

THE AGES DIGITAL LIBRARY  
**REFERENCE**

CYCLOPEDIA of BIBLICAL,  
THEOLOGICAL and  
ECCLESIASTICAL  
LITERATURE

**Ananiel - Apocrypha**

*by James Strong & John McClintock*

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

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

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

**AGES Software Rio, WI USA**  
**Version 1.0 © 2000**

## Anan'iel

(Ἀνανιήλ, i. q. *Hananel*, q.v.), the son of Aduel, father of Tobiel, and grandfather of Tobit (Tobit 1:1).

## Ananus

(Ἄνανος, prob. a Greek form of *Hanan*, q.v.), the name of several men in Josephus.

- 1.** The senior of that name, whose five sons all enjoyed the office of high-priest (Josephus, *Ant.* 20, 9, 1), an office that he himself filled with the greatest fidelity (*War*, 4:3, 7). He is probably the same as Ananus, the son of Seth, who was appointed highpriest by Cyrenius (*Ant.* 23, 2, 1), and removed by Valerius Gratus (*ib.* 2). He is apparently the ANNAS *SEE ANNAS* (q.v.) mentioned in the Gospels.
- 2.** Son of the preceding, high-priest three months, A.D. 62, by appointment of Agrippa (Josephus, *Ant.* 20, 9, 1). He was a man extremely bold and enterprising, of the sect of the Sadducees; who, thinking it a favorable opportunity, after the death of Festus, governor of Judaea, and before the arrival of Albinus, his successor, assembled the Sanhedrim, and therein procured the condemnation of James, the brother (or relative) of Christ, who is often called the bishop of Jerusalem, and of some others, whom they stigmatized as guilty of impiety, and delivered to be stoned. This was extremely displeasing to all considerate men in Jerusalem, and they sent privately to King Agrippa, who had just arrived in Judaea, entreating that he would prevent Ananus from taking such proceedings in future. He was, in consequence, deprived of his office. He was exceedingly active in opposing the Zealots (Josephus, *Life*, 38; *War*, 4, 3, 9-14), and, in consequence, was put to death at Jerusalem at the beginning of the Jewish wars, A.D. 67 (*ib.* 4, 5, 2).
- 3.** Son of Bamadus, the most barbarous of all the guards of Simon the tyrant during the final siege of Jerusalem (Josephus, *War*, 5,13, 1). He was from Emmaus, and deserted to the Romans before the capture of the city (*ib.* 6, 4, 2).
- 4.** A governor (of the Temple), sent by Quadratus as a prisoner to Rome, along with the high-priest Ananias (Josephus, *Ant.* 20, 6, 2); called in the parallel passage (*War*, 2, 12, 6) the son of this Ananias. He was perhaps

the same elsewhere (*War*, 2, 19, 5) called the son of Jonathan (comp. *War*, 2, 12, 5).

## Anaphah

*SEE HERON.*

## Anaphora

(ἀναφορά, *raising up*), in the Greek Church Liturgy, is that part of the service which includes the consecration of the elements. The book containing the service is also called *Anaphora*. The term answers to the *canon missce* of the Roman Liturgy. — Palmer, *Orig. Liturg*, 1, 20,

## Anastasia

a martyr of the fourth century, of Roman descent, instructed in the principles of Christianity by Chrysogonus. Her father, being a pagan, gave her in marriage to a man of his own faith named Publius, who informed against her as a Christian. By command of Florus, governor of Illyricum, she was put to the torture; but, her faith remaining unshaken, he ordered her to be burnt, which sentence was executed December 25, A.D. 304, about one month after the martyrdom of Chrysogonus, her instructor. The Greeks commemorate her as a saint on Dec. 22: the Latins, Dec. 25. — Baillet, under Dec. 25.

## Anastasis

*SEE RESURRECTION.*

## Anastasius I

Pope, a native of Rome, succeeded Siricus about the year 398. He was a contemporary of St. Jerome, who speaks highly of his probity and apostolic zeal. He condemned the doctrine of Origen, and excommunicated Rufinus, who, in a controversy with Jerome, had been the advocate of Origen. Anastasius is said to have acknowledged that he did not understand the controversy. Rufinus wrote an apology, which is found in Constant's collection of the "Epistles of the Popes." Anastasius died in 402, and was succeeded by Innocent I. — Riddle, *Hist. of Papacy*, 1, 150; Baillet, under April 27.

## Anastasius II

Pope, a native of Rome, succeeded Gelasius I in 496. He endeavored to put an end to the schism then existing between the see of Constantinople and that of Rome about the question of precedence. Two letters written by him on the occasion to the Emperor Anastasius are still extant. He also wrote a congratulatory letter to Clovis, king of the Franks, on his conversion to Christianity. He endeavored to revoke the condemnation of Acacius (q.v.), and thus brought upon himself the hatred of the Roman clergy (Baronius, sub anno 497). He died A.D. 498. — Riddle, *Hist. of Papacy*, 1, 192; Baronius, *Annal.* A.D. 496.

## Anastasius III

Pope, likewise a Roman, succeeded Sergius III in 911, and died the following year.

## Anastasius IV

Cardinal Conrad, bishop of Sabina, was elected pope in 1153, after the death of Eugenius III. Rome was then in a very disturbed state, owing to the movements of Arnold of Brescia and his followers. Anastasius died in 1154, and was succeeded by Adrian IV. He wrote a work on the Trinity.

## Anastasius Anti-pope,

elected about 855 in opposition to Benedict III. Emperor Louis, at the request of the people and clergy of Rome, induced him to resign.

## Anastasius St., patriarch of Antioch,

was raised to that throne in 559. The Emperor Justinian, who favored the errors of the *Aphthartodocetæ* (who held that our Lord before his resurrection was, as to his flesh, incorruptible and incapable of suffering), did all in his power to induce Anastasius to support them also, but he persisted in opposing them. Justin II banished him from Antioch, which he did not revisit until 593, after twenty-three years of exile. He died in 598 or 599, amid the heaviest afflictions. Gregory the Great wrote often to him to console him, and to congratulate him on his return. In the second council of Nicaea, a letter of Anastasius was read, in which he drew the distinction between the worship due to God, and that which we render to men and angels, viz., that we serve God alone. His remains may be found in *Bib.*

*Max. Patr.* tom. 9, and in Combefis, *Nov. Auct.* tom. 1. He is often confounded with *Anastasius Sinaita* (q.v.). — Landon, *Eccl. Dict.* 1, 336.

### Anastasius, St. surnamed Astric,

the apostle of Hungary, born in 954, died Sept. 10, 1044. He entered the Benedictine order at Rouen, France. Subsequently he went to Bohemia with Adalbert, bishop of Prague, by whom he was made abbot of Braunau. When Adalbert had to flee from Bohemia, Astric left with him. He found an asylum at the court of Duke Stephen of Hungary, who, in the year 1000, put him at the head of the Benedictine abbey of St. Martin. Stephen having divided his duchy into ten bishoprics, that of Colocza was accorded to Astric, who henceforth assumed the name Anastasius. The duke then sent him to Rome to obtain from the pope, Sylvester II, the sanction of the ecclesiastical organization of Hungary, and for him (Stephen) the title of king. Anastasius was successful in this mission; he brought back for Stephen, with the royal crown and the double cross, the right to regulate the affairs of the Hungarian Church. Being proclaimed king by the nation, Stephen was consecrated and crowned by Anastasius. The latter was, during three years, provisional metropolitan of Hungary, the archbishop of Strigonia being, by a temporary loss of sight, prevented from discharging the duties of his office. While provisional metropolitan, Anastasius was present at the assembly of Frankfort, and blessed the marriage of the king with Gisella, sister of the Emperor Henry. When the archbishop of Strigonia recovered his sight, Anastasius retired into his diocese, when he devoted himself until his death to the propagation of the Christian faith. — *Oesterreichisches biographisches Lexicon* (Vienna, 1851); Hoefer, *Biog. Generale*, 2, 480.

### Anastasius Sinaita

a monk of Matthew Sinai, born, it is supposed, about 600, though the date is undecided. He is said to have traveled much in Egypt and Syria, defending the faith against the Acephalists, Severians, and Theodosians. In his “Odegos,” or “Guide to the Right Path,” he speaks of John who was the Theodosian patriarch of Alexandria from 677 to 686; he was consequently alive about that period, but when he died is not known. He is honored as a saint in the Greek Church. His principal work, the *Odegos* just mentioned, has been attributed by some writers to the patriarch Anastasius, who died in 598; but the fact just mentioned, viz., that John of

Alexandria, who was patriarch from 677 to 686, is spoken of in it, will prove the impossibility of this. This work was published by Gretser, at Ingolstadt, in 1606. Some of the MSS. do not, however, contain the Exposition of the Faith, which is contained in Gretser's edition at the beginning, and differ in many other particulars. The complete works of Anastasius Sinaita have been published by Migne, in *Patrologia Graecae*, tom. 89 (Paris, 1860).

### Anastasius

a Persian martyr who was baptized at Jerusalem. After his baptism he retired into the monastery of Anastasius, and thence imbibing the superstitious desire of martyrdom, he journeyed to Caesarea, When there, he was brought before the governor Barzabanes, who endeavored, first by bribes, and afterward by tortures, to induce him to forsake the faith; failing in his attempts, he sent him into Persia, where he was first strangled, and then beheaded by order of Chosroes, January 22, 628, the day on which he is commemorated as a saint both in the East and West. — Baillet, *Vies des Saints*, Jan. 22; Landon, *Eccl. Dict.* s.v.

### Anastasius

(*Bibliothecarius*), librarian of the Vatican, and abbot of St. Maria Trans-Tiberim at Rome, a celebrated and learned writer of the ninth century. The dates of his birth and death are unknown. He was on terms of intimacy with the learned men of his age, especially with Photius and Hincmar. He was present in 869 at the eighth council of Constantinople, where Photius was condemned. He translated the Acts of the Council from Greek into Latin. He wrote a *Historia Ecclesiastica* (Paris, ed. by Fabrotti. 1649, fol.); but the most important of his writings is a History of the Popes, under the title *De Vitis Romanorum pontificum, a Petro Apostolo ad Nicolaunz I, adjectis vitis Hadriani II et Stephani IV* (Romae, 1718-1735, 4 vols. fol., and several other editions). — Cave, *Hist. Lit.* ann. 870; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 2, 479.

### A'nath

(*Heb.*, *Anath'*, תַּנַּח) an *answer*, i.e. to prayer; Sept. Ἀνάθη), the father of Shamgar, one of the judges of Israel (<sup><OR></sup>Judges 3:31; 5:6). B.C. ante 1429.

## Anath'ema

(ἀνάθεμα), literally any thing *laid up* or suspended (from ἀνατίθημι, *to lay up*), and hence any thing laid up in a temple set apart as sacred (2 Maccabees 9:16). In this general sense the form employed is ἀνάθημα, a word of not unfrequent occurrence in Greek classic authors, and found once in the N.T., <sup><2175></sup>Luke 21:5. The form ἀνάθεμα, as well as its meaning, appears to be peculiar to the Hellenistic dialect (Valekenauer, *Schol.* 1, 593). The distinction has probably arisen from the special use made of the word by the Greek Jews. In the Sept. ἀνάθεμα is the ordinary rendering of the Hebrew word מֵרַךְ *eche'rem* (although in some instances it varies between the two forms, as in <sup><1278></sup>Leviticus 27:28, 29), and in order to ascertain its meaning it will be necessary to inquire into the signification of this word. The Alexandrine writers preferred the short penultimate in this and other kindred words (e.g. ἐπίθεμα, σύνθεμα); but occasionally both forms occur in the MSS., as in <sup><1769></sup>Judges 16:19; 2 Maccabees 13:15; <sup><2175></sup>Luke 21:5: no distinction therefore existed originally in the meanings of the words, as had been supposed by many early writers. The Hebrew מֵרַךְ *cherem*, is derived from a verb signifying primarily to *shut up*, and hence to (1) *consecrate* or *devote*, and (2) *exterminate*. Any object so devoted to the Lord was irredeemable: if an inanimate object, it was to be given to the priests (<sup><1814></sup>Numbers 18:14); if a living creature, or even a man, it was to be slain (<sup><1278></sup>Leviticus 27:28, 29); hence the idea of *extermination* as connected with *devoting*. Generally speaking, a vow of this description was taken only with respect to the idolatrous nations who were marked out for destruction by the special decree of Jehovah, as in <sup><1212></sup>Numbers 21:2; <sup><1617></sup>Joshua 6:17; but occasionally the vow was made indefinitely, and involved the death of the innocent, as is illustrated in the case of Jephthah's daughter (<sup><1713></sup>Judges 11:31), according to many, and certainly in that of Jonathan (<sup><1414></sup>1 Samuel 14:24), who was only saved by the interposition of the people. The breach of such a vow on the part of any one directly or indirectly participating in it was punished with death (<sup><1175></sup>Joshua 7:25). In addition to these cases of spontaneous devotion on the part of individuals, the verb מֵרַךְ ; *charam'*, is frequently applied to the extermination of idolatrous nations: in such cases the idea of a *vow* appears to be dropped, and the word assumes a purely secondary sense (Sept. ἐξολοθρεύω); or, if the original meaning is still to be retained, it may be in the sense of Jehovah (<sup><2342></sup>Isaiah 34:2) *shutting up*, i.e. *placing under a ban*, and so necessitating the *destruction* of them, in order to prevent all contact. The

extermination being the result of a positive command (<sup><0221></sup>Exodus 22:20), the idea of a vow is excluded, although doubtless the instances already referred to (<sup><0202></sup>Numbers 21:2.; <sup><0167></sup>Joshua 6:17) show. how a vow was occasionally superadded to the command. — It may be further noticed that the degree to which the work of destruction was carried out varied. Thus it applied to the destruction of

- (1) men alone (<sup><0103></sup>Deuteronomy 20:13);
- (2) men, women, and children (<sup><0124></sup>Deuteronomy 2:34);
- (3) virgins excepted (<sup><0817></sup>Numbers 31:17; <sup><0211></sup>Judges 21:11);
- (4). all living creatures (<sup><0106></sup>Deuteronomy 20:16; <sup><0153></sup>1 Samuel 15:3);

the spoil in the former cases were reserved for the use of the army (<sup><0125></sup>Deuteronomy 2:35; 20:14; <sup><0128></sup>Joshua 22:8), instead of being given over to the priesthood, as was the case in the recorded vow of Joshua (<sup><0169></sup>Joshua 6:19). See Vow.

**I.** We thus find that the *cherem* was a person or thing consecrated or devoted irrevocably to God, and that it differed from any thing merely vowed or sanctified to the Lord in this respect, that the latter could be re'deemed (Leviticus 28:1-27), while the former was irreclaimable (<sup><0121></sup>Leviticus 27:21, 28); hence, in reference to living creatures, the devoted thing, whether man or beast, must be put to death (<sup><0129></sup>Leviticus 27:29). The prominent idea, therefore, which the word conveyed was that of a person or thing *devoted to destruction*, or *accursed*. Thus the cities of the Canaanites were anathematized (<sup><0202></sup>Numbers 21:2, 3), and, after their complete destruction, the name of the place was called Hormah (**hmrj** ; Sept. **ἀνάθεμα**). Thus, again, the city of Jericho was made an *anathema* to the Lord (<sup><0167></sup>Joshua 6:17); that is, every living thing in it (except Rahab and her family) was devoted to death; that which could be destroyed by fire was burnt, and all that could not be thus consumed (as gold and silver):was forever alienated from man and devoted to the use of the sanctuary (<sup><0124></sup>Joshua 6:24). The prominence thus given to the idea of a *thing accursed* led naturally to the use of the word in cases where there was no reference whatever to consecration to the service of God, as in <sup><0126></sup>Deuteronomy 7:26, where an idol is called **μῖν** εἰς **ἀνάθεμα**, and the Israelites are warned against idolatry lest they should be *anathema* like it. In these instances the term denotes the object of the curse, but it is sometimes used to designate the curse itself (e.g. <sup><0117></sup>Deuteronomy 20:17,



Sept.; comp. <sup><4234></sup>Acts 23:14), and it is in this latter sense that the English word is generally employed.

In this sense, also, the Jews of later times use the Hebrew term, though with a somewhat different meaning as to the curse intended. The **μῖj echerem**, of the rabbins signifies excommunication or exclusion from the Jewish Church. The more recent rabbinical writers reckon three kinds or degrees of excommunication, all of which are occasionally designated by this generic term (Elias Levita, in *Sepher Tisbi*).

**1.** The first of these, **γWḌnj nidau'i**, *separation*, is merely in temporary separation or suspension from ecclesiastical privileges, involving, however, various civil inconveniences, particularly seclusion from society to the distance of four cubits. The person thus excommunicated was not debarred entering the temple, but instead of going in on the right hand, as was customary, he was obliged to enter on the left, the usual way of departure: if he died while in this condition there was no mourning for him, but a stone was thrown on his coffin to indicate that he was separated from the people and had deserved stoning. Buxtorf (*Lex. Talm.* col. 1304) enumerates twenty-four causes of this kind of excommunication: it lasted thirty days, and was pronounced without a curse. If the individual did not repent at the expiration of the term (which, however, according to Buxtorf, was extended in such cases to sixty or ninety days), the second kind of excommunication was resorted to.

**2** This was called simply and more properly **μῖj echerem**, *curse*. It could only be pronounced by an assembly of at least ten persons, and was always accompanied with curses. The formula employed is given at length by Buxtorf (*Lex.* col. 828). A person thus excommunicated was cut off from all religious and social privileges: it was unlawful either to eat or drink with him (comp. <sup><4511></sup>1 Corinthians 5:11). The curse could be dissolved, however, by three common persons, or by one person of dignity.

**3.** If the excommunicated person still continued impenitent, a yet more severe sentence was, according to the rabbins, pronounced against him, which was termed **aTMvj sham'-mata'**, *imprecation* (Elias Levita, in *Tisbi*). It is described: as a complete excision from the Church and the giving up of the individual to the judgment of God and to final perdition. There is, however, reason to believe that these three grades are of recent origin. The Talmudists frequently use the term by which the first and last

are designated interchangeably, and some rabbinical writers (whom Lightfoot has followed in his *force Hebr. et Talmi ad* <sup><418></sup>1 Corinthians 5:5) consider the last to be a lower grade than the second; yet it is probable that the classification rests on the fact that the sentence was more or less severe according to the circumstances of the case; and though we cannot expect to find the three grades distinctly marked in the writings in the N.T., we may not improbably find the phrase “put out of the synagogue,” <sup><418></sup>ἀποσυνάγαγον ποιεῖν, <sup><418></sup>John 16:2 (comp. 9:22; 12:42), as referring to a lighter censure than is intended by one or more of the three terms used in <sup><418></sup>Luke 6:22, where perhaps different grades are intimated. The phrase “deliver over to Satan” (<sup><418></sup>1 Corinthians 5:5; <sup><510></sup>1 Timothy 1:20) has been by many commentators understood to refer to the most severe kind of excommunication. Even admitting the allusion, however, there is a very important difference between the Jewish censure and the formula employed by the apostle. In the Jewish sense it would signify the delivering over of the transgressor to final perdition, while the apostle expressly limits his sentence to the “destruction of the flesh” (i.e. the depraved nature), and resorts to it in order “that the spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus,” *SEE ACCURSED*.

**II.** But, whatever diversity of opinion there may be as to the degrees of excommunication, it is on all hands admitted that the term <sup><418></sup>μῆτις with which we are more particularly concerned as the equivalent of the Greek <sup><418></sup>ἀνάθεμα, properly denotes, in its rabbinical use, an excommunication accompanied with the most severe curses and denunciations of evil. We are therefore prepared to find that the *anathema* of the N.T. always implies execration; but it yet remains to be ascertained whether it is ever used to designate a judicial act of excommunication. That there is frequently no such reference is very clear: in some instances the individual denounces the anathema on himself, unless certain conditions are fulfilled. The Inoun and its corresponding verb are thus used in <sup><422></sup>Acts 23:12, 14, 21, and the verb occurs with a similar meaning in <sup><424></sup>Matthew 26:74; <sup><417></sup>Mark 14:71. The phrase “to call Jesus anathema” (<sup><417></sup>1 Corinthians 12:3) refers not to a judicial sentence pronounced by the Jewish authorities, but to the act of any private individual who execrated him and pronounced him accursed. That this was a common practice among the Jews appears from the rabbinical writings. The term, as it is used in reference to any who should preach another gospel, “Let him be anathema” (<sup><408></sup>Galatians 1:8, 9), has the same meaning as let him be accounted execrable and accursed. In none

of these instances do we find any reason to think that the word was employed to designate specifically and technically excommunication either from the Jewish or the Christian Church. There remain only two passages in which the word occurs in the N.T., both presenting considerable difficulty to the translator.

(a.) With regard to the first of these (~~450B~~Romans 9:3), Grotius and others understand the phrase “accursed from Christ,” ἀνάθεμα εἶναι ἀπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, to signify excommunication from the Christian Church, while most of the fathers, together with Tholuck, Ruckert, and a great number of modern interpreters, explain the term as referring to the Jewish practice of excommunication. On the other hand, Deyling, Olshausen, De Wette, and many more, adopt the more general meaning of accursed. The great difficulty is to ascertain the extent of the evil which Paul expresses his willingness to undergo; Chrysostom, Calvin, and many others understand it to include final separation, not, indeed, from the love, but from the presence of Christ; others limit it to a violent death; and others, again, explain it as meaning the same kind of curse as that under which they might be delivered by repentance and the reception of the Gospel (Deylingii *Observatt. Sacrae*, pt. 2, p. 495 and sq.). It would occupy too much space to refer to other interpretations of the passage, or to pursue the investigation of it further. There seems, however, little reason to suppose that a judicial act of the Christian Church is intended, and we may remark that much of the difficulty which commentators have felt seems to have arisen from their not keeping in mind that the apostle does not speak of his wish as, a possible thing, and their consequently pursuing to all its results what should be regarded simply as an expression of the most intense desire (ἠὺχόμενῃ ἠὺχόμεν ἄν, *I could wish*, i.e. were such a thing proper or available, see Winer, *Idioms*, p. 222). Some have even thought (taking the verb as a *historical Imperfect*) that the apostle was simply referring to his former detestation of Christ, when yet unconverted (see Bloomfield, *Recensao Synopt.* in loc.), and Tregelles proposes (*Account of Gr. Text of N.T.* p. 219) to remove the difficulty altogether in this way, by enclosing the clause in question in a parenthesis. See Woltii *Curae*, in loc.; Poll *synopsis*, in loc.; Trautermann, *Illustratio* (*Jen.* 1758); *Meth. Quart. Rev.* 1863, p. 420 sq. **SEE BAN.**

(b.) The phrase ANATHEMA MARAN-ATHA **SEE ANATHEMA MARAN-ATHA**, ἀνάθεμα μαρὰν ἀθά (~~462~~1 Corinthians 16:22), has been considered by many to be equivalent to the aTMivj *shammata*, of the

rabbins, the third and most severe form of excommunication. This opinion is derived from the supposed etymological identity of the Syriac phrase itself, *maran-atha* (q.v.), *ata}rm*; “the Lord cometh,” with the Hebrew word which is considered by these commentators to be derived from *hta}mveshem atha*, “the Name (i.e. Jehovah) cometh.” This explanation, however, can rank no higher than a plausible conjecture, since it is supported by no historical evidence. The Hebrew term is never found thus divided, nor is it ever thus explained by Jewish writers, who, on the contrary, give etymologies different from this (Buxtorf, *Lex.* col. 2466). It is, moreover, very uncertain whether this third kind of excommunication was in use in the time of Paul; and the phrase which he employs is not found in any rabbinical writer (Lightfoot, *Horae Hebr. et Talm.* on <sup>4162</sup>1 Corinthians 16:22). The literal meaning of the words is clear, but it is not easy to understand why the Syriac phrase is here employed, or what is its meaning in connection with anathema. Lightfoot supposes that the apostle uses it to signify that he pronounced this anathema against the Jews. However this may be, the supposition that the anathema, whatever be its precise object, is intended to designate excommunication from the Christian Church, as Grotius and Augusti understand it, appears to rest on very slight grounds: it seems preferable to regard it, with Lightfoot, Olshausen, and most other commentators, as simply an expression of detestation. Though, however, we find little or no evidence of the use of the word anathema in the N, T. as the technical term for excommunication, it is certain that it obtained this meaning in the early ages of the Church; for it is thus employed in the apostolic canons, in the canons of various councils, by Chrysostom, Theodoret, and other Greek fathers (Suiceri *Thesaurus Eccl.* s. vv. *ἀνάθεμα* and *ἀφορισμός*). *SEE EXCOMMUNICATION.*

**III.** Anathema, in ecclesiastical usage, is the cutting off any person from the communion or privileges of a society. The anathema differed from simple ex communication in being attended with curses and execrations. It signifies not only to cut off the living from the Church, but the dead from salvation. It was practiced in the early Church against notorious offenders. The form has been preserved: the following was pronounced by Synesius against one Andronicus: “Let no Church of God be open to Andronicus and his accomplices, but let every sacred temple and church be shut against them. I admonish both private men and magistrates to receive them neither under their roof nor to their table; and priests, more especially, that they

neither converse with them living nor attend their funerals when dead.” When any one was thus anathematized, notice was given to the neighboring churches, and occasionally to the churches over the world, that all might confirm and ratify this act of discipline by refusing to admit such a one into their communion. The form of denouncing anathemas against heresies and heretics is very ancient. But as zeal about opinions increased, and Christians began to set a higher value on trifles than on the weightier matters of the law, it became a common practice to add anathemas to every point in which men differed from each other. At the Council of Trent a whole body of divinity was put into canons, and an anathema affixed to each. How fearful an instrument of power the anathema was in the hands of popes in the Middle Ages is attested by history. Popes still continue to hurl anathemas against heretics, which are little regarded. — Bingham, *Orig. Eccles*, bk. 16, ch. 2, § 16. *SEE INTERDICTION*.

