plain of five miles wide, and six or seven miles long. This plain is 'the land of Gennesareth'" (*S. & P.* p. 374). Still his description goes far to confirm in other respects the almost exaggerated language in which Josephus depicts the prodigality of nature in this region. "No less than four springs pour forth their almost full-grown rivers through the plain, the richness of the soil displays itself in magnificent corn-fields; whilst along the shore rises a thick jungle of thorn and oleander, abounding in birds of brilliant colours and various forms." Burckhardt tells us that even now the pastures of Khan Minyeh are proverbial for their richness (*Syria*, p. 319).

In the *Journal of Classical and Sacred Philology* (ii. 290-308) Mr. Thrupp has endeavoured to show that the land of Gennesaret was not *el-Ghuweir*, but the fertile plain *el-Batîhah* on the north-eastern side of the lake. The dimensions of this plain and the character of its soil and productions correspond so far with the description given by Josephus of the land of Gennesaret as to afford reasonable ground for such an identification. But it appears from an examination of the narrative in the Gospels, that, for other reasons, the plain *el-Batîhah* is not the

land of Gennesaret, but more probably the scene of the miracle of feeding the five thousand. After delivering the parable of the Sower, our Lord and His disciples left Capernaum, near which was the scene of the parable, and went to Nazareth (Matt. xiii. 54; Mark vi. 1). It was while He was here, apparently, that the news was brought Him by the Apostles of the death of John the Baptist (Matt. xiv. 13; Mark vi. 30). He was still, at any rate, on the western side of the lake of Tiberias. On hearing the intelligence "He departed thence by ship into a desert place apart" (Matt. xiv. 13; Mark vi. 32), the "desert place" being the scene of the miraculous feeding of the five thousand, and "belonging to the city called Bethsaida" (Luke ix. 10). St. John (vi. 1) begins his account of the miracle by saying that "Jesus went over the sea of Galilee;" an expression which he could not have used had the scene of the miracle lain on the western shore of the lake, as Mr. Thrupp supposes, at el-Ghuweir. It seems much more probable that it was on the eastern or north-eastern side. After the miracle Jesus sent His disciples in the boat to the other side (Matt. xiv. 22) towards Bethsaida (Mark vi. 45), in order to go to Capernaum (John vi. 17), where He is found next day by the multitudes whom He had fed (John vi. 24, 25). The boat came to shore in the land of Gennesaret. It seems therefore perfectly clear, whatever be the actual positions of Capernaum and the scene of the miracle, that they were on opposite sides of the lake, and that Capernaum and the land of Gennesaret were close together on the same side.

Additional interest is given to the land of Gennesaret, or el-Ghuweir, by the probability that its scenery suggested the parable of the Sower. It is admirably described by Professor Stanley. "There was the undulating corn-field descending to the water's edge. There was the trodden pathway running through the midst of it, with no fence or hedge to prevent the seed from falling here and there on either side of it, or upon it; itself hard with the constant tramp of horse and mule and human feet. There was the 'good' rich soil, which distinguishes the whole of that plain and its neighbourhood from the bare hills elsewhere descending into the lake, and which, where there is no interruption, produces one vast mass of corn. There was the rocky ground of the hillside protruding here and there through the corn-fields, as elsewhere through the grassy slopes. There were the large bushes of thorn—the 'Nabk,' that kind of which tradition says that the Crown of Thorns was woven—springing up, like the fruit-trees of the more inland parts, in the very midst of the waving wheat" (S. & P. p. 426).

GEZ'RITES, THE (הַגְּזֵרִי, Keri הַגְּזֵרִי: δ Γεζερί; Alex. δ Γεζραῖος: Gerzi). 1 Sam. xxvii. 8. [GERZITES.]

GIL'EADITES, THE (גִּלְעָדִי Judg. xii. 4, 5, הַגִּלְעָדִי: Γαλαάδ, Judg. xii. 4, 5, δ Γαλααδί, Num. xxvi. 29, δ Γαλαάδ, Judg. x. 3, δ Γαλααδίτης; Alex. δ Γαλααδίτης, δ Γαλααδίτης: Galaaditae, Galaadites, viri Galaad). A branch of the tribe of Manasseh, descended from Gilead. There appears to have been an old standing feud between them and the Ephraimites, who taunted them with being deserters. See Judg. xii. 4, which may be rendered, "And the met of

Gilead smote Ephraim, because they said, Rimagates of Ephraim are ye (Gilead is between Ephraim and Manasseh);" the last clause being added parenthetically. In 2 K. xv. 25 for "of the Gileadites" the LXX. have ἀπὸ τῶν τετρακοσίων.

H

HALLELU'JAH. [Appendix, p. lxvi.]