Treatises on this subject are the following: Dirr, *De anathemate* (Alta. 1662); Baldwin, *De anathematismis* (Viteb. 1620); Bose, in Winckler’s *Tenpe sacr.* p. 231 sq.; Fecht, *De precibus contra alios* (Rost. 1708); Pipping, *De imprecationibus* (Lips. 1721); Pisanski, *Vindiciae Psalmorum ob execrationes* (Regiom. 1779); Poncarius, *De imprecationibus in impios*, in the *Bibl. Lubec.* p. 565 sq. *SEE IMPRECATION*.

## An’athoth

(*Heb.*, *A nathoth*, ת/תנ[ ] *answers*, i.e. to prayers; *Sept.* Ἀναθώθ), the name of one city and of two men.

**1.** One of the towns belonging to the priests in the tribe of Benjamin, and as such a city of refuge (<sup><16218></sup>Joshua 21:18). it is omitted from the list in Joshua 18, but included “suburbs” (<sup><13160></sup>1 Chronicles 6:60 [45]). Hither, to his “fields,” Abiathar was banished by Solomon after the failure of his attempt to put Adonijah on the throne (<sup><11026></sup>1 Kings 2:26). This was the native place of Abiezer, one of David’s 30 captains (<sup><10237></sup>2 Samuel 23:27; <sup><31128></sup>1 Chronicles 11:28; 27:12), and of Jehu, another of the mighty men (<sup><13128></sup>1 Chronicles 12:3). The “men” (μυνία) not μυνB; as in most of the other cases; compare, however, Netophah, Michmash, etc.) of Anathoth returned from the captivity with Zerubbabel (<sup><15123></sup>Ezra 2:23; <sup><16727></sup>Nehemiah 7:27; 1 Esdras 5:18). It is chiefly memorable, however, as the birthplace and usual residence of the prophet Jeremiah (<sup><21010></sup>Jeremiah 1:1; 11:21-23;

29:27; 32:7-9), whose name it seems to have borne in the time of Jerome, “Anathth of Jeremiah” (*Onomast.* s.v.). The same writer (*Comment. in Jeremiah* 1, 1) places Anathoth three Roman miles north of Jerusalem, which correspond with the twenty stadia assigned by Josephus (*Ant.* 10, 7, 3). In the Talmud (*Yoma*, 10) it is called *Anath* (תנח). (For other notices, see Reland’s *Palest.* p. 561 sq.) Anathoth lay on or near the great road from the north to Jerusalem (<sup><2300></sup>Isaiah 10:30). The traditional site at *Kuriet el-Enab* does not fulfill these conditions, being 10 miles distant from the city, and nearer west than north. Dr. Robinson (*Researches*, 2, 109) appears to have discovered this place in the present village of *Anata*, at the distance of an hour and a quarter from Jerusalem (Tobler, *Topogr.* 5, *Jerus.* 2, 394). It is seated on a broad ridge of hills, and commands an extensive view of the eastern slope of the mountainous tract of Benjamin, including also the valley of the Jordan, and the northern part of the Dead Sea (see Hackett’s *Illustr. of Script.* p. 191). It seems to have been once a walled town and a place of strength. Portions of the wall still remain, built of large hewn stones, and apparently ancient, as are also the foundations of some of the houses. It is now a small and very poor village; yet the cultivation of the priests survives in tilled fields of grain, with figs and olives. From the vicinity a favorite kind of building-stone is carried to Jerusalem. Troops of donkeys are employed in this service, a hewn stone being slung on each side; the larger stones are transported on camels (Raumer’s *Paldistina*, p. 169; Thomson’s *Land and Book*, 2, 548).

Its inhabitants were sometimes called ANATHOTHITES *SEE ANATHOTHITES* (*Annethothi*’, יתיתח) “Anethothite,” <sup><1027></sup>2 Samuel 23:27; or *Anthothi*’, יתיתח) “Antothite,” <sup><3128></sup>1 Chronicles 11:28; “Anetothite,” 27:12). *SEE ANTOTHITE*.

**2.** The eighth named of the nine sons of Becher, the son of Benjamin (<sup><13708></sup>1 Chronicles 7:8). B.C. post 1856.

**3.** One of the chief Israelites that sealed the covenant on the return from Babylon (<sup><16009></sup>Nehemiah 10:19), B.C. cir. 410.

## Anatolius

bishop of Laodicea, in Syria, was born at Alexandria, in Egypt, about 230. He excelled, according to Jerome, in arithmetic, geometry, astronomy, physics, logic, and rhetoric. About 264 he traveled into Syria and Palestine;

and while at Caesarea, Theoctenus, bishop of that see, made him his coadjutor, meaning that he should have succeeded him; but as he passed through Laodicea, on his way to the council of Antioch in 269, he was retained to be bishop of that see. He signalized his episcopate by his constant endeavors to destroy heresy and idolatry, and to cause virtue to flourish. He seems to have lived until the time of Diocletian, and to have died in peace. The Roman Martyrology marks his festival on the 3d of July. He left a Treatise on Arithmetic, in ten books, and one on Easter, *Canon Paschalis*, a fragment of which is given by Eusebius. A Latin translation of the entire *Canon Paschalis*, published by Aegidius Bucher (Amsterd. 1634; reprinted in Gallandii *Bibl. Patr.* t. 3), has been shown by Ideler (*Handbuch der Chronologie*, 2, 266 sq.) to be spurious. — Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* 7, 32.

### Anchieta, Jose De

a Jesuit, born in 1533 at Teneriffe, was from 1554 to 1558 missionary in Brazil, where he distinguished himself more than any other member of his order. He is often called the Apostle of Brazil. He had an extraordinary influence over the Indians, who, under his guidance, aided in establishing the city of Rio, and in expelling the French from the country. He is the author of a grammar of the Brazilian Indians, which is still regarded as a classic work on that subject (see *Ausland*, 1835, p. 650 sq.). Although a large number of miracles were reported of him, he has not yet been canonized. He died June 19, 1597. A Latin biography of him was published by Beretarius in Cologne, 1617.

### Anchor

#### Picture for Anchor 1

(ἄγκυρα), the instrument fastened in the bottom of the sea to hold a vessel firm during a storm (<sup>427B</sup>Acts 27:29, 30, 40); from which passage it appears that the vessels of Roman commerce had several anchors, and that they were attached to the stern as well as prow of the boat (see Conybeare and Howson, *St. Paul*, 2, 335). The anchors used by the Romans were for the most part made of iron, and their form resembled that of the modern anchor. The anchor as here represented, and as commonly used, was called *bidens*, because it had two teeth or flukes. Sometimes it had one only. The following expressions were used for the three principal processes in managing the anchor: *Ancoram solvere*, ἄγκυραν χαλᾶν, “to loose the

anchor;” *Ancoram jacere*, βάλλειν, ῥίπτειν, “to cast anchor;” *Ancoram tollere*, αἶρειν, ἀναιρείσθαι, ἀνάσπασθαι, “to weigh anchor.” The anchor usually lay on the deck, and was attached to a cable (*funis*), which passed through a hole in the prow, termed *oculus*. In the heroic times of Greece we find large stones, called εὐναί (*sleepers*), used instead of anchors (Hom. *Iliad*, 1, 436). See SHIP.

## Picture for Anchor 2

In ~~869~~ Hebrews 6:19, the word *anchor* is used metaphorically for a spiritual support in times of trial or doubt; a figure common to modern languages. *SEE HOPE.*

## Anchorets

*SEE ANACHORETS.*

## Ancient of Days

(Chald. ἡμιῖν ἡμερῶν; Sept. παλαιὸς ἡμῶν, Vulg. *antiquus dierum*), an expression applied to Jehovah thrice in a vision of Daniel (ch. 7, 9, 13, 22), apparently much in the same sense as Eternal. *SEE JEHOVAH.* The expression, viewed by itself, is somewhat peculiar; but it is doubtless employed by way of contrast to the successive monarchies which appeared one after another rising before the eye of the prophet. These all proved to be ephemeral existences, partaking of the corruption and evanescence of earth; and so, when the supreme Lord and Governor of all appeared to pronounce their doom, and set up his own everlasting kingdom, He is not unnaturally symbolized as the Ancient of Days — one who was not like those new formations, the offspring of a particular time, but who had all time, in a manner, in his possession — one whose days were past reckoning. *SEE DANIEL (BOOK OF).*

## Ancillon, David

was born March 17, 1617, at Metz, where his father was an eminent lawyer. After studying at the Jesuits' College in Metz, he went to Geneva in 1633, to complete his studies in philosophy and theology, and in 1641 was licensed to preach by the Protestant Synod of Charenton, and appointed minister of Meaux, where he remained till 1653, when he returned to Metz; and here he continued to officiate with great reputation till the revocation of the Edict of Nantes in 1685, when he retired to



Frankfort, and afterward to Berlin, where he was received with great favor by the Elector of Brandenburg. He died Sept. 3, 1692. Among his writings are, *Traite de Tradition* (Sedan, 1657, 4to); *Vie de Farel* (Amst. 1691, 12mo), etc.. Perhaps, however, the most favorable impression of his varied learning is to be obtained from the work entitled “*Melanges Critiques de Litterature, recueilli des Conversations de feu M. Ancillon.*” published at Basle in 1698 by his son Charles, who was a man of literary distinction (see Haag, *La France Protestante*, 1, 80; Bayle, *Dict.* s.v.).

### Ancillon, Jean Pierre Frederic

a descendant of David Ancillon, was born at Berlin on the 30th of April, 1766. He studied theology, and on his return from the university he was appointed teacher at the military academy of Berlin, and preacher at the French church of the same town. He began his literary career by a work entitled “*Melanges de Litterature et de Philosophie* (Berlin, 1801, 2 vols. 8vo); and a few years after he was elected a member of the Academy of Sciences of Berlin, and was, at the same time, appointed its historiographer. His preaching at Berlin attracted the attention of the king, and he was drawn into political life. In 1806 he was appointed instructor of the Crown Prince of Prussia, and was further distinguished by the title of Councillor of State. In 1825 he was made Minister of Foreign Affairs, in which office he died, April 10, 1837. — *Biog. Dict. Soc. Useful Knowledge*; Haag, *La France Protestante*, 1, 90.

### Ancyra

a city in Galatia (see Smith’s *Dict. of Class. Geog.* s.v.), where three councils were held:

**I.** In 314, attended by twelve or eighteen bishops; the subject of apostates was discussed, and twenty-five canons framed.

**II.** Semi-Arian, in 358, on the second formula of Sirmium (q.v.).

**III.** In 375, when Hypsius, bishop of Parnassus, was deposed. — Smith, *Tables of Church Hist.*

### Anderson, Christopher

an English Baptist minister, born at Edinburgh, Feb. 19, 1782, and educated at the Baptist College, Bristol. In 1806 he commenced his labors

as a city missionary in Edinburgh at his own expense; and in ten years a church was established, of which he remained pastor until his death. He was one of the principal founders of the Edinburgh Bible Society (1809) and of the Gaelic School Society (1811). He died Feb. 18, 1852. Besides fugitive essays on missions, etc. he wrote "*The Design of the Domestic Constitution*" (Lond. 8vo): *Historical Sketches of the Ancient Irish* (Edinb. 1828, 12mo) — *Annals of the English Bible* (Lond. 1845, 2 vols. 8vo). — Jamieson. *Relig. Biog.* p. 16

### Anderson, John, D.D.

an eminent Presbyterian minister, born in Guilford, N.C., April 10, 1767. Licensed to preach in 1791. He itinerated in Kentucky, Tennessee, and Ohio until 1801, when he became pastor at Upper Buffalo, Washington Co., Pa., where he remained till 1833. He was made D.D. by Washington College, 1821. He died Jan. 5, 1835. Many ministers of eminence studied in Dr. Anderson's house. Sprague, *Annals*, 3, 588.

### Anderson (or Andreae), Lars (or Laurent)

chancellor of Gustavus Vasa, born in Sweden in 1480. He was at first a priest at Strengnas, and became subsequently archdeacon at Upsal. On his return from a journey to Rome he passed through Wittenberg, and became convinced of the truth of Luther's doctrines. Arriving in Sweden, he was made chancellor by Gustavus Vasa, who readily seconded all his efforts for promoting the Reformation in Sweden. At the request of the king, Anderson, together with Olaus Petri, translated the Bible into Swedish. The Reformation was established by the Diet of Westeras in 1527. Anderson was high in office and favor until 1540, when he was charged with having failed to disclose a conspiracy against the king of which he had knowledge, and he was sentenced to death. He was, however, let off for a sum of money, and retired to Strengnais, where he died, April 29, 1552. — Hoefler, *Biog. Generale*, 2, 520.

### Anderson, Peyton

a Methodist preacher of Virginia, born 1795, entered the Virginia Conference at nineteen, and preached in the principal cities and stations until his death in 1823, aged twenty-eight. Mr. Anderson was a teacher previous to his ministry, and, being well-educated, modest, faithful, and circumspect, and greatly devoted to his calling, his promise of future

usefulness to the church was rapidly maturing, when he died. — *Minutes of Conferences*, 1824.

### Andrada, Antonio d'

a Portuguese Jesuit and missionary, born at Villa de Oleiros about 1580, died August 20, 1633. He entered the order of Jesuits at Coimbra in 1596, and was, in 1601, sent as missionary to India. Having been appointed superior of the missions of Mongolia, he learned that in Thibet certain vestiges of Christianity, or some form of religious worship similar to that of the Roman Catholic Church, was to be found. He accordingly concluded to visit that, until then, almost entirely unknown country. He successfully accomplished the hazardous journey, and reached Caparanga, a city which was the residence of the military chief of Thibet. It is said that he was well received by the grandees and the court, and that he was allowed to preach and to erect a temple to the Virgin Mary. He returned to Mongolia in order to associate with himself other missionaries. With these he went a second time to Thibet, where he again met with a favorable reception.

Subsequently he was elected provincial of the residence of Goa, where he remained until his death. Andrada published an account of his first journey to Thibet under the title *Novo Descobrimento do Grao Catayo, ou dos Reynos de Thibet* (Lisb. 1626, 4to) — (*New Discovery of the Great Cathay, or the Kingdoms of Thibet*). This work was translated into many other languages — into French in 1629. — Hoefler, *Biog. Generale*, 2, 546.

### Andrada, Diogo Payva d'

a Portuguese theologian, was born at Coimbra in 1528, and became grand treasurer of King John. He distinguished himself at the Council of Trent, concerning which he wrote *Questionum Orthodoxarum libri x*, against Chemnitz *Examen 'Conc. Trid.* (Venice, 1564, 4to); also *Defensio Fidei Trident. lib. vi* (Lisb. 1578, 4to); *De Conciliorum Auctoritate*: and several volumes of sermons. He died in 1575. — Alegambe, *Bibl. Script. Soc. Jesu*; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 1, 533.

### Andraca

or *Thomas de Jesus*, brother of the last, and monk of the Augustine monastery at Coimbra. He laid the foundation in 1578 of the *Discalceats*. He followed King Don Sebastian into Africa, and was taken prisoner at the

battle of Alcacer, August 4, 1578, and thrown by the infidels into a dungeon. where no other light penetrated but that which came to him through the cracks in the door. Here he wrote, in Portuguese, *The Labors of Jesus*, which obtained great celebrity, and has been translated into Spanish, Italian, and French. He died April 17. 1582, in the place of his confinement, where, in spite of the ransom sent by his sister, the Countess of Linhares, he preferred to remain, that he might comfort, during the remainder of his days, the Christian captives imprisoned with him. Father Alexis de Meneses has written his *Life*, which is appended to “The Labors of Jesus,” printed in 1631. — Landon, *Eccles. Dict.* 1, 350.

### Andrea, Jakob

a celebrated Lutheran theologian, born at Waiblingen, in Wurtemberg, March 25, 1528. In 1543 he took the degree of B.A. in the University of Tubingen, and in 1553 that of doctor in theology. In 1546 he became deacon in Stuttgart; and when the Spanish troops took the town, he alone, of all the Protestant pastors, remained. In 1555 and 1556 he labored successfully in planting the Reformation in Oettingen and Baden. In 1557 he attended the diets of Frankfort and Ratisbon, and was one of the secretaries at the Conference of Worms. In 1557 he published his work *De Coena Domini*, and in the year following he published a reply to the work of Staphylus (who had gone over to the Roman Church) against Luther, in which that writer had made a collection of the various opinions of all the different Protestant sects, and attributed them to Luther as the origin of all. In 1562 he was made professor of theology and chancellor of the University of Tubingen. He went, in 1563, to Strasburg, where Zanchius had been propounding the doctrine that the elect cannot fall from grace, sin as they will, and persuaded Zanchius to sign a confession of faith which he drew up. See ZANCHIUS. During the next eight years he traveled largely in Germany and Bohemia, consolidating the Reformation. In 1571 he combatted the notion of Flaccius Illyricus that *sin is a substance*. But the most important labor of his life was his share in the preparation of the *Formula Concordice*, composed by a meeting of divines at Torgau, 1576, and revised in April, 1577. at the monastery of Berg, by Andrea, Chemnitz, and Selnekker. This *Liber Bergensis* was accepted by Augustus, elector of Saxony, who caused his clergy to sign it, and invited those of other German states to sign also. Many refused. The book, previously revised by Musculus, Cornerus, and Chytraeus, with a preface by Andrea, was printed in 1579. (See Francke, *Libri Symbolici*, part 3, Prolegom.; and *SEE*

*FORMULA CONCORDIE*.) It is thoroughly polemical, on the Lutheran side, against the Calvinistic view of the sacraments. An account of the controversies caused by the *Formula* is given by Mosheim (*Ch. Hist.* cent. 16, sec. 3, pt. 2, ch. 1). Andrei labored earnestly to gain general assent to the *Formula*; for five years he traveled widely, conferring with princes, magistrates, and pastors. In 1583 and 1584 he labored at a voluminous work on the ubiquity of Christ. In 1586 he disputed with Beza at the colloquy of Montbelliard, and died at Tübingen Jan. 7. 1590. He wrote more than one hundred and fifty different works, chiefly polemical — Mosheim, *Ch. Hist.* cent. 16, pt. 2, ch. 1, § 38-40; Niedner's *Zeitschrift*, 1853, Heft in; Herzog, *Real-Encyclopadie*, s.v.

### Andreus, Abraham

Lutheran archbishop of Upsala, a native of Angermannland, died in 1607. While rector of the university of Stockholm he offended King John, the son of Gustavus Wasa, who wished to reestablish the Roman Catholic Church in Sweden. In order to escape imprisonment he fled to Germany, where he spent thirteen years, during which time he published most of his works. In 1593, after the death of John, and during the absence of Sigismund, his successor, who was at the same time king of Poland, the Swedish clergy met at Upsal, resolved to maintain the Confession of Augsburg, and unanimously elected Andreae archbishop. King John Sigismund, on his arrival at Stockholm, had to confirm the election, and he was crowned by Andreae. Duke Charles, the prince regent of Sweden, charged him with reorganizing the church affairs; but on the tour which he undertook to this end he raised the indignation of the people by his rigor, and incurred the displeasure of the regent. Being moreover accused of a secret understanding with Sigismund, he was deprived of his office and imprisoned in the Castle of Gripsholm, where he died. Andreae wrote a work against the Adiaphorists (*Forum Adiaphorum*, Wittenberg, 1587, 8vo), with several other works. He also translated a commentary on Daniel by Draconitis, and published several works of his father-in-law, Laurentius Petri de Nerike. — Hoefer, *Biog. Generale*, 2, 574.

### Andreas Cretensis

(*Andrew of Crete*), so called because he was archbishop of that island. Born at Damascus about 635, he embraced the monastic state at Jerusalem, for which reason he is sometimes styled *Hierosolymitanus*. He was a

vehement antagonist of the Monothelites, was ordained deacon at Constantinople, and shortly after was made archbishop of Crete, which church he governed for many years, and died at Mitylene at the end of the seventh century. Besides his sermons, homilies, and orations, he wrote many hymns; some of which are still sung in the Greek churches. The Greek Church commemorates him as a saint on July 4. His remains are gathered under the title *Opera Gr. et Lat. cum notis Combefis*, fol. (Paris, 1644). — Cave, *Hist. Lit.* anno 635; Landon, *Eccles. Dict.* 1, 352.

## Andreas

archbishop of Crain in Austria, one of the forerunners of Luther, lived in the second half of the fifteenth century. Having been sent by the Emperor Frederick III to Rome, he was scandalized at the manners of the Roman court. Andreas urged the necessity of a reform of the church upon the cardinals and the pope, who at first praised his zeal, but when Andreas became more urgent had him put in prison in 1482. Having been liberated through the intervention of Emperor Frederick III, he went to Basle, and attempted to convoke another general council. Public opinion and the universities showed to him a great deal of sympathy, but the pope excommunicated him and all who would give him an asylum. When the city of Basle refused to expel Andreas, the papal legate put it under the interdict, to which, however, no one paid any attention except the Carmelite monks, who on that account were refused any alms by the citizens, and nearly starved to death. After a long negotiation between the pope and the emperor, Andreas was summoned to retract, and when he refused he was put in prison, where, after a few months, he was found hung, in 1484 — on the same day, it is said, when Luther was born. His body was put in a barrel, and, through the executioner, thrown into the Rhine. — Hoefler, *Biog. Generale*.

## Andreas, or Andreai, Johann Valentin

grandson of Jakob, was born at Herrenberg, Aug. 17, 1586. After completing his academic course at Tübingen, he traveled for some years as tutor. In 1614 he became deacon at Vaihingen, where he labored zealously six years as preacher and writer, directing his efforts mainly against formalism and mysticism. Himself a practical Christian, he mourned over the frivolous learning and pedantry of the time, and directed his life and labors against it. But instead of attacking them in the usual way, he

adopted wit and satire as his weapons. He wrote *Menippus, sive Satyricorum dialogorumn centuria* against unpractical orthodoxy, and *Alethea Exul* against cabalistic theosophy. His *Fama Fraternitatis Rosae Crucis* (1614), and *Confessio fraternitatis R. C.* (1615), were an ironical attack on the secret societies of his times. Those who did not understand the mystification ascribed to him the foundation of the Rosicrucians (q, v.). He wrote again, and book after book, to show that his first work was fictitious, and designed to teach a useful lesson; but nobody would believe him at first. But finally he was understood, and “no satire was probably ever attended with more beneficial results.” His real object was to overthrow the idols of the time in literature and religion, and to bring the minds of men back to Christ; and no writer of his time did more to accomplish this end. He removed to Caly in 1620, where, after the battle of Nordlingen, 1634, he lost his library and other property. He died at Adelsberg, June 27, 1654. For a further account of him, see Hossbach, *Andrea und sein Zeitalter* (Berlin, 1819); Hurst, *History of Rationalism*; chap. 1; Rheinwald, *Andrea Vita ab ipso conscripta* (Berl. 1849); Hase, *Church History*, § 380.

## An'drew

(**Ἀνδρέας**, *manly*), one of the twelve apostles. His name is of Greek origin (Athen. 15:675; 7:312), but was in use among the later Jews (Josephus, *Ant.* 12, 2, 2; see Dio Cass. 68, 32; comp. Died. Sic. *Excerpta Vat.* p. 14, ed. Lips.), as appears from a passage quoted from the Jerusalem Talmud by Lightfoot (*Harmony*, ~~450~~ Luke 5:10). He was a native of the city of Bethsaida in Galilee (~~404~~ John 1:44), and brother of Simon Peter (~~404B~~ Matthew 4:18; 10:2; ~~404B~~ John 1:41). He was at first a disciple of John the Baptist (~~403~~ John 1:39), and was led to receive Jesus as the Messiah in consequence of John's expressly pointing him out as “the Lamb of God” (~~403~~ John 1:36), A.D. 26. His first care, after he had satisfied himself as to the validity of the claims of Jesus, was to bring to him his brother Simon. Neither of them, however, became at that time stated attendants on our Lord; for we find that they were still pursuing their occupation as fishermen on the Sea of Galilee when Jesus, after John's imprisonment, called them to follow him (~~404B~~ Matthew 4:18 sq.; ~~4016~~ Mark 1:16,17). A.D. 27. **SEE PETER**. In two of the lists of the apostles (~~4002~~ Matthew 10:2; ~~4063~~ Luke 6:13) he is named in the first pair with Peter, but in ~~4018~~ Mark 3:18, in connection with Philip, and in ~~4013~~ Acts 1:13, With James. In accompanying Jesus he appears as one of the confidential disciples

(<sup>413B</sup>Mark 13:3; <sup>418B</sup>John 6:8; 12:22), but he is by no means to be confounded (as by Lutzelberger, *Kirchl. Tradit. iber Joh.* p. 199 sq.) with the *beloved disciple* of the fourth Gospel (see Licke, *Comm. Lib. Joh.* 1, 653 sq.; Maier, *Conzm. zu Joh.* 1, 43 sq.). Very little is related of Andrew by any of the evangelists: the principal incidents in which his name occurs during the life of Christ are the feeding of the five thousand (<sup>410B</sup>John 6:9), his introducing to our Lord certain Greeks who desired to see him (<sup>4122B</sup>John 12:22), and his asking, along with his brother Simon and the two sons of Zebedee, for a further explanation of what our Lord had said in reference to the destruction of the temple (<sup>413B</sup>Mark 13:3). Of his subsequent history and labors we have no authentic record. Tradition assigns Scythia (Eusebius, 3, 71), Greece (Theodoret, 1, 1425; Jerome, Ep. 148 *ad Maarc.*), and, at a later date, Asia Minor, Thrace (Hippolytus, 2:30), and elsewhere (Niceph. 2:39), as the scenes of his ministry. It is supposed that he founded a church in Constantinople, and ordained Stachys (q.v.), named by Paul (<sup>4510B</sup>Romans 16:9), as its first bishop. At length, the tradition states, he came to Patrae, a city of Achaia, where AÆgeas, the proconsul, enraged at his persisting to preach, commanded him to join in sacrifices to the heathen gods; and upon the apostle's refusal, he ordered him to be severely scourged and then crucified. To make his death the more lingering, he was fastened to the cross, not with nails, but with cords. Having hung two days, praising God, and exhorting the spectators to the faith, he is said to have expired on the 30th of November, but in what year is uncertain. The cross is stated to have been of the form called *Crux decussata* (X), and commonly known as "St. Andrew's cross;" but this is doubted by some (see Lepsius, *De cruce*, 1, 7; Sagittar. *De cruciatib. martyr.* 8, 12). His relics, it is said, were afterward removed from Patrae to Constantinople. (Comp. generally Fabric. *Cod. Apocryph.* 1, 456 sq.; Salut. *Lux Evang.* p. 98 sq.; *Menolog. Grecor.* 1, 221 sq.; Perionii *Vit. Apostol.* p. 82 sq.; Andr. de Sassy, *Andreas frater Petri*, Par. 1646.) **SEE APOSTLE.**

An apocryphal book, bearing the title of "The Acts of Andrew," is mentioned by Eusebius (3, 25), Epiphanius (*Haer.* 46, 1; 63:1), and others. It seems never to have been received except by some heretical sects, as the Encratites, Origenians, etc; (Fabric. *Cod. Apocryph.* 2, 747; Kleuker, *Ueb. die Apocr. d. N.T.* p. 331 sq.). This book, as well as a "Gospel of St. Andrew," was declared apocryphal by the decree of Pope Gelasius (Jones, *On the Canon*, 1, 179 sq.). Tischendorf has published the Greek text of a



work bearing the title “Acts of Andrew,” and also of one entitled “Acts of Andrew and Matthew” (*Acta Apostolorum Apocrypha*, Lpz. 1841). See Hammerschmid, *Andreas descriptus* (Prag. 1699); Hanke, *De Andrea apostolo* (Lips. 1698); Lemmius, *Memoria Andreae apostoli* (Viteb. 1705); Woog, *Presbyterorum et diaconorum Achaice de martyrio S. Andrece epistola* (Lips. 1749). **SEE ACTS, SPURIOUS; SEE GOSPELS, SPURIOUS.**

## Andrew

bishop of Cesarea, in Cappadocia, lived at the close of the fifth century (according to others; toward the close of the ninth). **SEE ARETAS.** He wrote in the Greek language a commentary on the Apocalypse, which was translated into Latin by Peltanus, and published under the title, *Andreoe, Cessareoe Cappodocioe, Episcopi, Commentarii in Johannis Apostoli, Apocalypsim* (Ingolstadt, 1584, 4to). The original was published, with notes, at Heidelberg, in 1596 (fol.), and again, together with the works of Aretas and others, in 1862, at Paris (*S. P. N. Andreoe Caesareoe, etc. Opera*, 8vo). They also attribute to him a *Therapeutica Spirtualis*, which is to be found in manuscript at the library of Vienna. The work on the Apocalypse, which gives the views of Gregory, Cyril, Papias, Irenseus, Methodius, and Hippolytus, is of some importance for establishing the canonicity of the Apocalypse. — Hoefers’ *Biog. Genesis* 2, 549; Rettig, *Ueber Andreas und Aretas*, in *Stud. u. Krit.* (1838, p. 748); Lardner, *Works*, 5, 77-79.)

## Andrew of Crete.

**SEE ANDREAS CRETENSIS.**

## Andrew Archbishop of Crain.

**SEE ANDREAS**

## Andrewes, Lancelot

bishop of Winchester, was born in London 1555, educated at Merchant-Tailors’ School, whence he was removed to Pembroke, Hall, Cambridge. As divinity lecturer of Pembroke Hall, he delivered, in 1585, his well-known lectures on the Ten Commandments, which were first published in 1642, and a new and complete edition in 1650. He afterward had the living of Alton, in Hampshire; then that of St. Giles’ — without, Cripplegate, in

London, and was made canon residentiary of St. Paul's, prebendary, of Southwell, and master of Pembroke Hall. By King James I he was created, in 1605, bishop of Chichester; then, in 1609, bishop of Ely; and lastly, in 1618, was translated to Winchester, which he held to the day of his death in 1626. His piety, learning, and acuteness are well known; and so charitable was he, that in the last six years of his life he is said to have given, in private charity alone, £1300, a very large sum in those days. He translated the authorized version of the historical books of the Old Testament from Joshua to Chronicles. Casaubon, Cluverius, Grotius, Vossius, and other eminent scholars of the time, have all highly eulogized the extensive erudition of Bishop Andrewes, which was wont, it appears, to overflow in his conversation, as well as in his writings. He was also celebrated for his talent at repartee. He united to the purest conscientiousness a considerable degree of courtly address, of which the following anecdote has been preserved as a curious instance. Neale, bishop of Durham, and he, being one day at dinner in the palace, James surprised them by suddenly putting this question, "My lords, cannot I take my subjects' money when I require it, without all the formality of a grant by Parliament?" Bishop Neale immediately replied, "God forbid, sire, but you should. You are the breath of our nostrils." "Well," said James, turning to the bishop of Winchester, "what do you say?" "Sire, I am not qualified to give an opinion in Parliamentary affairs," was the evasive reply. "Come, now, Andrewes, no escape, your opinion immediately," demanded the king. "Then, sire," answered he, "I think it perfectly lawful to take my brother Neale's, for he has offered it."

Bishop Andrewes was indisputably the most learned of his English contemporaries, excepting Usher, in the Fathers, ecclesiastical antiquities, and canon law. He was the head of that school which began to rise in England in the 16th century, which appealed to antiquity and history in defense of the faith of the Church of England in its conflicts with Rome. To express his theological tenets briefly, he was of the school which is generally called the school of Laud, holding the doctrines of apostolic succession, that "the.. true and real body of Christ is in the Eucharist." He was strongly opposed to the Puritans, who in turn charged him with popery and superstition because of the ornaments of his chapel, and the ceremonies there. He was a man of the most fervent devotion. Five hours every day did he dedicate almost entirely to devotional exercises. Prayer might be said to be the very element he breathed. During the illness that

laid him on a bed of languishing and death, his voice was almost constantly heard pouring forth ejaculatory prayers; and when, through failure of strength, he could no longer articulate, his uplifted hands and eyes indicated the channel in which his unexpressed thoughts continued to flow. He died September 25, 1626, at the age of seventy-one. His chief work is his Sermons, ninety-six in all, the best edition of which is that published in the *Anglo-Catholic Library* (Oxford, 5 vols. 8vo, 1841-43). He also wrote *Tortura Torti* (Lond. 1609), being an answer to Bellarmine on King James's Book concerning the Oath of Allegiance (Oxford, 1851, 8vo); *Pieces Private* (1648; and lately in English by the Rev. P. Hall, 1839); *The Pattern of Catechistical Doctrine* (Lond. 1650, fol.; Oxf. 1846, 8vo); *Posthumous and Orphan Lectures, delivered at St. Paul's and St. Giles'* (Lond. 1657, fol.); *Opuscula quaedam posthuma* (Lond. 1629, 4to; reprinted in *Anglo Catholic Library*, Oxford, 1851, 8vo). The Rev. C. Danbery published *Seventeen Sermons* of Andrewes, "modernized for general readers" (Lond. 1821, 8vo). See Isaacson, *Life of Bishop Andrewes*; Cassan, *Lives of the Bishops of Winchester* (London, 1827); Fuller, *Church History of Britain*; *British Critic*, 31, 169; Darling, *Cyclopaedia Bibliographica*, 1, 78; Allibone, *Dict. of Authors*, 1, 61.

### Andrews, Elisha

a Baptist minister, was born at Middletown, Conn., Sept. 29, 1768. He was converted at an early age, and soon resolved to become a Baptist minister. His opportunities of education were limited, but he made the most of them, and was occupied as a teacher and surveyor, with occasional attempts at preaching, until he was ordained as pastor in Fairfax, Vt., in 1793. He labored successively in Hopkinton, N. H.; Nottingham West (now Hudson), in the same state; Templeton, Mass., in which region he is still remembered as the "apostle of the Baptists;" Hinsdale, N. H.; the region west of Lake Champlain; Princeton; Leominster; South Gardiner and Royalston. Amid all his labors, his desire for study was irrepressible, and he mastered Greek, Hebrew, and German. In January, 1833, he had an attack of paralysis, and a second in 1834, which disabled him almost wholly. He died Feb. 3, 1840. Mr. Andrews published several essays, tracts, and sermons; also *The Moral Tendencies of Universalism* (18mo); *Review of Winchester on universal Restoration; Vindication of the Baptists* (12mo). — Sprague, *Annals*, 6, 268.

## Andrews, Jedediah

the first Presbyterian minister in Pennsylvania, was born at Hingham, Mass., in 1674, graduated at Harvard 1695, and settled in 1698 at Philadelphia, where he was ordained in 1701. In the division of the church in 1744, Mr. Andrews remained with the *Old Side*. Toward the close of his life he was suspended for immorality, but afterward restored. He died in 1747. — Sprague, *Annals*, 3, 10.

## Andrews, Lorin, LL.D.

president of Kenyon College, Ohio, was born in Ashland Co., Ohio, April 1, 1819. He was educated at Kenyon College. On leaving college, he became a teacher, and was engaged in various educational positions of importance until 1854, when he was elected president of Kenyon College. The college was then at its lowest ebb. There were scarcely thirty students, and but a remnant of a faculty. Yet in six years of his administration the number of students grew to 250, the faculty was enlarged, and new buildings added. When the war of the Rebellion broke out in 1861, "President Andrews felt it to be his duty to come forward with all his energies and influence in support of the government. He raised a company at Knox County, of which he; was made captain; and afterward was elected colonel of the 4th Ohio Regiment. His first post was at Camp Dennison, from whence he was ordered with his regiment to Virginia. After fatiguing service on the field, he was stationed at Oakland, where he remained on duty until the end of August. But the great exposure to which he was subjected, wore so much on his health that he was prostrated with camp fever. He was ordered at once to proceed home, and arrived there only to be placed on the bed from which he never rose. He died at Gambier, September 18, 1861. A large part of his activity had been devoted to the common school system of Ohio; and its present excellence is largely due to his labors. Eminent as a teacher, -orator, and college officer, he crowned the glory of an active and faithful life by a patriotic and glorious death for his *country*." — *Episcopal Recorder*, Nov. 28, 1861.

## Andrew's, St., See and University of

county of Fife, Scotland. The legendary story is that Regulus, a Greek monk of Patrae, in Achaia, warned by a vision, carried with him in a ship the relics of St. Andrew. After long storms the ship was wrecked near the place where the city of St. Andrew's now stands; Regulus and his company

escaped, and brought the relics safe to shore. This was in the time of Hergustus, king of the Picts (about the year 370), who erected a church there, afterward called the church of St. Regulus, or St. Rule's church, the ruins of which still remain. Kenneth, 3d king of the Scots († 994), transferred the see of Abernethy to this city, and ordered it to be called the church of St. Andrew, and the bishop thereof was styled Maximus Scotorum Episcopus." The present incumbent of "St. Andrew's, Dunkeld, and Dumblane," is Charles Wordsworth, D.D., consecrated in 1852. The *University*, the oldest in Scotland, was founded by Bishop Wardlaw in 1410. It consists of the United College of St. Salvador, founded by Bishop Kennedy in 1456, and St. Leonard, founded in 1512; and St. Mary's College, founded by Beaton in 1537. The education in the latter is exclusively theological. The number of chairs in the colleges which constitute the university is 14, and the attendance of late years has been rather less than 200. Here, in the center of the papal jurisdiction in Scotland, the Reformation first made its appearance; Scotland's proto-martyr, Patrick Hamilton, suffered here in 1527, and George Wishart in 1546, and here John Knox first opened his lips as a preacher of the Reformed faith. — Chambers, *Encyclopedia*; Landon, *Eccl. Dict.* 1, 358.

### Andronicians

followers of a certain Andronicus, who taught the errors of Severus. They believed the upper part of the woman to be the creation of God, and the lower part the work of the devil. — Epiph. *Haeres.* 45; Landon, *Eccl. Dictionary*, s.v.

### Androni'cus

(Ἀνδρόνικος, *man-conquering*), the name (frequent among the Greeks) of several men in Scripture history.

**1.** An officer left as viceroy (διαδεχόμενος, 2 Maccabees 4:31) in Antioch by Antiochus Epiphanes during his absence (B.C. 171). Menelaus availed himself of the opportunity to secure his Lrood offices by offering him some golden vessels which he had taken from the temple. When Onias III (q.v.) was certainly assured that the sacrilege had been committed, he sharply reprovcd Menelaus for the crime, having previously taken refuge in the sanctuary of Apollo and Artemis at Daphne. At the instigation of Menelaus, Andronicus induced Onias to leave the sanctuary, and immediately put him to death in prison (παρέκλεισεν, 2 Maccabees

4:34?) This murder excited general indignation; and on the return of Antiochus, Andronicus was publicly degraded and executed (2 Maccabees 4:3038), B.C. 169. Josephus places the death of Onias before the high-priesthood of Jason (*Ant.* 12, 5, 1), and omits all mention of Andronicus; but there is not sufficient reason to doubt the truthfulness of the narrative in 2 Maccabees, as Wernsdorf has done (*De fide libr. Macc.* p. 90 sq.). — Smith, s.v.

**2.** Another officer of Antiochus Epiphanes who was left by him on Gerizim (2 Maccabees 5:23), probably in occupation of the temple there. As the name was common, it seems unreasonable to identify this general with the former one, and so to introduce a contradiction into the history (Ewald, *Gesch. d. Volkes Isr.* 4, 335 n.; comp. Grimm, 2 Maccabees 4:38). He was possibly the same with the Andronicus, son of Messalamus, mentioned by Josephus (*Ant.* 13, 3, 4) as having convinced Ptolemy (Philometor) of the orthodoxy of the temple at Jerusalem in opposition to that of the Samaritans.

**3.** A Jewish Christian, the kinsman and fellow-prisoner of Paul, who speaks of him as having been converted to Christianity before himself, and as now enjoying the high regards of the apostles for his usefulness (~~5167~~Romans 16:7), A.D. 55. According to Hippolytus, he became bishop of Pannonia; according to Dorotheus, of Spain. See the treatises of Bose, *De Andronico et Junio* (Lips. 1742); Orlog, *De Romanis quibus Paulus epistolam misit* (Hafn. 1722).

## Andronicus

*SEE ANDRONICIANS.*

## Andrus, Luman

a pious and devoted Methodist preacher, born in Litchfield, Ct., 1778, and entered the ministry in 1810, laboring effectively in Connecticut and New York until superannuated in 1834. He died in 1852.

## Anecdota

(ἀνέκδοτα, *not given out*), a term applied to the unpublished works of ancient writers. Thus Muratori entitles the works of the Greek fathers which he gathered from various libraries, and published for the first time,

*Anecdota Graeca*. Martene styles his work of a similar nature *Thesaurus Anecdotorum Novus*.

## A'nem

(*Heb.*, *Anem'*, ‏מִנֵּם‏; *two fountains*; Sept. ‏אַנֶמֶם‏ v. r. ‏אַיִנֹּנִם‏), a Levitical city with “suburbs,” in the tribe of Issachar, assigned to the Gershonites, and mentioned in connection with Ramoth (<sup><1363></sup>1 Chronicles 6:73). It is called EN-GANNI *SEE EN-GANNI* (q.v.) in <sup><1692></sup>Joshua 19:21; 21:29.

## A'ner

(*Heb.*, *Aner'*, ‏אַנֶר‏; perhaps a *boy*), the name of a man and of a place.

**1.** (Sept. ‏אַנֶנֶן‏.) A Canaanitish chief in the neighborhood of Hebron, who, with two others, Eshcol and Mamre, joined his forces with those of Abraham in pursuit of Chedorlaomer and his allies, who had pillaged Sodom and carried Lot away captive (<sup><0143></sup>Genesis 14:13, 24), B.C. cir. 2080. These chiefs did not, however, imitate the disinterested conduct of the patriarch, but retained their portion of the spoil. *SEE ABRAHAM*.

**2.** (Sept. ‏עֲנָן‏ v. r. ‏אַנֶנֶן‏.) A city of Manasseh, given to the Levites of Kohath's family (<sup><1360></sup>1 Chronicles 6:70). Gesenius supposes this to be the same with the TAANACH *SEE TAANACH* (q.v.) of <sup><0027></sup>Judges 1:27, or TANACH *SEE TANACH* (<sup><1625></sup>Joshua 21:25).

## An'ethothite, An'etothite

less correct forms of Anglicizing the word ANATHOTHITE. *SEE ANATHOTH*. The variations in the orthography of the name, both in Hebrew and the A.V., should be noticed.

**1.** The city: In 1 Kings 2, 26, and <sup><2319></sup>Jeremiah 32:9, it is ‏אַתּוֹת‏ and similarly in <sup><1627></sup>2 Samuel 23:27, with the article; Anathoth.

**2.** The citizens: Anethothite, <sup><1627></sup>2 Samuel 23:27; Anetothite, <sup><1372></sup>1 Chronicles 27:12; Antothite, <sup><13128></sup>1 Chronicles 11:28; 12:3. “Jeremiah of Anathoth,” <sup><2327></sup>Jeremiah 29:27, should be “Jeremiah the Anathothite.”

## Anethum

*SEE ANISE*.

## Angareuo

(ἄγγαρεύω, to *impress*; Vulg. *angario*; <sup><4154></sup>Matthew 5:41; <sup><4152></sup>Mark 15:21), translated “*compel*” (q.v.) in the Auth. Vers., is a word of Persian, or rather of Tatar origin, signifying to compel to serve as an ἄγγαρος or mounted courier (Xenoph. *Cyrop.* 8, 6, 17 and 18; Athen. 3, 94, 12; AEsch. *Agam.* 282; *Pers.* 217; Plut. *De Alex.* p. 326). The word *ankarie* or *angharie*, in Tatar, means compulsory work without pay. Herodotus (8, 98) describes the system of the ἄγγαρεία. He says that the Persians, in order to make all haste in carrying messages, have relays of men and horses stationed at intervals, who hand the dispatch from one to another without interruption either from weather or darkness, in the same way as the Greeks in their λαμπαδηφορία. This horse-post the Persians called ἄγγαρήιον. In order to effect the object, license was given to the couriers by the government to press into the service men, horses, and even vessels (comp. <sup><4784></sup>Esther 8:14). Hence the word came to signify “press,” and ἄγγαρεία is explained by Suidas (*Lex.* s.v.) as signifying to extort public service. Persian supremacy introduced the practice and the name into Palestine; and Lightfoot (On <sup><4154></sup>Matthew 5:41) says the Talmudists used to call any oppressive service *ayr ḥḥai* (see Buxtorf, *Lex. Talm.* col. 131). Among the proposals made by Demetrius Soter to Jonathan the high-priest, one was that the beasts of the Jews should not be taken (ἄγγαρεύεσθαι) for the public use (Josephus, *Ant.* 13, 2, 3). The system was also adopted by the Romans, and thus the word “*angario*” came into use in later Latin. Pliny (*Ep.* 10, 14, 121, 122) alludes to the practice of thus expediting public dispatches. Chardin (*Travels*, p. 257) and other travelers (e.g. Colossians Cambell, *Trav.* pt. 2, p. 92 sq.) make mention of it. The ἄγγαροι were also called ἀστάνδαι (Stephens, *Thesaur. Gr.* p. 379). The word is also applied to the imposition of our Savior’s cross upon Simon the Cyrenian (<sup><4173></sup>Matthew 27:32). See Kuinol, *Comment.* on <sup><4154></sup>Matthew 5:41, and the literature there referred to; Rawlinson’s *Herodotus*, 4, 285.

## Angel

(ἄγγελος, used in the Sept. and New Test. for the Hebrew *Ēal ḥḥi malak’*), a word signifying both in Hebrew and Greek *a messenger* (q.v.), and therefore used to denote whatever God employs to execute his purposes, or to manifest his presence or his power; hence often with the



addition of *h/hy]* *Jehovah*, or *μῆχι ἔ*, *Elohim*. In later books the word *μῆχιδῆχ]* *kedoshim*’, *holy ones*, *οἱ ἄγιοι* is used as an equivalent term. In some passages it occurs in the sense of an ordinary messenger (<sup><8014></sup>Job 1:14; <sup><9113></sup>1 Samuel 11:3; <sup><9104></sup>Luke 7:4; 9:52); in others it is applied to prophets (<sup><2439></sup>Isaiah 43:19; <sup><3013></sup>Haggai 1:13; Malachi 3); to priests (<sup><2185></sup>Ecclesiastes 5:5; <sup><3107></sup>Malachi 2:7); to ministers of the New Testament (Revelations 1:20). It is also applied to impersonal agents; as to the pillar of cloud (<sup><9149></sup>Exodus 14:19); to the pestilence (<sup><1246></sup>2 Samuel 24:16, 17; <sup><2931></sup>2 Kings 19:30); to the winds (“who maketh the winds his angels,” <sup><9404></sup>Psalms 104:4): so likewise plagues generally are called “evil angels” (<sup><1989></sup>Psalms 78:49), and Paul calls his thorn in the flesh an “angel of Satan” (<sup><4117></sup>2 Corinthians 12:7).

But this name is more eminently and distinctly applied to certain spiritual beings or heavenly intelligences, employed by God as the ministers of his will, and usually distinguished as *angels of God* or *angels of Jehovah*. In this case the name has respect to their official capacity as “messengers,” and not to their nature or condition. The term “spirit,” on the other hand (in Greek *πνεῦμα*, in Hebrew *j Wr*), has reference to the nature of angels, and characterizes them as incorporeal and invisible essences. When, therefore, the ancient Jews called angels *spirits*, they did not mean to deny that they were endued with bodies. When they affirmed that angels were incorporeal, they used the term in the sense in which it was understood by the ancients; that is, free from the impurities of gross matter. This distinction between “a natural body” and “a spiritual body” is indicated by Paul (<sup><4354></sup>1 Corinthians 15:44); and we may, with sufficient safety, assume that angels are spiritual bodies, rather than pure spirits in the modern acceptance of the word. (See Ode, *De Angelis*, Tr. ad Rh. 1739.)