HAR'EL (with the def. art. הַהַרְאֵל: τὸ ἀριήλ: Ariel). In the margin of Ez. xliii. 15 the word rendered "altar" in the text is given "Harel, i. e. the mountain of God." The LXX., Vulg., and Arab. evidently regarded it as the same with "Ariel" in the same verse. Our translators followed the Targum of Jonathan in translating it "altar." Junius explains it of the ἐσχάρα or hearth of the altar of burnt offering, covered by the network on which the sacrifices were placed over the burning wood. This explanation Gesenius adopts, and brings forward as a parallel the Arab. إره, ireh, "a hearth or fireplace," akin to the Heb. אור, úr, "light, flame." Fürst (Handw. s. v.) derives it from an unused root אָרַא hárá, "to glow, burn," with the termination -el; but the only authority for the root is its presumed existence in the word Harel. Ewald (Die Propheten des A. B. ii. 373) identifies Harel and Ariel, and refers them both to a root אָרַא, aráh, akin to אור, úr.

HAT. [HEADRESS, p. 767 a.]

HAZ'AZON-TA'MAR. 2 Chr. xx. 2. [HAZEZON TAMAR.]

HE'BERITES, THE (הַחֶבְרִי: δ Χοβερί: Heberitae). Descendants of Heber, a branch of the tribe of Asher (Num. xxvi. 45).

HE'BREWESS (עֵבְרִיָּה: Ἑβραία: Hebraea). A Hebrew woman (Jer. xxxiv. 9).

HEB'RONITES, THE (הַחֶבְרוֹנִי: δ Χεβρών, δ Χεβρωνί: Hebronitae, Hebroni). A family of Kohathite Levites, descendants of Hebron the son of Kohath (Num. iii. 27, xxvi. 58; 1 Chr. xxvi. 23). In the reign of David the chief of the family west of the Jordan was Hashabiah; while on the east in the land of Gilead were Jerijah and his brethren, "men of valour," over the Reubenites, the Gadites, and the half-tribe of Manasseh (1 Chr. xxvi. 30, 31, 32).

HER'MONITES, THE (הַחֶרְמוֹנִי: Ἑρμωνίαι: Hermoniim). Properly "the Hermons," with reference to the three summits of Mount Hermon (Ps. xlii. 6 [7]). [HERMON, p. 790 b.]

HES'RON (הַחֶצְרוֹן: Ἀσρών; Alex. Ἀσρώμ: Hesron). HEZRON, the son of Reuben (Num. xxvi. 6). Our translators followed the Vulg. in adopting this form of the name.

HES'RONITES, THE (הַחֶצְרוֹנִי: δ Ἀσρωνί; Alex. δ Ἀσρωνεῖ: Hesronitae). Descendants of Hesron, or Hezron, the son of Reuben (Num. xxvi. 6).

HEZ'RONITES, THE (הַחֶצְרוֹנִי: δ Ἀσρωνί: Hesronitae). A branch of the tribe of Judah, descendants of Hezron, the son of Pharez (Num. xxvi. 21).

HUPHAMITES, THE (הַחֻפְּמִי: om. in LXX.: *Huphamitae*). Descendants of Hupham of the tribe of Benjamin (Num. xxvi. 39).

## I, J

ISH'MAELITE. [ISHMAEL, p. 893 b.]

ISRAELITE (יִשְׂרָאֵלִי: 'Ιεζραηλίτης; Alex. 'Ισμαηλείτης: *de Jesraeli*). In 2 Sam. xvii. 25, Ithra, the father of Amasa, is called "an Israelite," or more correctly "the Israelite," while in 1 Chr. ii. 17 he appears as "Jether the Ishmeelite." The latter is undoubtedly the true reading, for unless Ithra had been a foreigner there would have been no need to express his nationality. The LXX. and Vulg. appear to have read יִזְרְעֵאֲלִי, "Jezreelite."

IZ'EHARITES, THE (הַיִּזְהָרִי: δ'Ισσαάρ; Alex. δ'Σαάρ: *Jesaaritae*). A family of Kohathite Levites, descended from Izhar the son of Kohath (Num. iii. 27): called also in the A. V. "Izharites."

IZ'HARITES, THE (הַיִּזְהָרִי: δ'Ισσααρί, Ισσαάρ, δ'Ισσααρί; Alex. δ'Ισσααρί, 'Ισσαρί, δ'Ικααρί: *Isaari, Isaaritae*). The same as the preceding. In the reign of David Shelomith was the chief of the family (1 Chr. xxiv. 22), and with his brethren had charge of the treasure dedicated for the Temple (1 Chr. xxvi. 23, 30).

JAH (יָה: Κύριος: *Dominus*). The abbreviated form of "Jehovah," used only in poetry. It occurs frequently in the Hebrew, but with a single exception (Ps. lxviii. 4) is rendered "Lord" in the A. V. The identity of Jah and Jehovah is strongly marked in two passages of Isaiah (xii. 2, xxvi. 4), the force of which is greatly weakened by the English rendering "the Lord." The former of these should be translated "for my strength and song is JAH JEHOVAH" (comp. Ex. xv. 2); and the latter, "trust ye in Jehovah for ever, for in JAH JEHOVAH is the rock of ages." "Praise ye the Lord," or Hallelujah, should be in all cases "praise ye Jah." In Ps. lxxxix. 8 [9] Jah stands in parallelism with "Jehovah the God of hosts" in a passage which is wrongly translated in our version. It should be "O Jehovah, God of hosts, who like thee is strong, O Jah!"