It is disputed whether the term *Elohim* (q.v.) is ever applied to angels; but in <sup><9185></sup>Psalms 8:5, and 97:7, the word is rendered by *angels* in the Sept. and other ancient versions; and both these texts are so cited in <sup><3006></sup>Hebrews 1:6; 2:7, that they are called *Sons of God*. But there are many passages in which the expression, the “angel of God,” “the angel of Jehovah,” is certainly used for a manifestation of God himself. This is especially the case in the earlier books of the Old Testament, and may be seen at once by a comparison of <sup><9221></sup>Genesis 22:11 with 12, and of <sup><9182></sup>Exodus 3:2 with 6 and 14, where He who is called the “angel of God” in one verse is called “God,” and even “Jehovah,” in those that follow, and accepts the worship

due to God alone (contrast Revelations 19:10; 21:9). See also <sup><0147></sup>Genesis 16:7, 13; 21:11, 13; 48:15, 16; <sup><0222></sup>Numbers 22:22, 32, 35; and comp. <sup><260></sup>Isaiah 63:9 with <sup><0314></sup>Exodus 33:14, etc., etc. The same expression, it seems, is used by Paul in speaking to heathens (see <sup><073></sup>Acts 27:23; comp. with 23:11). More remarkably, the word “Elohim” is applied in <sup><8816></sup>Psalms 82:6, to those who judge in God’s name.

It is to be observed also that, side by side with these expressions, we read of God’s being manifested in the form of *man*; e.g. to Abraham at Mamre (<sup><0182></sup>Genesis 18:2, 22; comp. 19:1); to Jacob at Peniel (<sup><0324></sup>Genesis 32:24, 30); to Joshua at Gilgal (<sup><0513></sup>Joshua 5:13, 15), etc. It is hardly to be doubted that both sets of passages refer to the same kind of manifestation of the Divine Presence. This being the case, since we know that “no man hath seen God” (the Father) “at any time,” and that “the only-begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath revealed him” (<sup><0118></sup>John 1:18), the inevitable inference is that by the “Angel of the Lord” in such passages is meant He who is from the beginning, the “Word,” i.e. the Manifestor or Revealer of God. These appearances are evidently “foreshadowings of the incarnation” (q.v.). By these God the Son manifested himself from time to time in that human nature which he united to the Godhead forever in the virgin’s womb. **SEE JEHOVAH.**

This conclusion is corroborated by the fact that the phrases used as equivalent to the word “angels” in Scripture, viz., the “sons of God,” or even in poetry, the “gods” (*Elohim*), the “holy ones,” etc., are names which, in their full and proper sense, are applicable only to the Lord Jesus Christ. As He is “*the* Son of God,” so also is He *the* “angel” or “messenger” of the Lord. Accordingly, it is to his incarnation that all angelic ministration is distinctly referred, as to a central truth, by which alone its nature and meaning can be understood (comp. <sup><0151></sup>John 1:51, with <sup><0311></sup>Genesis 28:11-17, especially ver. 13). (See an anon. work, *Angels, Cherubim, and Gods*, Lond. 1861.) **SEE LOGOS.**

**I. Their Existence and Orders.** — In the Scriptures we have frequent notices of spiritual intelligences existing in another state of being, and constituting a celestial family or hierarchy, over which Jehovah presides. The Bible does not, however, treat of this matter professedly and as a doctrine of religion, but merely adverts to it incidentally as a fact, without furnishing any details to gratify curiosity. The practice of the Jews of referring to the agency of angels every manifestation of the greatness and

power of God has led some to contend that angels have no real existence, but are mere personifications of unknown powers of nature; and we are reminded that, in like manner, among the Gentiles, whatever was wonderful, or strange, or unaccountable, was referred by them to the agency of some one of their gods. It may be admitted that the passages in which angels are described as speaking and delivering messages might be interpreted of forcible or apparently supernatural suggestions to the mind, but they are sometimes represented as performing acts which are wholly inconsistent with this notion (<sup><01131></sup>Genesis 16:7,12; <sup><07131></sup>Judges 13:1-21; <sup><01812></sup>Matthew 28:2-4); and other passages (e.g. <sup><02210></sup>Matthew 22:30; <sup><30014></sup>Hebrews 1:4 sq.) would be without force or meaning if angels had no real existence. (See Winer's *Zeitschr.* 1827, 2.)

That these superior beings are very numerous is evident from the following expressions: <sup><20710></sup>Daniel 7:10, "thousands of thousands," and "ten thousand times ten thousand;" <sup><02613></sup>Matthew 26:53, "more than twelve legions of angels;" <sup><01113></sup>Luke 2:13, "multitude of the heavenly host;" <sup><30222></sup>Hebrews 12:22, 23, "myriads of angels." It is probable, from the nature of the case, that among so great a multitude there may be different grades and classes, and even natures — ascending from man toward God, and forming a chain of being to fill up the vast space between the Creator and man, the lowest of his intellectual, creatures. Accordingly, the Scripture describes angels as existing in a society composed of members of unequal dignity, power, and excellence, and as having chiefs and rulers. It is admitted that this idea is not clearly expressed in the books composed before the Babylonish captivity; but it is developed in the books written during the exile and afterward, especially in the writings of Daniel and Zechariah. In <sup><30111></sup>Zechariah 1:11, an angel of the highest order (see Keil, *Comment.* ad loc.) appears in contrast with angels of an inferior class, whom he employs as his messengers and agents.(comp. 3, 4). In <sup><27013></sup>Daniel 10:13, the appellation "one of the chief princes" (<sup>^</sup>/*varirc*), and in <sup><27111></sup>Daniel 12:1, "the great prince" (*I /dGhirCh*), are given to Michael. The Grecian Jews rendered this appellation by the term ἀρχάγγελος, *archangel* (q.v.), which occurs in the New Test. (Jude 9; <sup><50416></sup>1 Thessalonians 4:16). The names of several of them even are given. *SEE GABRIEL, SEE MICHAEL*, etc. The opinion, therefore, that there were various orders of angels was not peculiar to the Jews, but was held by Christians in the time of the apostles, and is mentioned by the apostles themselves. The distinct divisions of the angels, according to their rank in the heavenly hierarchy, however, which

we find in the writings of the later Jews, were almost or wholly unknown in the apostolical period. The appellations ἀρχαί, ἐξουσίαι, δυνάμεις, θρόνοι, κυριότητες, are, indeed, applied in <sup><401></sup>Ephesians 1:21; <sup><5016></sup>Colossians 1:16, and elsewhere, to the angels; not, however, to them exclusively, or with the intention of denoting their particular classes; but to them in common with all beings possessed of might and power, *visible* as well as *invisible*, on *earth* as well as in heaven. (See Henke's *Magaz.* 1795, 3; 1796, 6.) *SEE PRINCIPALITY.*

**II. Their Nature.** — They are termed “spirits” (as in <sup><5014></sup>Hebrews 1:14), although this word is applied more commonly not so much to themselves as to their power dwelling in man (<sup><0980></sup>1 Samuel 18:10; <sup><4086></sup>Matthew 8:16, etc. etc.). The word is the same as that used of the soul of man when separate from the body (<sup><4045></sup>Matthew 14:26; <sup><2237></sup>Luke 24:37, 39; <sup><4089></sup>1 Peter 3:19); but, since it properly expresses only that supersensuous and rational element of man's nature, which is in him the image of God (see <sup><4024></sup>John 4:24), and by which he has communion with God (<sup><4086></sup>Romans 8:16); and since, also, we are told that there is a “spiritual body” as well as a “natural (ψυχικόν) body” (<sup><4154></sup>1 Corinthians 15:44), it does not assert that the angelic nature is incorporeal. The contrary seems expressly implied by the words in which our Lord declares that, *after the Resurrection*, men shall be “like the angels” (ἰσάγγελοι) (<sup><4276></sup>Luke 20:36); because (as is elsewhere said, <sup><4082></sup>Philippians 3:21) their bodies, as well as their spirits, shall have been made entirely like His. It may also be noticed that the glorious appearance ascribed to the angels in Scripture (as in <sup><2706></sup>Daniel 10:6) is the same as that which shone out in our Lord's Transfiguration, and in which John saw Him clothed in heaven (Revelations 1:14-16); and moreover, that whenever angels have been made manifest to man, it has always been in human form (as in Genesis 18, 19; <sup><4240></sup>Luke 24:4; <sup><4010></sup>Acts 1:10, etc. etc.). The very fact that the titles “sons of God” (<sup><4006></sup>Job 1:6; 38:7; <sup><2735></sup>Daniel 3:25, comp. with 28), and “gods” (<sup><4905></sup>Psalms 8:5; 97:7), applied to them, are also given to men (see <sup><4038></sup>Luke 3:38; <sup><4906></sup>Psalms 82:6, and comp. our Lord's application of this last passage in <sup><4034></sup>John 10:34-37), points in the same way to a difference only of degree and an identity of kind between the human and the angelic nature. The angels are therefore revealed to us as beings; such as man might be and will be when the power of sin and death is removed, partaking in their measure of the attributes of God, Truth, Purity, and Love, because always beholding His face (<sup><4080></sup>Matthew 18:10), and therefore being “made like Him” (<sup><4082></sup>1 John 3:2). This, of

course, implies finiteness, and therefore (in the strict sense) “imperfection” of nature, and constant progress, both moral and intellectual, through all eternity. Such imperfection, contrasted with the infinity of God, is expressly ascribed to them in <sup><18018></sup>Job 4:18; <sup><1286></sup>Matthew 24:36; <sup><1012></sup>1 Peter 1:12; and it is this which emphatically points them out to us as creatures, fellow-servants of man, and therefore incapable of usurping the place of gods. This finiteness of nature implies capacity of temptation (see Butler’s *Anal.* pt. i, c. 5), and accordingly we hear of “fallen angels.” Of the nature of their temptation and the circumstances of their fall we know absolutely nothing. All that is certain is, that they “left their first estate” (τὴν ἐαυτῶν ἀρχήν), and that they are now “angels of the devil” (<sup><1254></sup>Matthew 25:41; Revelations 12:7, 9), partaking therefore of the falsehood, uncleanness, and hatred, which are his peculiar characteristics (<sup><1384></sup>John 8:44). All that can be conjectured must be based on the analogy of man’s own temptation and fall. On the other hand, the title especially assigned to the angels of God, that of the “holy ones” (see <sup><2013></sup>Daniel 4:13, 23; 8:13; <sup><1253></sup>Matthew 25:31), is precisely the one which is given to those men who are renewed in Christ’s image, but which belongs to them in actuality and in perfection only hereafter. (Comp. <sup><1820></sup>Hebrews 2:10; 5:9; 12:23.). Its use evidently implies that the angelic probation is over, and their crown of glory won.

In the Scriptures angels appear with bodies, and in the human form; and no intimation is anywhere given that these bodies are not real, or that they are only assumed for the time and then laid aside. It was manifest, indeed, to the ancients that the matter of these bodies was not like that of their own, inasmuch as angels could make themselves visible and vanish again from their sight. But this experience would suggest no doubt of the reality of their bodies; it would only intimate that they were not composed of gross matter. After his resurrection, Jesus often appeared to his disciples, and vanished again before them yet they never doubted that they saw the same body which had been crucified, although they must have perceived that it had undergone an important change. The fact that angels always appeared in the human form does not, indeed, prove that they really have this form, but that the ancient Jews believed so. That which is not pure spirit must have some form or other; and angels *may* have the human form, but other forms are possible. **SEE CHERUB.**

The question as to the food of angels has been very much discussed. If they do eat, we can know nothing of their actual food; for the manna is manifestly called “angels’ food” (<sup><17825></sup>Psalm 78:25; Wisd. 16:20) merely by

way of expressing its excellence. The only real question, therefore, is whether they feed at all or not. We sometimes find angels, in their terrene manifestations, eating and drinking (<sup><0188></sup>Genesis 18:8; 19:3); but in <sup><0735></sup>Judges 13:15, 16, the angel who appeared to Manoah declined, in a very pointed manner, to accept his hospitality. The manner in which the Jews obviated the apparent discrepancy, and the sense in which they understood such passages, appear from the apocryphal book of Tobit (12:19), where the angel is made to say, "It seems to you, indeed, as though I did eat and drink with you; but I use invisible food which no man can see." This intimates that they were supposed to simulate when they appeared to partake of man's food, but that yet they had food of their own, proper to their natures. Milton, who was deeply read in the "angelic" literature, derides these questions (*Par. Lost*, 5, 433-439). But if angels do *not* need food; if their spiritual bodies are inherently *incapable* of waste or death, it seems not likely that they gratuitously perform an act designed, in all its known relations, to promote growth, to repair waste, and to sustain existence.

The passage already referred to in <sup><4123></sup>Matthew 22:30, teaches by implication that there is no distinction of sex among the angels. The Scripture never makes mention of female angels. The Gentiles had their male and female divinities, who were the parents of other gods, and Gesenius (*The. Heb.* s.v. <sup>^</sup>Be12) insists that the "sons of God" spoken of in <sup><0002></sup>Genesis 6:2, as the progenitors of the giants, were angels. But in the Scriptures the angels are all males; and they appear to be so represented, not to mark any distinction of sex, but because the masculine is the more honorable gender. Angels are never described with marks of age, but sometimes with those of youth (<sup><4165></sup>Mark 16:5). The constant absence of the features of age indicates the continual vigor and freshness of immortality. The angels never die (<sup><4278></sup>Luke 20:36). But no being besides God himself has essential immortality (<sup><5466></sup>1 Timothy 6:16); every other being, therefore, is mortal in itself, and can be immortal only by the will of God. Angels, consequently, are not eternal, but had a beginning. As Moses gives no account of the creation of angels in his description of the origin of the world, although the circumstance would have been too important for omission had it then taken place, there is no doubt that they were called into being before, probably very long before the acts of creation which it was the object of Moses to relate. *SEE SONS OF GOD.*

That they are of superhuman intelligence is implied in <sup><4132></sup>Mark 13:32: “But of that day and hour knoweth no man, not *even* the angels in heaven.” That their power is great may be gathered from such expressions as “mighty angels” (<sup><3007></sup>2 Thessalonians 1:7); “angels, powerful in strength” (<sup><19431></sup>Psalms 103:20); “angels who are greater [than man] in power and might.” The moral perfection of angels is shown by such phrases as “holy angels” (<sup><40125></sup>Luke 9:26); “the elect angels” (2 Timothy 5:21). Their felicity is beyond question in itself, but is evinced by the passage (<sup><42136></sup>Luke 20:36) in which the blessed in the future world are said to be *ἰσάγγελοι, καὶ υἱοὶ τοῦ θεοῦ*, “like unto the angels, and sons of God.” (See Timpson, *Angels of God*, Lond. 1837.)

**III. Their Functions.** — Of their office in heaven we have, of course, only vague prophetic glimpses (as in <sup><11219></sup>1 Kings 22:19; <sup><23101></sup>Isaiah 6:1-3; <sup><20201></sup>Daniel 7:9, 10; Revelations 6:11, etc.), which show us nothing but a never-ceasing adoration, proceeding from the vision of God. Their office toward man is far more fully described to us. (See Whately, *Angels*, Lond. 1851, Phil. 1856.)

**1.** They are represented as being, in the widest sense, agents of God’s providence, natural and supernatural, to the body and to the soul. Thus the operations of nature are spoken of, as under angelic guidance fulfilling the will of God. Not only is this the case in poetical passages, such as <sup><19404></sup>Psalms 104:4 (commented upon in <sup><3007></sup>Hebrews 1:7), where the powers of air, and fire are referred to them, but in the simplest prose history, as where the pestilences which slew the firstborn (<sup><12123></sup>Exodus 12:23; <sup><38123></sup>Hebrews 11:28), the disobedient people in the wilderness (<sup><46001></sup>1 Corinthians 10:10), the Israelites in the days of David (<sup><102416></sup>2 Samuel 24:16; <sup><13216></sup>1 Chronicles 21:16), and the army of Sennacherib (<sup><12135></sup>2 Kings 19:35), as also the plague which cut off Herod (<sup><4423></sup>Acts 12:23), are plainly spoken of as the work of the “Angel of the Lord.” Nor can the mysterious declarations of the Apocalypse, by far the most numerous of all, be resolved by honest interpretation into mere poetical imagery. (See especially Revelations 8 and 9.) It is evident that angelic agency, like that of man, does not exclude the action of secondary, or (what are called) “natural” causes, or interfere with the directness and universality of the providence of God. The personifications of poetry and legends of mythology are obscure witnesses of its truth, which, however, can rest only on the revelations of Scripture itself.

**2.** More particularly, however, angels are spoken of as ministers of what is commonly called the “supernatural,” or, perhaps, more correctly, the “spiritual” providence of God; as agents in the great scheme of the spiritual redemption and sanctification of man, of which the Bible is the record. The representations of them are different in different books of Scripture, in the Old Testament and in the New; but the reasons of the differences are to be found in the differences of scope attributable to the books themselves. As different parts of God’s providence are brought out, so also arise different views of His angelic ministers.

**(1.)** In the Book of Job, which deals with “Natural Religion,” they are spoken of but vaguely, as surrounding God’s throne above, and rejoicing in the completion of His creative work (<sup><18106></sup>Job 1:6; 2:1; 38:7). No direct and visible appearance to man is even hinted at. (See Rawson, *Holy Angels*, N.Y. 1858.)

**(2.)** In the Book of Genesis there is no notice of angelic appearances till after the call of Abraham. Then, as the book is the history of the *chosen family*, so the angels mingle with and watch over its family life, entertained by Abraham and by Lot (Genesis 18, 19), guiding Abraham’s servant to Padan-Aram (<sup><02407></sup>Genesis 24:7, 40), seen by the fugitive Jacob at Bethel (<sup><02812></sup>Genesis 28:12), and welcoming his return at Mahanaim (<sup><03311></sup>Genesis 32:1). Their ministry hallows domestic life, in its trials and its blessings alike, and is closer, more familiar, and less awful than in after times. (Contrast Genesis 18 with <sup><00621></sup>Judges 6:21, 22; 13:16, 22.)

**(3.)** In the subsequent history, that of a *chosen nation*, the angels are represented more as ministers of wrath and mercy, messengers of a King, than as common children of the One Father. It is, moreover, to be observed that the records of their appearance belong especially to two periods, that of the judges and that of the captivity, which were transition periods in Israelitish history, the former destitute of direct revelation or prophetic guidance, the latter one of special trial and unusual contact with heathenism. During the lives of Moses and Joshua there is no record of the appearance of created angels, and only obscure references to angels at all. In the Book of Judges angels appear to rebuke idolatry (<sup><00814></sup>Judges 2:1-4), to call Gideon (<sup><00611></sup>Judges 6:11, etc.), and consecrate Samson (<sup><07133></sup>Judges 13:3, etc.) to the work of deliverance.

**(4.)** The prophetic office begins with Samuel, and immediately angelic guidance is withheld, except when needed by the prophets themselves



(<sup><1195></sup>1 Kings 19:5; <sup><1767></sup>2 Kings 6:17). During the prophetic and kingly period angels are spoken of only (as noticed above) as ministers of God in the operations of nature. But in the captivity, when the Jews were in the presence of foreign nations, each claiming its tutelary deity, then to the prophets Daniel and Zechariah angels are revealed in a fresh light, as watching, not only over Jerusalem, but also over, heathen kingdoms, under the providence, and to work out the designs, of the Lord. (See Zechariah *passim*, and <sup><2743></sup>Daniel 4:13, 23; 10:10, 13, 20, 21, etc.) In the whole period they, as truly as the prophets and kings, are God's ministers, watching over the *national life* of the subjects of the Great King. (See Heigel, *De angelofoederis*, Jen. 1660.)

(5.) The Incarnation marks a new epoch of angelic ministration. "The Angel of Jehovah," the Lord of all created angels, having now descended from heaven to earth, it was natural that His servants should continue to do Him service here. Whether to predict and glorify His birth itself (<sup><400></sup>Matthew 1:20; <sup><400></sup>Luke 1:2), to minister to Him after His temptation and agony (<sup><4041></sup>Matthew 4:11; <sup><226></sup>Luke 22:43), or to declare His resurrection and triumphant ascension (<sup><4082></sup>Matthew 28:2; <sup><3012></sup>John 20:12; <sup><4010></sup>Acts 1:10, 11), they seem now to be indeed "ascending and descending on the Son of Man," almost as though transferring to earth the ministrations of heaven. It is clearly seen that whatever was done by them for men in earlier days was but typical of and flowing from their service to Him. (See <sup><9911></sup>Psalms 91:11; comp. <sup><4006></sup>Matthew 4:6.)

(6.) The New Testament is the history of the *Church of Christ*, every member of which is united to Him. Accordingly, the angels are revealed now as "ministering spirits" to each *individual* member of Christ for his spiritual guidance and aid (<sup><3014></sup>Hebrews 1:14). The records of their visible appearance are but unfrequent (<sup><4469></sup>Acts 5:19; 8:26; 10:3; 12:7; 27:23); yet their presence and their aid are referred to familiarly, almost as things of course, ever after the Incarnation. They are spoken of as watching over Christ's little ones (<sup><4880></sup>Matthew 18:10), as rejoicing over a penitent sinner (<sup><4050></sup>Luke 15:10), as present in the worship of Christians (<sup><4610></sup>1 Corinthians 11:10), and (perhaps) bringing their prayers before God (Revelations 8:3, 4), and as bearing the souls of the redeemed into paradise (<sup><462></sup>Luke 16:22). In one word, they are Christ's ministers of grace now, as they shall be of judgment hereafter (<sup><4039></sup>Matthew 13:39, 41, 49; 16:27; 24:31, etc.). By what method they act we cannot know of ourselves, nor are we told, perhaps lest we should worship them instead of Him, whose servants they

are (see <sup><5128></sup>Colossians 2:18; Revelations 22:9); but, of course, their agency, like that of human ministers, depends for its efficacy on the aid of the Holy Spirit.

The *ministry* of angels, therefore, a doctrine implied in their very name, is evident, from certain actions which are ascribed wholly to them (<sup><4134></sup>Matthew 13:41, 49; 24:31; <sup><2162></sup>Luke 16:22), and from the scriptural narratives of other events, in the accomplishment of which they acted a visible part (<sup><4011></sup>Luke 1:11, 26; 2:9 sq.; <sup><4519></sup>Acts 5:19, 20; 10:3, 19; 12:7; 27:23), principally in the guidance of the destinies of man. In those cases also in which the agency is concealed from our view we may admit the probability of its existence, because we are told that God sends them forth “to minister to those who shall be heirs of salvation” (<sup><8014></sup>Hebrews 1:14; also <sup><4348></sup>Psalms 34:8, 91; <sup><4080></sup>Matthew 18:10). But the angels, when employed for our welfare, do not act independently, but as the instruments of God, and by His command (<sup><4930></sup>Psalms 103:20; 104:4; <sup><8013></sup>Hebrews 1:13, 14): not unto them, therefore, are our confidence and adoration due, but only to him (<sup><6990></sup>Revelation 19:10; 22:9) whom the angels themselves reverently worship. (See Mostyn, *Ministry of Angels*, Lond. 1841.)

**3. Guardian Angels.** — It was a favorite opinion of the Christian fathers that every individual is under the care of a particular angel, who is assigned to him as a guardian. *SEE GUARDIAN ANGEL*. They spoke also of two angels, the one good, the other evil, whom they conceived to be attendant on each individual: the good angel prompting to all good, and averting ill, and the evil angel prompting to all ill, and averting good (*Hermas*, 2, 6). *SEE ABADDON*. The Jews (excepting the Sadducees) entertained this belief, as do the Moslems. The heathen held it in a modified form — the Greeks having their tutelary *daemon* (q.v.), and the Romans their *genius*. There is, however, nothing to support this notion in the Bible. The passages (<sup><4947></sup>Psalms 34:7; <sup><4080></sup>Matthew 18:10) usually referred to in support of it have assuredly no such meaning. The former, divested of its poetical shape, simply denotes that God employs the ministry of angels to deliver his people from affliction and danger; and the celebrated passage in Matthew cannot well mean any thing more than that the infant children of believers, or, if preferable, the least among the disciples of Christ, whom the ministers of the Church might be disposed to neglect from their apparent insignificance, are in such estimation elsewhere that the angels do not think it below their dignity to minister to them. *SEE SATAN*.

**IV. Literature.** — For the Jewish speculations on Angelology, see Eisenmeriger, *Entdecktes Judenthum*, 2, 370 sq.; the Christian views on the subject may be found in Storr and Flatt's *Lehrbuch der Chr. Dogmatik*, § 48; Scriptural views respecting them are given in the *American Biblical Repository*, 12, 356-368; in the *Bibliotheca Sacra*, 1, 766 sq.; 2, 108 sq.; on the ministry of angels, see *Journal Sac. Lit.* January, 1852, p. 283 sq.; on their existence and character, *ib.* October, 1853, p. 122 sq. Special treatises are the following, among others: Loers, *De angelorum corporibus et natura* (Tuis. 1719, F. a. Rh. 1731); Goede, *Demonstrationes de existentia corporum angelicorum*. (Hal. 1744); Hoffmann, *Num angeli boni corpora hominum interdum obsideant* (Viteb. 1760); Schulthess, *Engelwelt, Engelgesetz u. Engeldienst* (Zur. 1833); Cotta, *Doctrinæ de Angelis historia* (Tub. 1765); Damitz, *De lapsu angelorum* (Viteb. 1693); Wernsdorf, *De commercio angelorum. c. filiabus hominum* (Viteb. 1742); Schmid, *Enarratio de lapsu demonum* (Viteb. 1775); Maior, *De natura et cultu angelorum*. (Jen. 1653); Merheim, *Hist. angelorum spec.* (Viteb. 1792); Seiler, *Erroneæ doctrinæ de angelis* (Erlang. 1797); Driessen, *Angelorum corpora* (Gron. 1740); Beyer, *De Angelis* (Hal. 1698); Carhov's ed. of Abarbanel, *De creatione angelorum* (in Lat. Lpz. 1740); Mather, *Angelography* (Bost. 1696); Ambrose, *Ministration of and Communion with Angels* (in *Works*, p. 873); Camfield, *Discourse of Angels* (Lond. 1678); Lawrence, *Communion and Warre with Angels* (s. 1. 1646); Casman, *Angelographia* (Freet. 1597); Herrenschildt, *Theatrum angelorum* (Jen. 1629); Clotz, *Angelographia* (Rost. 1636); Dorsche, *Singularium angelicorum septenarius* (Argent. 1645); Museus, *Angelologia apostolica* (Jen. 1664); Schmid, *Senarius angelicus* (Helmst. 1695); Meier, *De archangelis* (Hamb. 1695); Oporin, *Lehre von den Engeln* (*ib.*; 1735); Strodimann, *Gute Engel* (Guelph. 1744); Reuter, *Reich des Teufels* (Lemg. 1715); Nicolai, *De gradibus nequitie diabolice* (Magd. 1750); Herrera, *De angelis* (Salam. 1595); Grasse, *Biblioth. magica* (Lpz. 1843). **SEE SPIRIT.**

On the worship of angels, as practiced in the Roman Church, treatises exist in Latin by the following authors: AEpinus (Rost. 1757); Bechmann (Jen. 1661); Clotz (Rost. 1636); Osiander (Tubing. 1670); Pfeffinger (Argent. 1708, Helmst. 1731); Reusch (Helmst. 1739); Schultze (Lips. 1703); Quistorp (Gryph. 1770); Thomasius, in his *Dissert.* p. 89-103; Wildvogel (Jen. 1692); Willisch (Lips. 1723). **SEE INVOCATION.**

## Angela Merici

better known as Angela of Brescia, founder of the order of the Ursulines, was born in 1511, at Dezenzano. She entered a Franciscan convent, and made a journey to the Holy Land. On her return, in 1537, she assembled at Brescia a company of women, to whom she gave the name of St. Ursula, whom she made the patron of the order. During her lifetime they lived each in the house of her parents; but after her death, which happened Mar. 21, 1540, the Ursulines began to live together. Paul III approved the institution in 1544. So rapid was the growth of the order, that within a century there were 350 convents in France alone. — Landon, *Eccl. Dict.* 1, 318; Helyot, *Ord. Monastiques*, 4, 150. *SEE URSULINES.*

## Angeli

*SEE ANGELIS.*

## Angelical Hymn

the hymn or doxology (q.v.) *Gloria in Excelsis*, beginning with “Glory be to God on high,” etc. It is so called from the former part of it having been sung by the angels to announce the birth of the Redeemer. The Greek original, as restored by Bunsen from the *Cod. Alex.*, is given in his *Analecta dnteniccena*, 3, 87; also in Procter, *On Common Prayer*, p. 354. — See Palmer, *Orig. Liturg.* 4, § 23; Bingham, *Orig. Ecclesiastes* bk. 64, ch. 2, § 2. *SEE GLORIA.*

## Angelici

a heretical sect of the 3d century, supposed to have gained the appellation in consequence of their worship of angels. The practice was imitated in the time of Chrysostom, and called forth his animadversions in his Homilies on the Colossians; and the Council of Laodicea enacted a severe canon accompanied with the denunciation of anathema to restrain it. That council says, “Christians ought not to forsake the Church of God, and go aside, and hold conventicles to invoke or call upon the names of angels; which things are forbidden. If any one, therefore, be found to exercise himself in this private idolatry, let him be accursed, because he hath forsaken our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, and gone over to idolatry.” — Epiphanius, *fler.* 60; Lardner, *Works*, 2, 602.

## Angelic Order, Nuns Of.

*SEE GUASTALINES.*

## Angelique

*SEE ARNAULD.*

## Angelis (or Angeli Degli), Girolamo

a Jesuit born at Castro Giovanni, in Sicily, in 1567, died Dec. 4, 1623. He entered the order of the Jesuits in 1585, and prepared himself for the Eastern missions. He embarked in 1596, and, after a long navigation, was cast upon the coast of Brazil, where he was seized by pirates and brought to England. Having from thence returned to Portugal, he was, in 1602, sent to Japan, in which country he labored as a missionary until the expulsion of the Jesuits in 1614. With the permission of his superiors, Angelis put on a Japanese dress, and remained on the island of Nippon for nine more years. He is said to have been the first European who visited the neighboring islands. In Jeddo he is said to have converted ten thousand natives to Christianity. Ultimately he was arrested, imprisoned, and burned alive, with ninety of his converts, after a stay in Japan of twenty-two years. A work on Jeddo (*Relazione del regno di Yezo*), which was published at Rome in 1625, is attributed to him. — Hoefer, *Biog. Generale*, 2, 646.

## Angelites

a sect in the reign of the Emperor Anastasius, about the year 494, so called from Angelium, a place in the city of Alexandria, where they held their first meetings. They held that the persons of the Trinity are not the same; that neither of them exists of himself, and of his own nature; but that there is a common God or Deity existing in them all, and that each is God by a participation of this Deity. *SEE SABELLIANS.*

## Angelo, Rocca

of the order of St. Augustine, educated at Rome, Venice, Perugia, and Padua. Pope Sixtus V employed him to superintend the printing of the Bible, Councils, and Fathers; and to his care the Augustines of Rome owe “the Bibliotheca Angelica,” the “Library of the Vatican,” that “of Theology and Holy Scripture,” etc. He died at Rome, April 7, 1620. — Landon, *Eccl. Dict.* s.v.

## Angelus

a prayer to the Virgin, commonly said in the Roman Church three times a day, viz., in the morning, at noon, and in the evening, when the bell is sounded thrice, three strokes each time. Pope John XXII instituted this office in 1316, and several popes have granted indulgences to those who say the *Angelus* on their knees. — Landon, *Eccl. Dict.* 1. 370.

## Angelus, Christopher

a Greek scholar, born in the Peloponnesus about the middle of the 16th century, died Feb. 1, 1638. Being compelled by the Turks to leave his country, he fled to England, where he was enabled by the support of the bishop of Norwich and of several members of the clergy to study at the universities of Cambridge and Oxford. He was subsequently appointed teacher of Greek in Baliol College, Oxford, which position he retained until his death. He published an account of his flight from Greece (Oxford, 1619, in Greek and in English); a work on the Greek religion (*Enchiridion de Institutis Greacis*, Cambridge, 1619, in Greek and Latin); *Encomium on the Kingdom of Great Britain* (Cambridge, 1619); *De Apostasia Ecclesiae et de Homine peccati, scilicet Antichristo* (London, 1624, 4to). — Wood, *Athen. Oxon.* vol. 1; *Gentleman's Mag.* 64, 785; Hoefer, *Biog. Generale*, 2, 651.

## Anger

(usually *ἄη* *aph*, *ὀργή*), the emotion of instant displeasure, which arises from the feeling of injury done, or the discovery of injury intended, or, in many cases, from the discovery of the omission of good offices to which we supposed ourselves entitled; or, it is simply the emotion of displeasure itself, independent of its cause or its consequences. “Like most other emotions, it is accompanied by effects on the body, and in this case they are of a very marked kind. The arterial blood-vessels are highly excited; the pulse, during the paroxysm, is strong and hard, the face becomes red and swollen, the brow wrinkled, the eyes protrude, the whole body is put into commotion. The secretion of bile is excessive, and it seems to assume a morbid consistency. In cases of violent passion, and especially in nervous persons, this excitement of the organs soon passes to the other extreme of depression; generally, this does not take place till the anger has subsided, when there follows a period of general relaxation. The original tendency to

anger differs much in individuals according to temperament; but frequent giving way to it begets a habit, and increases the natural tendency. From the nature of anger, it is easy to see that it must be — often at least — prejudicial to health. It frequently gives rise to bile, fever, inflammation of the liver, heart, or brain, or even to mania. These effects follow immediately a fit of the passion; other evil effects come on, after a time, as the consequence of repeated paroxysms, such as paralysis, jaundice, consumption, and nervous fever. The milk of a mother or nurse in a fit of passion will cause convulsions in the child that sucks; it has been known even to occasion instant death, like a strong poison. The controlling of anger is a part of moral discipline. In a rudimentary state of society, its active exercise would seem to be a necessity; by imposing some restraint on the selfish aggressions of one individual upon another, it renders the beginnings of social co-operation and intercourse possible. This is its *use*, or, as it is sometimes called, its final cause. But the more social intercourse comes to be regulated by customs and laws, the less need is there for the vindictive expression of anger. It seems an error, however, to suppose that the emotion ever will bear that it ought to be extirpated. Laws themselves lose their efficacy when they have not this feeling for a background; and it remains as a last resource for man, when society — as it does every now and then — resolves itself into its elements. Even in the most artificial and refined states of society, those minor moralities on which half the happiness of social intercourse depends, are imposed upon the selfish, in great measure, by that latent fund of anger which every man is known to carry about with him.” — Chambers, *Encyclopxdia*, s.v.

Anger is not evil *per se*. The mind is formed to be angry as well as to love. Both are original susceptibilities of our nature. If anger were in itself sinful, how could God himself be angry? How could He, who was separate from sin and sinners, have looked round upon men with anger? An essentially immoral character cannot attach to it if it be the mere emotion of displeasure on the infliction of any evil upon us. Anger may be sinful, when it arises too soon, without reflection, when the injury which awakens it is only apparent, and was designed to do good. The disposition which becomes speedily angry we call passionate. When it is disproportionate to the offense; when it is transferred from the guilty to the innocent; when it is too long protracted; it then becomes revengeful (<sup><4005></sup>Ephesians 4:26; <sup><4022></sup>Matthew 5:22; <sup><4028></sup>Colossians 3:8). When anger, hatred, wrath, are ascribed to God, they denote his holy and just displeasure with sin and

sinners. In him they are principles arising out of his holy and just nature, and are, therefore, steady and uniform, and more terrible than if mere emotions or passions. See Paley, *Mor. Phil.* ch. 7, vol. 1; Secker, *Sermons*, serm. 28; Fawcett, *Essay on Anger*; Seed, *Posth. Sermon*. 11; Buck, *Dict.* s.v.

### Angers (Andegavense)

a town in France, where the following councils were held: 453, for celibacy; 1055, against Berengar, archdeacon of Angers, for heresy; 1062, on the same subject; 1279, where four canons were made for the regulation of the clergy; 1366, on discipline; 1448, for reforms. — Smith, *Tables of Church Hist.*; Landon, *Manual of Councils*.

### Angilbert, St.

a noble Frank, first councillor of the Italian King Pepin and of Charlemagne. He is said to have been married to Bertha, the daughter of Charlemagne, but to have retired in 790, with the consent of his wife, to the convent of Centule (now St. Riquier). In 794 he became abbot of this convent, and died Feb. 18, 814. He is the author of a history of the abbey of Centule and of several poetical works, and was surnamed the Homer of his times. See *Acta Sanctorum*, Feb. 18; Ceillier, *Auteurs sacres*, vol. 18.

### Angilram

bishop of Metz from 768 to 791, also abbot of the monastery Senones, and arch-chaplain of Charlemagne. After 789 he bore the title archbishop as a personal distinction. His name is celebrated in the history of the Canon Law by a collection of laws respecting legal proceedings against bishops, called *Capitula Angilrami*. According to some Codd. they were presented by Angilram to Pope Adrian, but, according to others, presented by Adrian to Angilram. They are generally regarded as spurious (see Rettberg, *Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands*, 1, 501; and Herzog, s.v. Angilram), and as extracts from the Pseudo-Decretals; but their authenticity has been defended by Wassersleben, *Beitrag zur Geschichte der falschen Decretalen*. — Hase, *Church History*, p. 185. **SEE DECRETALS.**

### Anglican Church

another name of the Established Church of England. The phrase “Anglican Churches” is coming into general use as the collective title of the



Established Church of England and Ireland, the Scottish Episcopal Church, the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States, and the missionary churches established by any of these three bodies. The *Churchman's Calendar* for 1865 gives the following synoptical view of the Anglican Churches: 1. England, 2 archbishops, 26 bishops; 2. Ireland, 2 archbishops, 10 bishops; 3. Scotland, 8 bishops; 4. Mediterranean, 1 bishop; 5. United States, 38 bishops; 6. British America, 9 bishops; 7. West Indies, 6 bishops; 8. Asia, 8 bishops; 9. Africa, 8 bishops; 10. Oceanica, 14 bishops. *SEE ENGLAND, CHURCH OF.*

## Angling

### Picture for Angling

the art of taking fish with a hook and line. The word **hKj i chakkah'**, which the Auth. Vers. renders "angle" in <sup><2308></sup>Isaiah 19:8; <sup><3015></sup>Habakkuk 1:15, is the same that is rendered "hook" in <sup><1810></sup>Job 41:1, 12. The Scriptures contain several allusions to this mode of taking fish. The first of these occurs as early as the time of Job: "Canst thou draw out leviathan with an hook; or his tongue [*palate*, which is usually pierced by the hook] with a cord [line], which thou lettest down? Canst thou put a hook into his nose, or bore his jaw through with a thorn?" (<sup><1810></sup>Job 41:1, 2). This last phrase obviously refers to the thorns which were sometimes used as hooks, and which are long after mentioned as *the thorns of fishing* (<sup><3042></sup>Amos 4:2), in the Auth. Vers. "fish-hooks." Of the various passages relating to this subject, the most remarkable is that which records, as an important part of the "burden of Egypt," that "the fishers also shall mourn; and all they that cast angle [the hook] into the brooks shall lament, and they that spread nets upon the waters shall languish" (<sup><2308></sup>Isaiah 19:8). In this poetical description of a part of the calamities which were to befall Egypt, we are furnished with an account of the various modes of fishing practiced in that country, which is in exact conformity with the scenes depicted in the old tombs of Egypt. See FISH. Angling appears to have been regarded chiefly as an amusement, in which the Egyptians of all ranks found much enjoyment. The Egyptian hooks were of bronze, as appears from the specimens that have been found. Insects, natural or artificial, were not used in angling, ground bait being exclusively employed; and the float does not appear to have been known (Wilkinson's *Anc. Egyptians*, 3, 54). The fish caught in the lake of Tiberias were, some time since, taken exclusively with the rod and line, in the absence of boats upon that water; and probably this

is the case still. An instance of this occurs in the case of Peter, who was directed by Christ in this manner to procure a miraculous supply of money to pay the temple tax (~~AUTH~~ Matthew 17:27). *SEE HOOK.*

### Anglo-Catholic Church

a title recently adopted by the Puseyite or Romanizing portion of the Church of England. *SEE PUSEYITES.*

### Anglo-Saxon Church

*SEE ENGLAND, CHURCH OF.*

### Anglo-Saxon Versions of The Holy Scriptures.

#### Picture for Anglo-Saxon Versions

No translation of the entire Bible was made into the language of the Anglo-Saxons; although the substance of the Bible history was fragmentarily thrown into verse by the bards, especially Caedmon (*Metrical Paraphrase of Parts of the Holy Scriptures in Anglo-Saxon*, with an English translation, notes, etc. by Benjamin Thorpe, Lond 1832, 8vo). *SEE AUTHORIZED VERSION.* At an early period, however, glosses, or interlineary translations of the Vulgate into the vernacular tongue of our an; cestors, began to be made by the monks. Some of these are still extant. The oldest is the celebrated *Durham Book*, preserved among the Cotton MSS. in the British Museum. The Latin text of this MS. was written by Eadfrith, bishop of the Church of Holy Isle, some time before the year 688; it received many decorations from the combined skill of Bishop Ethilwold and Billfrith the anchorite, and it was finally glossed over into English (*of glosesade on Englisc*) by Aldred, who describes himself as “Presbyter indignus et miserrimus,” and ascribes his success to “Godes fultume & Sci Cuthberhtes.” The work existed first in four separate volumes, but these were at an early period collected into one. The date of Aldred’s gloss is supposed to be before A.D. 900. The next of these versions is the Rushworth Gloss of the Gospels, preserved in the Bodleian Library at Oxford; it closely resembles the Durham book in form, arrangement, and style of execution, and is regarded as of almost equal antiquity with it. Its authors were Farmen and Owen, priests at Harewood, and the Latin text was written by one Macregol. Another Anglo-Saxon translation of the gospels is extant, the author of which is unknown; it is believed to have

been executed near the time of the Norman conquest, and bears traces of having been made from one of the ante-hieronymian Latin versions. A translation of the Heptateuch, or first seven books of the Bible, was made by AElfric, archbishop of Canterbury, who died in 1006; and there is in the Cottonian Collection a MS. of a translation of the Book of Job, also ascribed to him. Of the same date is a gloss on the Proverbs by an unknown author, also among the Cotton MSS. Of the Psalter an interlineary translation was made at a very early period (about 706) by Adhelm., bishop of Sherborn, but of this no MS. remains. It is reported that King Alfred was also engaged at the time of his death on a translation of the Psalms (William of Malmesbury, *De Gest. Reg. Angl.* p. 44, E. T. p. 121, ed. Bohn), and other parts of the Bible are said also to have been translated by him. There are other versions of the Psalms in Anglo-Saxon extant in MS. An edition of the Four Gospels was printed at London in 1571, in 4to, with an English translation; it was edited by Archbishop Parker, with a preface by John Fox, the martyrologist. This edition was reprinted by Dr. Marshall, with improvements from the collation of several MSS. by Fr. Junius, Jr. (Dort, 1665, 4to; reissued with a new title-page, Amst. 1684). The best edition of the Gospels is that of Thorpe (London, 1842, 12mo). AElfric's Heptateuch and Job were published by Thwaites (Oxford, 1699, 8vo). Two editions of the Anglo-Saxon Psalter have been issued: the former by Spelman (London, 1640, 4to); the latter by Thorpe (Oxford, 1835, 4to). Mill made use of the Anglo-Saxon versions for critical purposes in his edition of the Greek Testament. Critics are divided as to their value in this respect. Tischendorf has, however, made use of them in his edition (see his *Prolegomena*, p. 255, ed. 1859). **SEE VERSIONS (OF THE BIBLE).**

### Anglus, Thomas

a Roman Catholic theologian, was born in England in 1582. and died July 6, 1676. He was for some time principal of the English College at Lisbon, and assistant principal of the English College at Douai. He lived for a lonr time at Rome and Paris, defended the peripatetic philosophy against Descartes, tried to develop the theological doctrines of freedom and grace from Aristotelian principles, and was involved in a controversy with the Molinists (q.v.) and the Jansenists. He wrote a number of mystical books, most of which have been put into the Index. His principal works are: *De mundo* (Paris, 1642); *Institutiones peripateticce* (Lyons, 1646); *Institutiones theologicce* (1652). He assumed sometimes the names

Candidus, Albius, Bianchi, and Richworth, but his true name seems to have been White. — *Biog. Britannica*, s.v.; Bayle.

## Angola

a country on the western coast of Africa. It was discovered in 1486 by the Portuguese, who soon after began to form settlements on the river Congo and at various points south of that river. They still have a number of forts and commercial establishments at different places, in some instances extending many hundreds of miles into the interior, where the Portuguese colonists and natives meet for the purpose of trading. The Portuguese claim dominion over a population of about 360,000 souls. Toward the middle of the 16th century the diocese of Angola was established, and a large number of the inhabitants nominally received into the-Roman Catholic Church; but with the decline of the Portuguese, also the hold which the church had of the native population became weaker. A large portion of them, however, are desirous to be regarded as members of the Roman Catholic Church, although in 1857 there were only six priests for all Angola. The Roman Catholic population may be estimated at about 100,000 souls. — Schem, *Ecclesiastical Year-book*. **SEE AFRICA**.

## Anhalt

the name of a German duchy. At the beginning of the present century there were three duchies of Anhalt, denominated Anhalt-Dessau, Anhalt-Bernburg, and Anhalt-Koethen. The line of the reigning family in Anhalt-Koethen became extinct in 1847, and that of Anhalt-Bernburg in 1863, and thus the whole of Anhalt was united under one prince. The area of Anhalt is 1017 square miles. The population amounted, in 1864, to 193,046, of whom about 2000 are Roman Catholics and an equal number Jews; the remainder belong to the Protestant State Church, which has superintendents at Dessau and Bernburg, and about 150 ministers. Anhalt was one of the first German states which joined the Reformation, and several dukes distinguished themselves in the defense of German Protestantism. Until 1590 Lutheranism prevailed in the whole country, but in that year the controversies arising from the *Formula of Concord* (q.v.) induced the princes, with a large number of the clergy, to go over to the Reformed Church. How large a proportion of the people followed this example has not yet been established. The "Union" (between the Lutherans and Reformed) was introduced into Bernburg in 1820, into Dessau and

Koethen in 1827. Since 1855 the governments of the duchies issued several decrees, which again bind the clergymen more strictly to the symbolical books of the two denominations. *SEE GERMANY.*

### A'niam

(*Heb.*, *Aniam'*, μ[γνῖα] *sighing of the people*; *Sept.* Ἀνιάμ v. r. Ἀνιάν), the last named of the four sons of Shemidah, of the tribe of Manasseh (<sup>(1379)</sup>1 Chronicles 7:19). B.C. post 1856.

### Anianus

a native of Campania and ardent adherent of Pelagius, whose cause he defended at the council of Diospolis in 415. He wrote a work, *Contra Elpistolca Hieronymni ad Ctesphontem*, which is lost, and translated the homilies of Chrysostom on the Gospel of Matthew. According to the testimony of Richard Simon, Huet, and Casaubon, he was one of the ablest translators of the ancient church. His translation of Chrysostom is reprinted in the Benedictine edition. — Dupin, *Eccl. Writers*, vol. 3.

### Anicetus

a bishop of Rome, followed Pius I about 157, and is called a martyr in the Roman and other martyrologies, although it is not certain whether he shed his blood for the faith. He received, about 160, a visit from Polycarp, and tolerated the custom of the Asiatics in celebrating Easter on the fourteenth day of the first moon after the vernal equinox with the Jews. He had to combat the heretics Valentine and Marcion, and died 168. He is commemorated as a saint by the Roman Church on April 17. — Butler, *Lives of the Saints*, April 17.

### A'nim

(*Heb.*, *Anim'*, μγνῖ; *fountains*; comp. *AEnon*; *Sept.* Ἀείμ v. r. Αἰσάμ), a city in the mountains of the tribe of Judah, mentioned between Eshtemoah and Goshen (<sup>(6150)</sup>Joshua 15:50), in the district southwest of Hebron (Keil, *Comment.* in loc.). Eusebius and Jerome appear to call it *Ancea* (Ἀναϊά), and state that it was wholly inhabited by Jews, lying 9 Roman miles south of Hebron, near another village (with which the name likewise closely agrees) called *Ansema* (Ἀνσήμ), wholly inhabited by Christians (*Onomast.* s.v. Ἀνάμ, Anab). Schwarz (*Palest.* p. 105) says it is the modern village

*Ben-Enim*, 2 English miles E.N.E. of Hebron, meaning probably *Beit-Anim*; but this is in a different direction, and is probably the ancient Bethanath (q.v.). Van de Velde (*Memoir*, p. 285), although apparently wrong in thinking it may be the Levitical Ain (<sup>(16216)</sup>Joshua 21:16), is probably correct in agreeing with the identification by Wilson (*Lands of Bible*, 1. 354; 2:636) with the village *Ghuwein*, one hour south of Semoa, on the road from Hebron to Moladah; but unnecessarily supposes the Ain mentioned along with Rimmon (q.v.) in the “south” (<sup>(16552)</sup>Joshua 15:32), and apportioned to Simeon (<sup>(16807)</sup>Joshua 19:7), to have been a different one, as he is thus obliged to do. *SEE AIN*.