JAH'LEELITES, THE (הַיִּהְלֵאֲלִי: δ'Αλληλί: *Jalelitae*). A branch of the tribe of Zebulon, descendants of Jahleel (Num. xxvi. 26).

JAH'ZEELITES, THE (הַיִּזְעֵאֲלִי: δ'Ασιηλί: *Jezielitae*). A branch of the Naphthalites, descended from Jahzeel (Num. xxvi. 48).

JESUITES, THE (הַיִּשׁוּי: δ'Ιεσουί: *Jesuitae*). A family of the tribe of Asher (Num. xxvi. 44).

JES'URUN. [JESHURUN.]

JEW (יְהוּדִי), JEWS (יְהוּדִים, Ch. יְהוּדָאִי in Ezr. and Dan.). Originally "man, or men of Judah." The term first makes its appearance just before the Captivity of the ten tribes, and

then is used to denote the men of Judah who held Elath, and were driven out by Rezin king of Syria (2 K. xvi. 6). Elath had been taken by Azariah or Uzziah, and made a colony of Judah (2 K. xiv. 22). The men of Judah in prison with Jeremiah (Jer. xxxii. 12) are called "Jews" in our A. V., as are those who deserted to the Chaldeans (Jer. xxxviii. 19), and the fragments of the tribe which were dispersed in Moab, Edom, and among the Ammonites (Jer. xl. 11). Of these latter were the confederates of Ishmael the son of Nethaniah, who were of the blood-royal of Judah (Jer. xli. 3). The fugitives in Egypt (Jer. xlv. 1) belonged to the two tribes, and were distinguished by the name of the more important; and the same general term is applied to those who were carried captive by Nebuchadnezzar (Jer. lii. 28, 30) as well as to the remnant which was left in the land (2 K. xxv. 25; Neh. i. 2, ii. 16, &c.). That the term *Yehúdi* or "Jew" was in the latter history used of the members of the tribes of Judah and Benjamin without distinction is evident from the case of Mordecai, who, though of the tribe of Benjamin, is called a Jew (Esth. ii. 5, &c.), while the people of the Captivity are called "the people of Mordecai" (Esth. iii. 6). After the Captivity the appellation was universally given to those who returned from Babylon.

JEWS' LANGUAGE, IN THE (יְהוּדִית).

Literally "Jewishly;" for the Hebrew must be taken adverbially, as in the LXX. (Ἰουδαϊστί) and Vulgate (*Judaicè*). The term is only used of the language of the two southern tribes after the Captivity of the northern kingdom (2 K. xviii. 26, 28; 2 Chr. xxxii. 18; Is. xxxvi. 11, 13), and of that spoken by the captives who returned (Neh. xiii. 24). It therefore denotes as well the pure Hebrew as the dialect acquired during the Captivity, which was characterized by Aramaic forms and idioms. Elsewhere (Is. xix. 18) in the poetical language of Isaiah it is called "the lip of Canaan."

JEZ'ERITES, THE (הַיִּזְרְיָה: δ'Ιεσερί; Alex. δ'Ιεσπί; *Jeseritae*). A family of the tribe of Naphtali, descendants of Jezer (Num. xxvi. 49).

JEZ'REEL. 3. (יִזְרְעֵאֵל: 'Ιεζραελ: *Jezrahel*). The eldest son of the prophet Hosea (Hos. i. 4), significantly so called because Jehovah said to the prophet, "Yet a little while and I will avenge the blood of Jezreel upon the house of Jehu," and "I will break the bow of Israel in the valley of Jezreel."

JEZ'REELITE (יִזְרְעֵאֲלִי: 'Ιεζραηλίτης; Alex. 'Ισραηλίτης, once 2 K. ix. 21 'Ιζραηλίτης: *Jezrahelita*). An inhabitant of Jezreel (1 K. xxi. 1, 4, 6, 7, 15, 16; 2 K. ix. 21, 25).

JEZREELI'TESS (יִזְרְעֵאֲלִיטָה: 'Ιεζραηλίτις; Alex. Είζραηλείτις, 'Ιζραηλίτις, 'Ισραηλίτις: *Jezrahelitis, Jezraëlites, Jezraëlitis*). A woman of Jezreel (1 Sam. xxvii. 3, xxx. 5; 2 Sam. ii. 2; iii. 2; 1 Chr. iii. 1).

JO'SEDECH (יְהוֹזָדָק: 'Ιωσεδέκ: *Josedec*). JEHOZADAK the son of Seraiah (Hagg. i. 12, 14; ii. 2, 4; Zech. vi. 11).

END OF APPENDIX.