### Anima Mundi

“the soul of the world,” accords ing to some philosophical systems, a soul-substance penetrating the entire world in a similar way as the human soul penetrates the body. Whether the Pythagoreans assumed a particular *anima mundi* is not certain; but Plato regards the existence of the cosmos as essentially mediated through the *anima mundi*. To him it is a product of the architect of the world, of the highest reason, as a connecting link between pure reason and the sensuous, which gives measure and order to the latter. Aristotle did not assume a particular *anima mundi*. With the Stoics, the conception of it coincides with that of a primitive divine power producing every thing from itself. With Plotin and the Neo-Platonists the *anima mundi* is not an immediate product of the highest primitive unit, but emanates from it through the  $\nu\omicron\delta\zeta$  (reason). Plotin sometimes distinguished between a higher *anima mundi*, which is a being absolutely non-sensuous and separated from the corporeal world, and a lower *anima mundi*, which is connected with the bodies of the universe in a similar manner as the individual soul is connected with its body. The origin of this philosophical opinion must be sought in the desire to find between the primitive cause of all things and the phenomenal world connecting links which are to make the origin of the latter from the former more easily comprehensible. Christianity, which derives the origin of the world from an immediate creative act of God, rejects altogether the notion of a particular *anima mundi*. — *Pierer*, 19, 89. *SEE PANTHEISM*.

## Animal

### Picture for Animal 1

(designated by various Hebrews terms, rendered “creature,” “living thing,” “cattle,” etc.), an organized living body, endowed with sensation. *SEE BEAST*. The Hebrews distinguished animals into pure and impure, clean and unclean; or those which might be eaten and offered, and those whose use was prohibited. The sacrifices which they offered were:

- (a.) of the beeve kind, a cow, bull, or calf. The ox could not be offered, because it was mutilated. Where it is said in our version oxen were sacrificed, we are to understand *bulls* (<sup><0204></sup>Exodus 20:24).
- (b.) Of the goat kind, a he-goat, a she-goat, or kid (<sup><0221></sup>Leviticus 22:21).
- (c.) Of the sheep kind, a ewe, ram, or lamb. When it is said sheep are offered, rams are chiefly meant, especially in burnt-offerings and sacrifices for sins. *SEE SACRIFICE*.

Besides these three sorts of animals used in sacrifices, many others might be eaten, wild or tame. All that have not cloven hoofs, and do not chew the cud, were esteemed impure, and could neither be offered nor eaten. *SEE CLEAN*. Commentators on the Scriptures are much divided with relation to the legal purity or impurity of animals. It would appear that this distinction obtained before the Flood, since God commanded Noah (<sup><0072></sup>Genesis 7:2) to carry seven couples of clean animals into the ark and two of unclean. *SEE FOOD*. The following is a complete list of all the Biblical animals, both clean and unclean (many of them named in <sup><0540></sup>Deuteronomy 14; <sup><0101></sup>Leviticus 11), exclusive of BIRDS *SEE BIRDS*, FISHES *SEE FISHES*, INSECTS *SEE INSECTS*, and REPTILES *SEE REPTILES* (all which see in their order), arranged under their true English names (with the Hebrew or Greek term in italics), so far as these have been discovered. (See Kinniburgh, *Scriptural Animals*, Edinb. 1852; Anonymous, *Scriptural Quadrupeds*, Lond. 1858). *SEE ZOOLOGY*.

### Picture for Animal 2

**WORSHIP OF ANIMALS.** — The reasons of the choice of animals consecrated to receive worship among the Egyptians, the great practisers of this superstition, are now involved in much obscurity; some are probably connected with the beasts themselves, some with astronomical allegories,

and some, perhaps, with now lost historical facts. (For a list of the sacred animals of different parts of Egypt, see Wilkinson's *Anc. Egyptians*, abridgm. 1:245 sq.) **SEE IDOLATRY**. The ox, the sheep, and the ichneumon were held in almost general veneration; the cat and the asp had their distinguishing homage; and the Egyptian custom of selecting some in preference to others, as the objects of veneration by different cities, extended to other countries, and was adopted by the Lemnians and Thessalians. The bloody wars occasioned by the variety of homage paid to animals, such as that caused by the inhabitants of Cynopolis eating the oxyrinchus, and the Oxyrinchians the dog, prove how fiercely the superstition was cherished. Herodotus says that the hippopotamus was sacred only in the Papremitic Nome, and he adds the eel and water-snake to the list of hallowed fishes, and the fox-goose to that of hallowed birds. Sacred serpents were kept at Thebes, and in the mysteries and many other pagan rites they were pre-eminently conspicuous. "The cats," Herodotus observes, "when dead, are carried to sacred buildings, and, after being embalmed, are buried in the city Bubastis. Dogs and ichneumons are buried wherever they happen to die. The shrew-mouse and the hawk are removed to Buto; the ibis to Hermonopolis; bears and wolves are buried in whatever place they die, but not, like the dogs, in consecrated chests" (Herod. 2, 65-67). The solar deities of the Egyptians are usually represented with the head of a hawk. In the procession at Dendera, several of these hawk-headed divinities appear with an ornament upon the head, — composed of the circle, and a serpent with an inflated neck, or, as it is usually termed, a basilisk. The worship of the serpent appears to have been at an early period almost universal, which may be accounted for by considering that reptile as the earliest type of the solar influence, which in later times gave place to other emblems, possibly on account of the venomous properties of the creature, which rendered it an unsuitable representation of that from which it was supposed all good proceeded. **SEE WORSHIP**. Lands were set apart for the support of the sacred animals; men and women were employed in feeding and maintaining them. If a person killed any of these creatures designedly, he was punished with death; if involuntarily, his punishment, in some cases, was referred to the priest; but if the animal killed were either a cat, a hawk, or an ibis, and that whether by design or not, the culprit was to die, without mercy, and the enraged multitude seldom waited even for the formalities of a trial. A Roman, in the time of one of the Ptolemies, who killed a cat accidentally, was torn in pieces by the populace on the spot, in spite of all the efforts of



the king's guard to save him. When any of these animals died, great lamentation was made, and vast sums expended on their funeral. We are told that in the beginning of the reign of Ptolemy Philadelphus, the bull Apis dying, his keeper expended more than fifty talents of silver, or £13,000, on his interment (see Wilkinson's *Anc. Eg.* 1, 226 sq.). The Israelites often debased themselves by an imitation of this daemonolatriy, for which they were severely punished by God, because it was one grand design of the Mosaic law to keep their theology free from these gross appendages. *SEE APIS; SEE CAT; SEE CROCODILE; SEE IBIS; SEE ICHNEUMON; SEE SERPENT; SEE SATYR*, etc.

## Animales

(*animals*), an opprobrious epithet bestowed by the Origenites on persons who differed from them in opinion as to the resurrection of the body. The doctrine of the Origenites was that men would have spiritual bodies in the next world; and they ridiculed others who maintained that the same body, altered in quality but not in substance, would be raised. They gave them the opprobrious names of *simplices* and *philosarce*, idiots and lovers of the flesh; *carne*, *animales*, *junmenta*, carnal, sensual, animals; *lutei*, earthy; *pilosote*, .from *pilus*, hair, because it was asserted that the body would rise perfect in all its parts. — Bingham, *Orig. Eccl.* bk. 1, ch. 3

## Anise

### Picture for Anise 1

(ἄνηθον, *anethum*) occurs in <sup>4123</sup>Matthew 23:23, “Woe unto you — for ye pay tithes of mint and *anise* and cummin.” By the Greek and Roman writers it was employed to designate a plant used both medicinally and as an article of diet (Pliny, 19:61; 20:74; Apicius, 6:5, 9). The Arabian translators of the Greek medical authors give as its synonyme *shabit*, the name applied in Eastern countries to an umbelliferous plant with flattened fruit commonly called “seed,” which is surrounded with a dilated margin. In Europe the word has always been used to denote a similar plant, which is familiarly known by the name of *dill*. Hence there is no doubt that, in the above passage, instead of “anise,” ἄνηθον should have been translated “dill;” and it is said to be rendered by a synonymous word in every version except our own.

The common dill, or *Anethum graveolens*, is an annual plant, growing wild among the corn in Spain and Portugal; and on the coast of Italy, in Egypt, and about Astrachan. It resembles fennel, but is smaller, has more glaucous leaves, and a less pleasant smell: the fruit or seeds, which are finely divided by capillary segments, are elliptical, broader, flatter, and surrounded with a membranous disk. They have a warm and aromatic taste, owing to the presence of a pale yellow volatile oil, which itself has a hot taste and a peculiar penetrating odor. The error in translation pointed out above is not of very great consequence, as loth the *anise* and the *dill* are umbelliferous plants, which are found cultivated in the south of Europe. The seeds of both are employed as condiments and carminatives, and have been so from very early times; but the *anethum* is more especially a genus of Eastern cultivation, since either the *dill* or another species is reared in all the countries from Syria to India, and known by the name *shabit*; while the *anise*, though known, appears to be so only by its Greek name ἄνισον. In the Talmudical tract *Masseroth* (of Tithes), 4:5, we read, “The seed, the leaves, and the stem of *dill* (תבֿוֹ; *shabath*) are, according to Rabbi Eliezer, subject to tithe” (comp. Gemara, *Aboda Sara*, 1, 2), which indicates that the herb was eaten, as is indeed the case with the Eastern species in the present day; and, therefore, to those acquainted with the cultivated plants of Eastern countries, the dill will appear more appropriate than anise in the above passage (see Celsii *Hierobot.* 1, 494 sq.). **SEE DILL.**

## Picture for Anise 2

The proper *anise* (Gr. ἄνισον) is the *Pimpinella anisum* of Linnaeus, an Eastern annual umbelliferous plant, the seeds of which are principally employed in the manufacture of cordials or liqueurs, and as a remedy against flatulence. Indeed all these kinds of plants, like the common fennel, possess a warming medicinal property. **SEE AROMATICS.**

There is another plant very dissimilar in external character to the two named above, the leaves and capsules of which are powerfully carminative. This is the “star anise,” or *aniseed-tree* (*illicium anisatum*), which belongs to the natural order *Magnoliacaes*. In China this is frequently used for seasoning dishes, etc.; but the species of this genus are not natives of the Bible lands, and must not be confused with the umbelliferous plants noticed in this article. **SEE BOTANY.**

## Anklet

### Picture for Anklet

This word does not occur in Scripture, but the ornament which it denotes is clearly indicated by “the tinkling (or *jingling*) ornaments (*sk[ , ekes*) about the feet” mentioned in the curious description of female attire which we find in Isaiah 3 *SEE ATTIRE*. Even in the absence of special notice, we might very safely conclude that an ornament to which the Oriental women have always been so partial (Thomson’s *Land and Book*, 1, 182) was not unknown to the Jewish ladies. The Egyptian monuments represent them as worn by men likewise (Wilkinson, 3, 375). The figures below represent different styles of anklets, as found on the Egyptian monuments, and in use at present (particularly by females) among the Egyptians, Persians, Arabs, and Hindoos. Anklets of solid gold or silver are worn by some ladies, but are more uncommon than they formerly were. They are, of course, very heavy, and knocking together as the wearer walks, make a ringing noise; hence it is said in a song, “The ringing of thy anklets has deprived me of reason” (Lane’s *Mod. Egyptians*, 2, 410). This practice, nevertheless, is forbidden in the Koran (24:31). This prohibition, however, perhaps rather refers (see Chardin, 1:133, 148, 194) to the small bells used by females, especially dancing girls, around the ankles (Lane, *ib.* 2, 368). To increase this pleasant sound, pebbles were sometimes enclosed in them (Calmet, s.v. Periscelides, Bells). Tertullian discountenances them (*De cult. femin.* 2, 13). They were sometimes of great value, but the poorer village children wear them of iron. For their use among the ancient Egyptians, see Wilkinson, 3, 374, and among the ancient Greeks and Romans, Smith’s *Dict. of Class. Ant.* s.v. Periscelis. They do not, we believe, occur in the Nineveh sculptures. Livingstone writes of the favorite wife of an African chief, “She wore a profusion of iron rings on her ankles, to which were attached little pieces of sheet iron to enable her to make a tinkling as she walked in her mincing African style” (p. 273). On the weight and inconvenience of the copper rings worn by the chiefs themselves, and the odd walk it causes them to adopt, see *id.* p. 276. *SEE BRACELET*.

## An’na

(”*Avva*), the Greek form of the name *Hannah* [q.v.]; it also occurs in the cognate Punic as that of the sister of Dido, Virgil, *En.* 4, 9), the name of two women.

1. The wife of Tobit, whose history is contained in the apocryphal book that bears his name (Tobit 1:9 sq.).

2. An aged widow, daughter of Phanuel, of the tribe of Asher. She had married early, but after seven years her husband died, and during her long widowhood she daily attended the morning and evening services of the temple. Anna was eighty-four years old when the infant Jesus was brought to the temple by his mother, and, entering as Simeon pronounced his thanksgiving, she also broke forth in praise to God for the fulfillment of his ancient promises (<sup><4126></sup>Luke 2:36, 37), B.C. 6. See Mayer, *De Anna prophetissa vidua* (Gryph. 1706).

### Anna, St.

the name, according to tradition, of the mother of the Virgin Mary, and wife of Joachim. The names of Anna and Joachim are not found in Holy Scripture, but are gathered from the fathers. According to a legend, her body was brought, in 710, from Jerusalem to Constantinople, and from that time many churches of Europe pretended to possess some relic of it. Her festival is kept in the Greek Church July 25th, in the Roman, July 26th. — Butler, *Lives of Saints*, 3, 212; comp. Binerus, *De Joachimo, Anna et Josepho* (Antw. 1638); Goetze, *De cultu Annoe* (Lips. 1702); Willisch, *Ehemal. St. Annenbriiderschaft* (Annab. 1723); Franz, *Versuch einer Geschichte des Marienund Annen-Cultus* (Halberst. 1854); and see the *Legenda matranoe Anne* (Lips. 1502).

### An'naas

(Σανάας), a man whose posterity (or a place whose residents) returned from the captivity (1 Esdras 5:23); evidently the SENAAB *SEE SENAAB* (q.v.) of the genuine text (<sup><4125></sup>Ezra 2:35).

### Annals Ecclesiastici

*SEE BARONIUS.*

### Annam

*SEE ANAM.*

## An'nas

(**Ἀννας**, probably a contracted form of the name *Ananiah* in its Greek form, **Ἀνανοῦς**), a highpriest of the Jews mentioned in Luke (3, 2) as being high-priest *along with* Caiaphas his son-in-law. Our Lord's first hearing (<sup><BIBS></sup>John 18:13) was before Annas, who then sent him bound to Caiaphas. In <sup><4016></sup>Acts 4:6, he is plainly called the high-priest, and Caiaphas merely named with others of his family. He is called by Josephus *Ananus* (q.v.) the son of Seth; and was first appointed to that office in his 37th year by Quirinus, proconsul of Syria, about A.D. 7 (*Ant.* 18, 2, 1), but was afterward deprived of it by Valerius Gratus, procurator of Judaea (A.D. 14), who gave the office first to Ismael the son of Phabaeus, and a short time after to Eleazar the son of Annas (Josephus, *Ant.* 18, 2, 1 and 2). He held the office one year, and was then succeeded by Simon the son of Camithus, who, after another year, was followed by Joseph, also called Caiaphas, the son-in-law of Annas, A.D. ante 27, who continued in office until A.D. 37. In the passages of the New Testament above cited, therefore, it is apparent that Caiaphas was the only actual and proper high-priest; but Annas, being his father-in-law, and having been formerly himself high-priest, and being also perhaps his substitute (*sagan*), had great influence and authority, and could with great propriety be still termed high-priest along with Caiaphas. — (See Anger, *De temp.* p. 185; Lightfoot, *Hor. Hebrews* p. 744 sq.; Rus, *Harmon. Evang.* 1, 313 sq.; III, 2:962 sq.; Vitranga, *Observ. Sacr.* 6, 529 sq.; Casaubon, *Exerc. antibar.* p. 216 sq.; Wieseler, *Chronol. Synops.* p. 186 sq.; Selden, *De Synedriis*, 2, 655; Saubert, *De Sacerdotio Ebrceor.* 1, 5; Kuinol, *Comment.* on <sup><4112></sup>Luke 3:2.) **SEE HIGH-PRIEST.** He died at an advanced age, and was succeeded by his first son in the sacerdotal dignity (Josephus, *Ant.* 20, 9, 1).

## An'has

(**Ἀνάβ** v. r. **Ἀνναῶς**) likewise occurs in the Apocrypha (Vulg. *Nuas*) as one of the Israelites who had married Gentile wives after the captivity (1 Esdras 9:32); evidently a corruption for the HARIM **SEE HARIM** (q.v.) of the genuine text (<sup><15012></sup>Ezra 10:31).

## Annates

or First-fruits, in the ecclesiastical law, means the value of every spiritual living for a whole year (hence the name, from the Latin word *annus*, a year), which the pope, claiming the disposition of every spiritual benefice

within Christendom, reserved out of every living. This impost was at first only levied from persons appointed to bishoprics; but it was afterward extended to the inferior clergy. The value of these annates was calculated according to a rate made under the direction of Pope Innocent IV (A.D. 1253), but which was afterward increased by Pope Nicholas III (A.D. 1292). This papal exaction was abolished in England by the act 25 Henry VIII, c. 20, and by an act passed in the following year of the same reign, 26 Henry VIII, c. 3), the right to annates, or first-fruits, was annexed to the crown. The various statutes subsequently passed on this subject have all been consolidated by an act (the 1 Vict. c. 20) regulating the collection of the money so levied. Gieseler, *Ch. Hist.* 3, 54-63. *SEE FIRST-FRUITS; SEE QUEEN ANNE'S BOUNTY.*

### Annesley, Samuel, D.D.

maternal grandfather of John Wesley, was one of the leading non-conformist divines of his day, and a man of good family, being a nephew of the earl of Anglesea. He was born near Warwick in 1620, and educated at Oxford, where, like his grandson, he was noted for his piety and diligence. He served the national church as chaplain at sea, and as parish priest at Cliff, in Kent, at St. John the Apostle's and at St. Giles's, two of the largest congregations in London. He refused to "conform" to the "Act of Uniformity," and endured a series of severe persecutions, which were attended by many of those "remarkable interpositions" that distinguish the later history of the family. One of his persecutors fell dead while preparing a warrant for his apprehension. He became a leader of the Puritans during the troubles of the times, preaching almost daily, providing pastors for destitute congregations, and relief for his ejected and impoverished brethren. After a ministry of more than half a century, and of sore trials, under which he never once faltered, he died, Dec. 31, 1696, exclaiming, "I shall be satisfied with thy likeness; satisfied, satisfied." De Foe, who sat under his preaching, has drawn his character as perfect, in an elegy. The non-conformists considered him a second St. Paul. Richard Baxter pronounced him totally devoted to God (Clarke, *Wesley Family*, p. 298). He was endeared to all who knew him intimately; and his noble relative, the countess of Anglesea, desired, on her death-bed, to be buried in his grave. He had a manly countenance and dignified person; a rich estate, which he devoted to charity; robust health, which was capable of any fatigue. Calamy (*Non-conformist's Memorial*, vol. 1) calls him an Israelite indeed.

— Stevens, *Hist. of Methodism*, 1, 35; Crowther, *Portraiture of Methodism*, p. 3.

## Annihilation

the act of reducing any thing to nothing. Whether matter can be utterly destroyed or not, is a question that has been much agitated in the schools. According to some, nothing is so difficult; according to others, nothing is so easy. Existence, say the last, is a state of violence; all things are continually endeavoring to return to their primitive nothing; no power is required to effect it; it would be accomplished of itself; nay more, an infinite power is required to prevent it. As to human beings, the majority of the Greek philosophers opposed the doctrine; the Brahmins held that at stated intervals all created things are annihilated; the Siamese hold annihilation to be the greatest reward of virtue (Buck, *Theol. Dictionary*, s.v.). The theory of the annihilation *of the wicked* has been set on foot at different periods, and has recently been revived. *SEE*

*ANNIHILATIONISTS.*

## Annihilationists

a name given to the holders of the theory that the wicked will not be kept in eternal misery, but will suffer a total extinction of being. *SEE* *ANNIHILATION.*

**1.** There are only a few traces of this doctrine in early church history. Some are disposed to find the first hint of it in Justin (*Dialog. cum Tryphon. c. 5*), where it is said that the souls of the wicked should be punished as long ἕστ' ἢ αὐτὰς καὶ εἶναι καὶ κολάζεσθαι ὁ Θεός θέλη (as long as God wishes them to exist and to be punished). Similar expressions are used by Irenaeus (2, 34: *Quoadusque ea Deus et esse et perseverare voluerit*), and Clem. Hom. 3, 3. In clearer terms the doctrine was propounded by Arnobius (q.v.) at the beginning of the 4th century. *SEE HELL.*

**2.** The theory of annihilation was maintained in the last century in England by a few writers of inferior note, as Samuel Bourne (*Sermons*), J. N. Scott, and others. They took the name of *Destructionists*, assuming the point in dispute, viz., that the word *destruction* in Scripture means *annihilation*. Their proper designation is "Annihilationists." Among the more eminent supporters of this doctrine was Taylor of Norwich (q.v.); and Macknight is also claimed as among its advocates. Jonathan Edwards, in his answer to

Dr. Chauncey, on the salvation of all men, says that this scheme was provisionally retained by Dr. Chauncey, i.e. in case the scheme of universal salvation should fail him; and Edwards, in his examination of that work, appropriates a chapter to the consideration of it. Among other reasonings against it are the following:

**“1.** The different degrees of punishment which the wicked will suffer according to their works, proves that it does not consist in annihilation, which admits of no degrees.

**2.** If it be said that the punishment of the wicked, though it will end in annihilation, yet shall be preceded by torment, and that this will be of different degrees, according to the degrees of sin, it maybe replied, this is making it to be compounded partly of torment and partly of annihilation. The latter also appears to be but a small part of future punishment, for that alone will be inflicted on the least sinner, and on account of the least sin; and that all punishment which will be inflicted on any person above that which is due to the least sin is to consist in torment. Nay, if we can form any idea in the present state of what would be dreadful or desirable in another, instead of its being any punishment to be annihilated after a long series of torment, it must be a deliverance, to which the sinner would look forward with anxious desire. And is it credible that this was the termination of torment that our Lord held up to his disciples as an object of dread? Can this be the destruction of body and soul in hell? Is it credible that everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power, should constitute only a part, and a small part, of future punishment; and such too as, after a series of torment, must, next to being made happy, be the most acceptable thing that could befall them? Can this be the object threatened by such language, as recompensing tribulation, and taking vengeance in flaming fire? (2 Thessalonians 1). Is it possible that God should threaten them with putting an end to their miseries? Moreover, this destruction is not described as the conclusion of a succession of torments, but as taking place immediately after the last judgment. When Christ shall come to be glorified in his saints then shall the wicked be destroyed.

**3.** Everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power, cannot mean annihilation, for that would be no exertion of divine power, but merely the suspension of it; for let the



upholding power of God be withheld for one moment, and the whole creation would sink into nothing.

**4.** The punishment of wicked men will be the same as that of wicked angels (<sup><4254></sup>Matthew 25:41): Depart, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels. But the punishment of wicked angels consists not in annihilation, but torment. Such is their present punishment in a degree, and such, in a greater degree, will be their punishment hereafter. They are ‘cast down to hell;’ they ‘believe, and tremble;’ they are reserved in chains under darkness to the judgment of the great day; they cried, saying, “What have we to do with thee? Art thou come to torment us before our time?” Could the devils but persuade themselves they should be annihilated, they would believe, and be at ease rather than tremble.

**5.** The Scriptures explain their own meaning in the use of such terms as death, destruction, etc. The second death is expressly said to consist in being cast into the lake of fire and brimstone, and as having a part in that lake (Revelations 20:14; 21:8), which does not describe annihilation, nor can it be made to consist with it. The phrase cut him asunder (<sup><4251></sup>Matthew 24:51) is as strong as those of death or destruction; yet that is made to consist of having their portion with hypocrites, where shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth.

**6.** The happiness of the righteous does not consist in eternal being, but eternal well-being; and as the punishment of the wicked stands everywhere opposed to it, it must consist, not in the loss of being, but of well-being, and in suffering the contrary.” Bishop Law (t 1789) maintained that spiritual death is an entire destruction — an annihilation of the soul, with the resolution of the body into its original dust (*Theory of Religion*, 7th ed. p. 339-351). The name of Archbishop Whately is probably to be enrolled among the modern supporters of annihilationism in England. ‘In his work on the future state (*A View of the Scripture Revelations concerning a Future State*, Philad. 1855) he argues the opinion fully. He says, that in the passages in which the words “death,” “destruction,” “eternal death,” are spoken of, these words may be taken as signifying literal death, real destruction, an utter end of things. The unquenchable fire” may mean that fire which utterly consumes what it is burning upon. The “worm that dieth not” may be that which entirely devours what. it feeds upon. “Everlasting perdition” may mean that perishing from which the soul canhot be saved, but it

will be final annihilating. The passage “The last enemy that shall be destroyed is *death*,” affords, according to Whately, some ground for thinking that there may be a “final extinction of evil and suffering by the total destruction of such as are incapable of good and happiness. If eternal death means final death — death without any revival — we can understand what is meant by death being destroyed, viz., that none henceforth are to be subjected to it” (p. 184). And Whately concludes this scriptural argument by this sentence: “On the whole, therefore, I think we are not warranted in concluding, as some have done so positively concerning the question, as to make it a point of Christian faith to interpret figuratively the ‘death and destruction’ spoken of in the Scriptures as the doom of the condemned, and to insist on the belief that they are to be left alive forevermore.”

**3.** The revival of annihilationism in this country seems to have begun with the publication of *Six Sermons on the Question* “Are the wicked immortal?” by George Storrs, answered by Prof. Post, in the *New Englander*, Feb. and May, 1856. One of the most representative advocates of the doctrine, and a very moderate one, is Dr. McCulloh, of Baltimore, in his *Analytical Investigations concerning the Scriptures* (Baltimore, 1852, 2 vols. 8vo). He maintains that after the final decisions of the judgment, the wicked will be utterly destroyed by a dreadful visitation of Almighty wrath. The ablest work produced on the side of destructionism is Hudson, *Debt and Grace, as related to the Doctrine of a Future State* (Boston, 1857, 12mo). This work “denies that the natural immortality of the soul is ever expressed or even implied in the Bible. On the contrary, life and immortality are brought in fullness by the Redeemer to the redeemed alone; while all others are not only naturally mortal, soul and body, at death, but, after that mortal suspension of positive existence, are raised at the final resurrection and cast into the lake of fire as the second death. It denies that endless conscious suffering is ever affirmed to be the nature of future penalty; but affirms that the penalty consists in privation, and in its perpetuity consists the eternity of future punishment. The class of Scripture terms by which eternal misery is usually understood to be designated, such as *condemnation, damnation, perdition, destruction*, the writer understands to express the painful and penal consignment of the entire nature to the disorganization and complete nonexistence from which it sprung” (*Meth. Quar. Rev.* Jan. 1858, p. 149). An exhaustive reply to Mr. Hudson, and a thorough examination of the whole controversy, is given by

Landis in his treatise *On the Immortality of the Soul and the Final Condition of the Wicked*. (N. Y. 1859, 12mo). The subject is also ably treated by Mattison in his work, *The Immortality of the Soul*. (Philad. 1864). See also Alvah Hovey, *State of Impenitent Dead* (1859); J. R. Thompson, *Law and Penalty*; *Meth. Quar. Rev.* 1852, p. 240; 1858, p. 149; 1861, p. 31; 1864, p. 689; *Presb. Quar. Rev.* April, 1860; *Am. Theol. Rev.* April, 1861; *Bibliotheca Sacra*, April, 1858, p. 395 sq., and April, 1863, art. 5; Buck, *Theol. Dict.*; Smith's Hagenbach, 1, 226; 2, 451. **SEE IMMORTALITY.**

### Annus, Giovanni

was born at Viterbo July 7, 1432. Having entered the order of Dominicans, he became a proficient in the Latin, Greek, and Oriental languages, and in theology. He published two works, entitled,

1. *Tractatus de Imperio Turcarum*; and
2. *De Futuris Christianorum triumphis*, etc. (Genoa, 1480, 4to), in which he endeavors to show that Mahomet was the Antichrist of the Apocalypse. But the work by which he is chiefly known is his seventeen books of Antiquities (Rome, 1498, fol.), in which he pretended to give the works of Berosus, Marsylus of Lesbos, Caton, Sempronius, Archilochus, Xenophon, Metasthenes or Megasthenes, Manetho, and others. These writings were the cause of a dispute among the learned at the time, some, as Pineda, Louis Viveza, the Spaniard, Vossius, Melchior Canus, and others, maintained the utter falsity of all these pieces, and declared Annus to be a sheer impostor; while others, who had among them such men as: Nauderius, Leander Albert, Sixtus of Siena, Alph. Mildonatus, etc., declared themselves in his favor. Annus was master of the palace for Alexander VI, and was, it is supposed, poisoned by Casar Borgia, whom he had offended. He died Nov. 13, 1502. — Hoefer, *Biog. Genzrale*, 2, 729; Landon, *Eccl. Dict.* s.v.

### Anniversary

in the Greek and Romish Churches, a name given to the day on which a martyr or saint is commemorated. Also, those days on which special prayer is made, year by year, for the souls of deceased persons, and masses said and alms distributed, are in the Romish Church called *anniversaries*. The anniversary office (*officium anniversarium*) is a double office, said *only* on

the first anniversary day after the death. On all succeeding anniversary days, the simple office is said, as in the daily office for the dead. Landon, *Eccl. Dict.* s.v.

### Anno or Hanno

(St.), archbishop of Cologne in the 11th century. Belonging to the Suabian family of Sonneberg, he was at first devoted to a military life; but, after a short career of arms, he entered the church. The emperor Henry III, the *B'ack*, appointed him to the see of Cologne upon the death of archbishop Hermann in 1055. He applied himself with diligence to his duties, both temporal and spiritual. He reformed many of the monasteries of his diocese, and built five or six others, among the latter the abbey of Sieberg. After the death of Henry III the empress made him regent. His zeal for the church outran his discretion, especially in the excessive energy with which he seconded the measures of Gregory VII (q.v.). The emperor Henry IV, though his pupil, was so dissatisfied with his conduct that he drove him from his see. He died December 4th, 1075, on which day he is commemorated. — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biographie Generale*, 2, 730; Baillet, *Vies des Saints*, December 4.

### Annual Conference

the name of the territorial synods or councils of the Methodist Episcopal Church, which are held every year, as distinguished from the general synod (General Conference) held quadrennially. The Annual Conference is composed of all the ministers in full connection within certain territorial limits. Preachers "on trial" are required to attend the sessions, but are not allowed to vote. The times of holding the Annual Conferences are fixed by the bishops, the place by the Conference itself. The presiding officer is the bishop; but, in case of his absence, some "member of the Conference appointed by the bishop shall preside; but if no appointment be made, the Conference elects a president by ballot among the elders, without debate." The duties of the Annual Conference, and the limits of its authority, are prescribed by the *Discipline*. A record of its proceedings is sent to each General Conference for revision, if necessary. The territorial boundaries of the Annual Conferences are fixed by the General Conference. There are now (1866) sixty annual conferences (including mission conferences) of the Methodist Episcopal Church in America, Europe, Africa, India, and *China*. — *Discipline of the Methodist Episcopal Church*, pt. 2, ch. 1; pt. 6, ch. 4;

Baker, *On the Discipline; Minutes of the Annual Conferences* (New York, 1866, 8vo). *SEE CONFERENCES; SEE METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH.*

## Anntilus

*a ring.* The clergy do not appear to have worn any badge of office until the fourth century; but subsequently various insignia or emblems of office were appropriated. The ring is now given to Romish bishops on their investiture, as emblematical of the bishop's espousals to the Church, in imitation of the ancient ceremony of presenting a ring in marriage. It was called "the ring of his espousals," *annulus sponsalitus*, or *annulus pronubus*; but sometimes, also, *annulus palatii*. The pope wears a ring with the device of Peter fishing; and papal briefs, stamped with this seal, are said to be given *sub annulo piscatorio*. The fisher-ring has been used for this purpose since the 13th century.

## Annunciad or Annunciada, Order of

### Picture for Annuniad or Annunciada 1

a military order, founded by Amedeus, count of Savoy, in 1350 or 1360, called at first the order of the *knots of love*, because of a hair bracelet, formed in love-knots, given to the count by a lady. Amedeus VIII, duke of Savoy (created Pope Felix III at the council of Basle), in 1494, changed the name of the order to that of *the Annunciad*.

### Picture for Annuniad or Annunciada 2

The figure of the Virgin was appended to the collar, in which the *loveknots* were changed into a pattern in twisted cord, and which bore the initials F. E. R. T., supposed to mean *Fortitudo ejus Rhodum tenuit*, in reference to the valiant defense of Rhodes by Amedeus the Great in 1310. The cloak of the knights was first red, afterward blue, and now of the color of amaranth, lined with cloth of silver. It still exists in Sardinia as an order of merit. — Helyot, *Ordres Religieux*, 1, 224; Burke, *Orders of Knighthood*, p. 350.

## Annunciade

the name of two orders of nuns.

1. That founded at Bourges in 1500, by Jeanne, queen of France, after her divorce from Louis XII. These nuns also call themselves the nuns of the *ten virtues*, viz., the virtues exhibited, as they say, in the mysteries which the Roman Church commemorates in the ten festivals of the Virgin Mary. Their rule is formed upon the idea of an initiation of these virtues. They wear a gray habit, a red scapulary, a cross of gold or silver, suspended from the neck, and a ring of one of those metals on the finger. At the Revolution they had 45 nunneries in France and Holland, all of which were suppressed. — Helyot, *Ordres Relig.* 1, 227.

2. Another order of nuns, otherwise called CELESTINES *SEE CELESTINES* (*Colestes* or *Colestinoe*), from the girdle and mantle of sky-blue which they wear over their white habit. A Genoese widow, named Maria Victoria Fornari, instituted this order in 1602 or 1604. The constitution of the order, approved by Clement VII, enjoins poverty and separation from the world. They are allowed to speak to persons out of their house only six times a year, and then only to their nearest relatives. In 1860 they had three nunneries in Italy, six in Belgium, and five in France. In Rome they are called *Turchine* (i.e. the “violet-blue” ones). — Helyot, *Ordres Religieux*, 1, 236; P. Carl vom heil. Aloys, *Statistisches Jahrbuch der Kirche* (Regensbg. 1860).

### Annunciation, Feast of the

(from the Lat. *annunciatio*, *announcement*), a festival observed in honor of the tidings which the angel Gabriel brought to the Virgin Mary of the incarnation of our Savior. It is called by various names in church history, e.g. Ἡμέρα ἀσπασμοῦ, “the day of salutation;” Χαριτισμός, in reference to the epithet κεχαριτωμένη, employed by the angel (Luke 1:28); also Εὐαγγελισμός, with reference to the subject of the announcement. Some doubt exists as to the date of its establishment. Augusti is of opinion that the festival was celebrated at the time of the council of Laodicea, cir. 364. In the homily ascribed to Athanasius it is called one of our Lord’s festivals. After the fifth century, in consequence of what passed during the Nestorian controversies, this festival was referred to Mary, and its observance fixed for the 25th of March, on which day it is now celebrated by the Greek, Roman, and English Churches. It seems to have been generally observed in the sixth century, but the first formal mention that we meet with of its being commemorated among the festivals of the Church is in the decrees of the council of Trullo, convened at the close of the seventh

century. Chrysostom, and Bernard after him, call it “the root of all festivals.” — Bingham, *Orig. Eccl.* bk. 20, ch. 8, § 4.

The following writers treat on this subject: Kocher, *De salutatione angelica* (Jen. 1760-1); Myslenta, *De angelica annunciatione* (Regiom. 1623); Rancke, *De locutione angelorum* (Lips. 1678); Sonntag, *De chaeretismo* (Altdorf. 1709); Zeibich, *De verbis Gabrieli ad Mariam* (Viteb. 1754). *SEE MARY.*

## Annu'us

( Ἄννουος, Vulg. *Amin*), given (1 Esdras 8:48) as the name of one of the Levites sent to accompany the captives returning from Babylon; but it is evidently an error of the translator for /Taw~~φ~~veitto', “and with him,” of the original text (<sup><1789></sup>Ezra 8:19).

## Anoint

### Picture for Anoint 1

(usually *j vīm*; *mashach'*, *χρίω*). The practice of anointing with perfumed oils or ointments appears to have been very common among the Hebrews, as it was among the ancient Egyptians. *SEE UNGUENT.* The practice, as to its essential meaning, still remains in the East; but perfumed waters are now far more commonly employed than oils or ointments (q.v.). See PERFUME. It is from this source that the usage has extended to other regions. Among the Greeks and Romans oil was employed as a lubricator for suppling the bodies of the athletes in the games (q.v.), and also after the bath (q.v.).

**I.** In the Scriptures several kinds of anointing are distinguishable (Scacchi, *Myrotheca*, 3, Romans 1637).

**1.** *Consecration and Inauguration.* — The act of anointing appears to have been viewed as emblematical of a particular sanctification, of a designation to the service of God, or to a holy and sacred use. Hence the anointing of the high-priests (<sup><1729></sup>Exodus 29:29; <sup><1808></sup>Leviticus 4:3), and even of the sacred vessels of the tabernacle (<sup><1816></sup>Exodus 30:26, etc.); and hence also, probably, the anointing of the king, who, as “the Lord’s anointed,” and, under the Hebrew constitution, the viceroy of Jehovah, was undoubtedly invested with a sacred character. This was the case also among the

Egyptians, among whom the king was, *ex officio*, the high-priest, and as such, doubtless, rather than in his secular capacity, was solemnly anointed at his inauguration. *SEE UNCTIONS* (of Christ).

As the custom of inaugural anointing first occurs among the Israelites immediately after they left Egypt, and no example of the same kind is met with previously, it is fair to conclude that the practice and the notions connected with it were acquired in that country. With the Egyptians, as with the Jews, the investiture to any sacred office, as that of king or priest, was confirmed by this external sign; and as the Jewish lawgiver mentions the ceremony of pouring oil upon the head of the high-priest *after* he had put on his entire dress, with the mitre and crown, the Egyptians represent the anointing of their priests and kings *after* they were attired in their full robes, with the cap and crown upon their heads. Some of the sculptures introduce a priest pouring oil over the monarch (Wilkinson's *Anc. Egyptians*, 4, 280). It is from this that the high-priest, as well as the king, is called "the anointed" (<sup><094B></sup>Leviticus 4:3; 5:16; 6:15; <sup><101D></sup>Psalms 133:2). In fact, anointing being the principal ceremony of regal inauguration among the Jews, as crowning is with us, "anointed," as applied to a king, has much the same signification as "crowned." It does not, however, appear that this anointing was repeated at every succession, the anointing of the founder of the dynasty being considered efficient for its purpose as long as the regular line of descent was undisturbed (Jahn, *Bibl. Archaol.* § 223); hence we find no instance of unction as a sign of investiture in the royal authority, except in the case of Saul, the first king of the Jews, and of David, the first of his line; and, subsequently, in those of Solomon, Joash, and Jehu, who ascended the throne under circumstances in which there was danger that their right might be forcibly disputed (<sup><092B></sup>1 Samuel 19:24; <sup><101B></sup>2 Samuel 2:4; 5:1-3; <sup><1310></sup>1 Chronicles 11:1, 2; <sup><1212></sup>2 Kings 11:12-20; <sup><1420></sup>2 Chronicles 23:1-21). Those who were inducted into the royal office in the kingdom of Israel appear to have been inaugurated with some peculiar ceremonies (<sup><1393></sup>2 Kings 9:13). But it is not clear that they were anointed at all; and the omission (if real) is ascribed by the Jewish writers to the want of the holy anointing oil which could alone be used on such occasions, and which was in the keeping of the priests of the temple in Jerusalem. The private anointing which was performed by the prophets (<sup><139B></sup>2 Kings 9:3; comp. <sup><090E></sup>1 Samuel 10:1) was not understood to convey any abstract right to the crown, but was merely a symbolical intimation that the person thus anointed should eventually ascend the throne.



The following species of official anointing appear to have prevailed among the Jews:

**(a.) Prophets** were occasionally anointed to their office (<sup><1196></sup>1 Kings 19:16), and are called messiahs, or anointed (<sup><1362></sup>1 Chronicles 16:22; <sup><945></sup>Psalms 105:15).

**(b.) Priests**, at the first institution of the Levitical priesthood, were all anointed to their offices, the sons of Aaron as well as Aaron himself (<sup><845></sup>Exodus 40:15; <sup><848></sup>Numbers 3:3); but afterward anointing seems not to have been repeated at the consecration of ordinary priests, but to have been especially reserved for the high-priest (<sup><929></sup>Exodus 29:29; <sup><862></sup>Leviticus 16:32); so that “the priest that is anointed” (<sup><848></sup>ἡκβίη ἵνῃ, <sup><848></sup>Leviticus 4:3) is generally thought to mean the high-priest (Sept. ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς ὁ κεχρισμένος; comp. verses 5, 16, and c. 6, 22 [15]).

**(c.) Kings.** The Jews were familiar with the idea of making a king by anointing before the establishment of their own monarchy (<sup><848></sup>Judges 9:8, 15). Anointing was the divinely appointed ceremony in the inauguration of their own kings (<sup><846></sup>1 Samuel 9:16; 10:1; <sup><1034></sup>1 Kings 1:34, 39); indeed, so pre-eminently did it belong to the kingly office, that “the Lord’s anointed” was a common designation of the theocratic king (<sup><848></sup>1 Samuel 12:3, 5; <sup><1014></sup>2 Samuel 1:14, 16). The rite was sometimes performed more than once. David was thrice anointed to be king: first, privately by Samuel, before the death of Saul, by way of conferring on him a right to the throne (<sup><846></sup>1 Samuel 16:1, 13); again over Judah at Hebron (<sup><1034></sup>2 Samuel 2:4), and finally over the whole nation (<sup><1038></sup>2 Samuel 5:3). After the separation into two kingdoms, the kings both of Judah and of Israel seem still to have been anointed (<sup><1388></sup>2 Kings 9:3; 11:12). So late as the time of the captivity the king is called “the anointed of the Lord” (<sup><988></sup>Psalms 89:38, 51; <sup><301></sup>Lamentations 4:20). Besides Jewish kings, we read that Hazael was to be anointed king over Syria (<sup><1195></sup>1 Kings 19:15). Cyrus also is called the Lord’s anointed, as having been raised by God to the throne for the special purpose of delivering the Jews out of captivity (<sup><2461></sup>Isaiah 45:1).

**(d.) Inanimate objects** also were anointed with oil in token of their being set apart for religious service. Thus Jacob anointed a pillar at Bethel (<sup><8313></sup>Genesis 31:13); and, at the introduction of the Mosaic economy, the tabernacle and all its furniture were consecrated by anointing (<sup><8316></sup>Exodus 30:26, 28). The expression “anoint the shield” (<sup><2461></sup>Isaiah 21:6; Sept.

ἔτοιμάσατε θυρεούς; Vulg. *arripite clypeum*) refers to the custom of rubbing oil into the hide which, stretched upon a frame, formed the shield, in order to make it supple and fit for use. (See the treatises in Latin, on the priestly anointing, by Clasing [Lemgon. (1717)]; Schwarz [Viteb. 1755]; Ziegra [Viteb. 1682]; Zoega [Lips. 1680]; on the royal anointing, by Weymar [Jen. 1629]; and among other nations, by Eschenbach [Jen. 1687]; Speckner [Viteb. 1716]).

## Picture for Anoint 2

2. *As an Act of Hospitality.* — The anointing of our Savior's feet by "the woman who was a sinner" (<sup><4738></sup>Luke 7:38) led to the remark that the host himself had neglected to anoint his head (ver. 46); whence we learn that this was a mark of attention which those who gave entertainments paid to their guests. As this is the only direct mention of the custom, the Jews are supposed by some to have borrowed it from the Romans at a late period, and Wetstein and others have brought a large quantity of Latin erudition to bear on the subject. (See the treatises, on this instance, in Latin, by Baler [Altdorf. 1722]; Goetze [Lips. 1687; and in Menethii *Thesaur.* 2, 200-204]; Jaeschke [Lips. 1700]; Krackewitz [Rost. 1703]; Polchow [Jen. 1755]; Ries [Marb. 1727]; Sonnuel [Lond. 1775, 1794]; Trautermann [Jen. 1749].) But the careful reader of the O.T. knows that the custom was an old one, to which there are various indirect allusions. **SEE HOSPITALITY.** The circumstances connected with feasts and entertainments are, indeed, rarely intimated; nor would the present direct reference to this custom have transpired but for the remarks which the act of the woman in anointing the feet of Jesus called forth. (See Walde, *De unctionibus Vett. Ebreoeorum convivialibus*, Jen. 1751.) Such passages, however, as <sup><19216></sup>Psalm 23:5; <sup><1207></sup>Proverbs 21:7; 27:9; Wisd. 2:7; as well as others in which the *enjoyments* of oil and wine are coupled together, may be regarded as containing a similar allusion. It is, therefore, safer to refer the origin of this custom among the Hebrews to their nearer and more ancient neighbors, the Egyptians, than to the Romans or the Greeks, who themselves had probably derived it from the same people. Among the Egyptians the antiquity of the custom is evinced by their monuments, which offer in this respect analogies more exact than classical antiquity or modern usage can produce. With them "the custom of anointing was not confined to the appointment of kings and priests to the sacred offices they held. It was the ordinary token of welcome to guests in every party at the house of a friend; and in Egypt, no less than in Judaea, the metaphorical expression 'anointed

with the oil of gladness' was fully understood, and applied to the ordinary occurrences of life. It was customary for a servant to attend every guest as he seated himself, and to anoint his head" (Wilkinson's *Anc. Egyptians*, 4, 279; 2:213). **SEE SPIKENARD**. It is probable, however, that the Egyptians, as well as the Greeks and Jews, anointed themselves at home, before going abroad, although they expected the observance of this etiquette on the part of their entertainer. That the Jews thus anointed themselves, not only when paying a visit, but on ordinary occasions, is shown by many passages, especially those which describe the omission of it as a sign of mourning (<sup><6840></sup>Deuteronomy 28:40; <sup><8083></sup>Ruth 3:3; <sup><10412></sup>2 Samuel 14:2; <sup><27018></sup>Daniel 10:3; <sup><31616></sup>Amos 6:6; <sup><31615></sup>Micah 6:15; <sup><17022></sup>Esther 2:12; <sup><94415></sup>Psalms 104:15; <sup><25013></sup>Isaiah 61:3; <sup><21008></sup>Ecclesiastes 9:8; <sup><20008></sup>Song of Solomon 1:3; 4:10; also Judith 10:3; Sus. 17; Ecclus. 39:26; Wisd. 2:7). One of these passages (<sup><94415></sup>Psalms 104:15, "oil that maketh the face to shine") shows very clearly that not only the hair but the skin was anointed. In our northern climates this custom may not strike us as a pleasant one; but as the peculiar usages of most nations are found, on strict examination, to be in accordance with the peculiarities of their climate and condition, we may be assured that this Oriental predilection for external unction must have arisen from a belief that it contributed materially to health and cleanliness. Niebuhr states that "in Yemen the anointing of the body is believed to strengthen and protect it from the heat of the sun, by which the inhabitants of this province, as they wear but little clothing, are very liable to suffer. Oil, by closing up the pores of the skin, is supposed to prevent that too copious transpiration which enfeebles the frame; *perhaps, too, these Arabians think a glistening skin a beauty*. When the intense heat comes on they always anoint their bodies with oil." **SEE OIL**.

**3. Anointing the Sick.** — The Orientals are indeed strongly persuaded of the sanative properties of oil; and it was under this impression that the Jews anoint the sick, and applied oil to wounds (<sup><94418></sup>Psalms 109:18; <sup><23016></sup>Isaiah 1:6; <sup><21041></sup>Luke 10:34; Revelations 3:18). Anointing was used in sundry disorders, as well as to promote the general health of the body. It was hence, as a salutary and approved medicament, that the seventy disciples were directed to "anoint the sick" (<sup><10613></sup>Mark 6:13); and hence also the sick man is directed by the apostle (<sup><31614></sup>James 5:14) to send for the elders of the Church, who were "to pray for him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord." The Talmudical citations of Lightfoot on <sup><11616></sup>Matthew 6:16, show that the later Jews connected charms and

superstitious mutterings with such anointings, and he is therefore probably right in understanding this text to mean, “It is customary for the unbelieving Jews to use anointing of the sick, joined with a magical and enchanting muttering; but how infinitely better is it to join the pious prayers of the elders of the Church to the anointing of the sick.” Niebuhr assures us that at Sana (and doubtless in other parts of Arabia) the Jews, as well as many of the Moslems, have their bodies anointed whenever they feel themselves indisposed. Analogous to this is the anointing with oil practiced by the twelve (<sup><4093></sup>Mark 9:13), and our Lord’s anointing the eyes of a blind man with clay made from saliva, in restoring him miraculously to sight (<sup><4006></sup>John 9:6, 11). *SEE MEDICINE.*

**4. Anointing the Dead.** — The practice of anointing the bodies of the dead is intimated in <sup><4148></sup>Mark 14:8, and <sup><2736></sup>Luke 23:56. This ceremony was performed after the body was washed, and was designed to check the progress of corruption. Although, from the mode of application, it is called anointing, the substance employed appears to have been a solution of odoriferous drugs. This (together with the laying of the body in spices) was the only kind of embalmment in use among the Jews. *SEE BURIAL; SEE EMBALMING.*

**5. Spiritual.** —

**(1.)** In the O.T. a Deliverer is promised under the title of Messiah, or Anointed (<sup><3902></sup>Psalms 2:2; <sup><2725></sup>Daniel 9:25, 26); and the nature of his anointing is described to be spiritual, with the Holy Ghost (<sup><2301></sup>Isaiah 61:1; see <sup><4048></sup>Luke 4:18). As anointing with oil betokened prosperity, and produced a cheerful aspect (<sup><3945></sup>Psalms 104:15), so this spiritual unction is figuratively described as anointing “with the oil of gladness” (<sup><3987></sup>Psalms 45:7; <sup><3809></sup>Hebrews 1:9). In the N.T. Jesus of Nazareth is shown to be the Messiah or Christ, or Anointed of the O.T. (<sup><4041></sup>John 1:41; <sup><4022></sup>Acts 9:22; 17:2, 3; 18:5, 28); and the historical fact of his being anointed with the Holy Ghost is recorded and asserted (<sup><4032></sup>John 1:32, 33; <sup><4027></sup>Acts 4:27; 10:38).

**(2.)** Spiritual anointing with the Holy Ghost is conferred also upon Christians by God (<sup><4021></sup>2 Corinthians 1:21), and they are described as having an unction ( $\chi\rho\acute{\iota}\sigma\mu\alpha$ ) from the Holy One, by which they know all things (<sup><4021></sup>1 John 2:20, 27). To anoint the eyes with eye-salve is used figuratively, to denote the process of obtaining spiritual perception (Revelations 3:18).

## Picture for Anoint 3

**6. Religious Significance of the Act.** — It is somewhat remarkable that the first Biblical instance of anointing — that of Jacob's unction of his pillow at Bethel (<sup>OLD</sup>Genesis 28:18) — has reference to an inanimate object; yet the sacred import of the ceremony is obvious, and must have been derived from primeval custom. At a later date, the formal agreement noticed by Sir G. Wilkinson, between the use of oil among the Egyptians and the Israelites in consecrating to an office, may undoubtedly be regarded as evidence that the Mosaic prescription was framed with some regard to the observances in Egypt; for by the time the former was instituted, the Israelitish people had been long habituated to the customs of Egypt; and it was the part of wisdom, when setting up a better polity, to take advantage of what existed there, so far as it could be safely employed. The king so anointed was solemnly recognised as the guest and protege of the lord of the temple; the statue was set apart for, and so far identified with the god it represented, and both were stamped as fit for their respective destinations. But in the true religion something more and higher was involved in the act of consecration. The article or subject was brought into contact with the holiness of Jehovah, and was made a vessel and instrument of the Spirit of God. Hence, anointing with oil in the times of the old covenant was always a symbol of the gift and grace of the Holy Spirit—in the case of inanimate objects imparting to them a ceremonial sacredness, so as to fit them for holy ministrations; and in the case of persons, not only designating them to a sacred office, but sealing to them the spiritual qualifications. needed for its efficient discharge. *SEE CONSECRATION.*

## II. Modern. —

**1.** In the Romish Church the custom of anointing priests is still continued. The ordaining bishop anoints with the holy oil called *chrism* (q.v.) the palm of both hands, the thumb, and the forefinger of the person to be ordained; and thus, according to the expression in the ritual of ordination, the hands receive power to bless, to consecrate, and to make holy. If a clergyman is excommunicated these spots are rubbed off. This custom, like many others, is a perversion of the sacred ceremony by which the Jewish priests and kings were inducted into office.

**2.** The history of *extreme unction* (q.v.) in its present form can be traced back no further than the twelfth century. When the ceremony of anointing

is mentioned at an earlier period, the reference is to the offices of baptism and confirmation. There is no mention of extreme unction in Justin Martyr, Irenaeus, Tertullian, or Cyprian, or in any of the writers of the first three centuries. In the fourth century Epiphanius makes no mention of it. It is not found in the “Apostolical Constitutions,” a work in which all church forms are minutely described, nor in the biographies of the first six centuries. After the twelfth century it was universally adopted in the Western Church.

**3.** The only occasion on which anointing is used in the Church of England is at the coronation of the sovereigns, when the archbishop solemnly anoints the king or queen, after the ancient practice of the Hebrews.

**ANOINTING OIL.** The “oil of holy ointment” prescribed by divine authority (<sup><4023></sup>Exodus 30:23-25) for the consecration of the Jewish priests and kings was compounded of the following ingredients:

Hebrew weight. English weight.

**lb.          oz.          dwt.    gr.**

Pure myrrh	500 shekels=	18	11	13	13 2/3
Sweet cinnamon	250 shekels=	9	5	16	18 1/24
Sweet calamus	250 shekels =	9	5	16	18 1/24
Cassia	500 shekels =	18	11	13	13 2-3
Olive oil, 1 hin=5 quarts	35 ½ shekels=	13	4	0	0
Total	1851 ½ shekels=	70	8	0	15 1/4

The shekel is here estimated at 9 dwts. and 2 4-T grains (*Troy*).

Under the law persons and things set apart for sacred purposes were anointed with this “holy ointment” (<sup><4020></sup>Exodus 29:7), which appears to have been a typical representation of the communication of the Holy Ghost to the Church of Christ (<sup><4005></sup>Acts 1:5; 10:38). Hence the Holy Spirit is

called an unction (q.v.), whereby believers were divinely inspired and guided into all truth (~~4012~~2 Corinthians 1:21; ~~4121~~1 John 2:20, 27). The profane or common use of the holy ointment was expressly forbidden, on pain of being excommunicated (~~1023~~Exodus 30:33; ~~3231~~Ezekiel 23:31). It was commanded to be kept by the Hebrews throughout their generations; it was therefore laid up in the most holy place. Prideaux observes that it was one of those things which was wanting in the second temple. There is an allusion to the ingredients of this sacred perfume in Ecclesiastes 24:15. The use of aromatics in the East may be dated from the remotest antiquity. "Ointment and perfume," says Solomon, "rejoice the heart" (~~3179~~Proverbs 27:9). They are still introduced, not only upon every religious and festive occasion, but as one essential expression of private hospitality and friendship. *SEE OINTMENT.*

**THE ANOINTED.** *The prophets, priests, and kings* were anointed at their inauguration; but no man was ever dignified by being anointed to hold the three offices in himself, so no person ever had the title of the Messiah, the Christ, the Anointed One, but Jesus the Savior. He alone is king of kings and lord of lords: the king who governs the universe, and rules in the hearts of his followers; the prophet, to instruct men in the way wherein they should go; and the great high-priest, to make atonement and intercession for the whole world. Of him, Melchizedek, Abraham, Aaron, David, and others were illustrious types; but none of these had the title of "The Anointed of God." This does, and ever will, belong exclusively to Jesus the Christ, who was consecrated in our nature by the anointing of the Holy Ghost (~~3912~~Psalm 2:2; ~~23601~~Isaiah 61:1; ~~2024~~Daniel 9:24; ~~1086~~Matthew 3:16,17; ~~1018~~Luke 4:18-21; ~~4027~~Acts 4:27; 10:38). *SEE MESSIAH.*

### Anomoeans

(*ἀνόμοιος*, *dissimilar*), the name by which the stricter Arians, who denied the *likeness* of the Word to the Father, were distinguished from the Semi-Arians, who merely denied his *consubstantiality*. — Gieseler, *Ch. Hist.* 1, 198. *SEE ARIANS.*

### A'nos

(*ἸἌνωϛ*), one of the "sons" of Maani (Bani), who divorced his Gentile wife (1 Esdras 9:34); apparently the VANIAH *SEE VANIAH* (q.v.) of the true text (Ezra, 10:36).

## Ansarians or Assassins

inhabitants of a district in Syria (called also ENSARIANS *SEE* *ENSARIANS*). Their religion is a compound of p:ganism and Mohammedanism, which they are said to have been taught by an old man who in 891 inhabited the village of Nasar, near Koufa, and passed for a saint and a prophet. Some of them worship the sun, others the dog and other material objects. A special work on them has been published by the Rev. Samuel Lyde (see a valuable summary of this work in the *N. Amer. Review*, Oct. 1862). According to Lyde, "they number about 200,000, for the most part rude and vicious. They are divided into Shemseeh (men of the sun, Northerners) and Kumreel (men of the moon, Southerners); the former may be descendants of the Canaanites; the latter, foreigners, brought their present religion into the land. The name Ansaireeh is probably derived from the founder of the sect, Nusari, dating from the ninth century. Their sacred name is Khaseeb, from the apostle of the sect. In many points they have affinities with the Assassins. They believe in the divine unity in three personalities, the second and third being created. The first person, the supreme deity, is *Manna*, or Meaning; the second, *Ism*, or Name; the third, *Bab*, or Dove. Of the supreme deity there have been seven manifestations; the last is All, Mohammed, and Salman il Farisee. Ali is the highest manifestation of God, alone to be adored. There is also a system of hierarchies, bewildering in numbers: 14,000 Near Ones, 15,000 Cherubim, 16,000 Spirituals, 17,000 Saints, 18,000 Hermits, 19,000 Listeners, 20,000 Followers — in all, 119,000 — besides prophets, apostles, and heroes. The doctrine of metempsychosis is strictly held, and minutely delineated. They receive the Old and New Testaments, and the Koran, with many apocryphal works." An account of them is given in Chesney's *Expedition to the Euphrates and the Tigris*. See also *Walpole's Travels in the East*, and *Blackwood's Magazine*, 70, 719. *SEE* *ASSASSINS*.

## Anschar, Ansgar, or Anshairius

St., the first archbishop of Hamburg, bishop of Bremen, and so-called apostle of Sweden and Denmark. The most probable opinion is that he was born in Picardy, Sept. 9, 801. In 821 he went from the abbey of Cormie, in Picardy, to that in Saxony. Having from his youth been desirous to labor in a missionary feild, he was sent in 826 to Denmark, and thence to Sweden, where he preached the Gospel with wonderful success. After this



he was made bishop of Hamburg, which see he governed until the destruction of the city by the Normans in 845; four years after this, Louis, king of Germany, made him bishop of Bremen, where he died, Feb. 3, 865, regretting that he was not called to seal his profession by martyrdom. He wrote a life of St. Willehad (in Pertz, *Monumenta German.* 2, 683 sq.). For a glowing account of him, see Neander, *Light in Dark Places*, p. 264 sq.; comp. Neander, *Ch. Hist.* 3, 272, 284; Gieseler, *Ch. Hist.* 2, 29. See also *Brit. and For. Evang. l Review*, July, 1865. The first biography of Anskar was written by his successor, Rimbert (published by Dahlmann, in Pertz, *Monum. Germ.*; translated into German by Misegais, Bremen, 1826). See also Kruse, *St. Anskar* (Altona, 1823); Krummacher, *St. Ansgar* (Brem. 1828); Reuterdahl, *Anegarius* (Berl. 1837); Klippel, *Lebensbeschreibung des Erzbischnfs Ansgar* (Brem. 1845); Cave, *Hist. Litt.* 1, 523; Bohringer, *Kircheng. in Biogr.* 2, 170.

### Ansegis

**1.** A Benedictine monk, born of noble parents at Lyons, was, together with Eginhard, superintendent of the royal edifices; became in 817 abbot at Luxen, and in 827 at Fontanelles. Charlemagne and Louis the Pious employed him for important embassies. He died in 833. He is the author of that important collection of imperial laws known as *Libri III Capitularium*, containing a number of decrees issued by Charlemagne and Louis the Pious. The German kings had to take an oath upon this book as containing the laws of the empire. The best edition of it is contained in Pertz, *Monumenta Germanie legum*, vol. 1, — *Acta Sanctorum*, saec. 4, 1; D'Achery, *spicileg.* t. 3.

**2.** Abbot of St. Michael's (probably at Beauvais); was sent in 870 by Charles the Bald as ambassador to Rome; appointed in 871 archbishop of Sens, and used as a tool by the pope against the clergy. John VIII appointed him in 876 primate of the French Church and vicar-general of the apostolic see, but a synod of Pontion protested against this, and recognised him only as metropolitane. He died in 882, and his successors had to abandon the distinction, which the pope had intended to connect forever with the see. — Gfrorer, *Kirchengeschichte*, vol. 2; *Gallia Christiana*.

### Anselm Of Canterbury

(commonly called St. Anselm) was born at Aosta, a town of the Alps, in Savoy, A.D. 1033. He was treated harshly by his father, and traveled early

into France, and afterward into Normandy, where he took the monastic habit in 1060, at Bec, where Lanfranc, afterward archbishop I of Canterbury, was prior. Three years after, when Lanfranc was promoted to the abbacy of Caen, Anselm succeeded him as prior of Bec, and became abbot in 1078. Anselm came to England while prior of Bec, and afterward in 1092 by the invitation of Hugh Lupus, earl of Chester, who requested his aid in sickness. Soon after his arrival William Rufus also required Anselm's assistance, and finally nominated him (though with great difficulty of acceptance on Anselm's part) to the see of Canterbury, which had lain vacant from Lanfranc's death in 1089. Anselm was consecrated with great solemnity December 4, 1093. In the following year a stinted offer, as the king thought it, of £500 from the archbishop, in aid of the war which William was carrying on against his brother Robert, was the first cause of the royal displeasure toward Anselm, followed by further discontent when Anselm desired leave to go to Rome to receive the pall from Pope Urban II, whom the king refused to acknowledge as pope. Anselm proposed a visit to Rome to consult the pope, but was refused permission. He went a second time to court to ask for leave, and was again refused, but gave his blessing to the king, and embarked at Dover. The king seized upon the archbishopric, and made every act of Anselm's administration void. The archbishop got safe to Rome, and was honorably received by the pope. He lived quietly, at Rome and other places, and finished his treatise *Cur Deus Homo* at a monastery in Champagne. He assisted the pope at the synod or council of Bari, where he prevented Urban from excommunicating the king of England for his various and frequent outrages upon religion. The king, however, finally bribed the court of Rome to desert Anselm, who retired to Lyons, where (with the interval of an attendance at a council at Rome in 1099) he continued to reside till he heard of William Rufus's death, with that of Pope Urban shortly after. Henry I, immediately upon his accession, invited Anselm to return. The archbishop was received in England with extraordinary respect both by the king and people, but refusing to be reinvested by the king, and to do the same homage with his predecessors, he again fell under the displeasure of the court. In 1103, at the request of the king and barons, Anselm went to Rome to arrange an accommodation the king at the same time, in distrust, dispatching an agent of his own, who arrived before the archbishop. The pope still continued inexorable, but wrote to the king, promising compliance in other matters if the king would but waive the matter of investiture. Anselm in chagrin again took up his residence at

Lyons, while a fresh embassy to Rome from the king was still more unsuccessful than the former. Anselm now removed to the court of Adela of Blois, the king's sister, who, during a visit which Henry I made to Normandy, contrived an interview between him and Anselm July 22, 1105, when the king restored to him the revenues of the archbishopric, but refused to allow him to return to England unless he would comply with the investiture. Anselm remained in France, retiring to the abbey of Bec. At length the pope, adopting a middle course, refused to give up the investitures, but was willing so far to dispense as to give leave to bishops and abbots to do homage to the king for their temporalities. This was in 1106. The king now invited Anselm to England; but the messenger finding him sick, the king himself went over into Normandy, and made him a visit at Bec, where all their differences were adjusted. Anselm, being recovered, embarked for England, and, landing at Dover, was received with extraordinary marks of welcome. From this time little that is remarkable occurred in his life, except a dispute with Thomas, elected archbishop of York in 1108, who, wishing to disengage himself from dependency upon the see of Canterbury, refused to make the customary profession of canonical obedience. Before the termination of this dispute Anselm died at Canterbury, April 21, 1109, in the seventy-sixth year of his age (*Penny Cyclopaedia*, s.v.).

The intellect of Anselm was of the highest order; Neander calls him the Augustine of the twelfth century. His speculations impressed their character not only upon the theology and philosophy of his own age, but also upon all subsequent ages to the present time. He is generally named as the "father of scholasticism." Though his faith was always sincere and undoubting, his profoundly inquisitive intellect made it *necessary* for him to philosophize upon the grounds of that faith. Opposing himself to Roscelin, his philosophy was a thorough-going Realism; and in applying his philosophy to theology, he sought to demonstrate the being and attributes of God by the *ontological* method, of which, in fact, he was substantially the inventor (*Proslogium*, de Dei existentia; *Monologium*, de Divinitatis essentia). Remusat (*Vie d'Anselm*, p. 473) ascribes a Pantheistic tendency to Anselm's uncompromising Realism. Does not the following passage in the *Proslogium* appear to involve the Pantheistic theory? Speaking of the divine nature, "It is," he says, "the essence of the being, the principle of the existence of all things . . . Without parts, without differences, without accidents, without changes, it might be said, in a certain sense, to alone

exist, for in respect to it the other things which appear to be have no existence. The unchangeable Spirit is all that is, and it is this without limit, *simpliciter, interminabiliter*. It is the perfect and absolute existence. The rest is come from nonentity, and thither returns, if not supported by God: it does not exist by itself. In this sense the Creator alone exists; the things created do not” (p. 473, 474). It is plain that these dependent and merely relative existences must be conceived as an emanation from the supreme and substantial essence — must, like the *qualities* of bodies, be in fact identical with the supposed substrata. In his treatises on free-will and predestination he followed the Augustinian doctrine, and sought acutely, but vainly, to reconcile it with human freedom. He was the first also to treat the doctrine of redemption, *SEE SATISFACTION*, in a scientific way, and to seek a rational demonstration of it (in his treatise, *Cur Deus Homo*). He propounds the question, Why is it necessary that God should have humbled himself so far as to become man and suffer death? His process of reasoning, in reply to this question, is as follows. Man has by sin deprived God of the glory which properly belongs to him, and must therefore give satisfaction for it, i.e. he must restore to God the glory which is his; for the divine justice would not allow of forgiveness out of pure compassion, apart from such reparation. This reparation must be commensurate with the enormity of the sin; yet it is not in the power of man to give such, because, apart from this, he is God’s debtor. Such a satisfaction cannot be given unless some one is able to offer to God something of his own of more value than all which is not God, for the whole world should not have tempted man to sin (<sup>4066</sup>Matthew 16:26, “For what is a man profited, if he shall *gain the whole world*, and lose his own soul?”) Since, however, he *has* sinned, he must offer to God more than the whole world, i.e. more than all outside of God. Consequently none can have this to give but God himself. But since it is man who owes it, it must also be given by a God-man, i.e. by a person possessing the two natures, divine and human. This could be no other than the second person of the Trinity, the Son; for otherwise there would be two Sons in the Trinity; and, had the Father become man, two grandsons (namely, the Father, grandson of himself by human descent, and the Son, grandson of the Virgin, as son of the Virgin’s son). It was fitting that the man with whom God united himself should be born of a woman without the co-operation of man, and even from a virgin; for as sin and the ground of condemnation were brought about by that sex, it is just that the remedy should also have come from it alone. Thus Christ was then born without original sin; he could sin if he willed it, but he could

not will it; consequently he died without owing death and of his own free will. His death, therefore, outweighed the number and magnitude of all sins. He gave unto God, for the sins of mankind, his own life unsullied by any sin of his own, thus giving what he did not owe, when considered as both God and man. But in consequence of his offering voluntarily so great a sacrifice, and inasmuch as to *him* no equivalent for it could be given, it was necessary, in order that the sacrifice should not be vain, that others at least should be benefited thereby in some way, namely, humanity in the forgiveness of sin. Anselm affirms the doctrine of a *satisfactio vicaria activa* (an active vicarious satisfaction), but not of a *satisfactio passiva* (passive satisfaction); for he nowhere says that Christ endured the actual punishment of men's sins (Neander, *Dogmengeschichte*, 2, 516). Dr. Shedd (*Hist. of Doctrines*, 2, 282) questions this statement of Neander's, but on what appear to be insufficient grounds.

The fundamental principles of Anselm's doctrine of satisfaction are found in the writings of many fathers before Anselm, e.g. Athanasius, Gregorius of Nazianzen, Chrysostom, and Cyril of Alexandria; but Anselm is the first who collected and arranged them into a systematic whole. Dr. Shedd has treated the relation of Anselm to theology (*Hist. of Doctrines*, bks. 4 and 5) more skillfully than any other modern writer in short compass. In concluding his analysis of the *Cur Deus Homo*, he remarks that it "exhibits a depth, breadth, and vigor of thinking not surpassed by any production of the same extent in theological literature. Such a view of the atonement as is here exhibited is thoroughly Biblical, and thoroughly Protestant. There may be incidental views and positions in this tract with which the modern theologian would not wholly agree; but certainly, so far as the general theory of vicarious satisfaction is concerned, this little treatise contains the substance of the reformed doctrine; while, at the same time, it enunciates these philosophical principles which must enter into the scientific construction of this cardinal truth of Christianity. On both the theoretic and the practical side, it is one of the Christian classics" (vol. 2, p. 283). As to the claim of absolute originality for Anselm's system, "it may be admitted that Anselm first used the term satisfaction to express the method in which a *solutio* could be effected of a *debitum* which had been incurred by sin; but the same fundamental idea is found in the sacrificial theory, to which so frequent reference is made by many earlier writers. Sacrifices were appointed in the mosaic economy by which violated laws might be appeased, and the offerer preserve his forfeited life by something other than

obedience. *Satisfaction* expresses a wider group of considerations, of which *sacrifice* is a particular illustration. We may grant to Anselm the dignity of having set forth, in more forcible light than earlier writers, the nature and responsibilities of sin, and the need of reconciliation with God. We may allow that his sense of the justice of God appears to have been more profound and comprehensive than those of earlier fathers; and the basis was doubtless laid for the quantitative and mercantile aspects of the subject which characterized the speculations of later divines" (*Brit. Quarterly*, April, 1865, p. 355). As to Anselm's deficiencies, Dr. Thomson (Bishop of Gloucester) remarks that "the passages of Scripture that speak of the wrath of God against man are not explicable by Anselm's system. The explanation of the Baptist, that Jesus is the Lamb of God, that taketh away the sin of the world; the prophecy of His sufferings by Isaiah (ch. 53); the words of Peter, that He "his own self bare our sins in his own body on the tree;" and passages of like import in St. Paul's writings, can only find place with Anselm by a very forced interpretation. His scheme is mainly this, that the merit of the perfect obedience of Jesus was so great as to deserve a great reward, and that, in answer to the prayer of the Lord, this reward was given in the form of the salvation of His brethren. But Christ does not appear in this system as groaning and suffering under the curse of the world, as He does in Holy Scripture. Until the time of Anselm the doctrine of the Atonement had, within certain limits, fluctuated with the change of teachers; the doctrine itself was one and the same, but this or that aspect of it had been made prominent. Anselm aimed at fixing in one system the scattered truths; and the result has been that he, like his predecessors, made some parts of the truth conspicuous to the prejudice of the rest" (*Aids to Faith*, Essay 8).

Anselm is commemorated as a saint in the Church of Rome on the 21st of April. His life, by Eadmer, his friend and companion, is given in the edition of his works named below. The best edition of his works is that entitled *Opera omnia necnon Eadmeri monachi Cantuariensis Historia* (Venet. 1744, 2 vols. fol.). A selection of the most important theological and philosophical works of Anselm has been published by C. Haas (*S. Anselmi opuscula philosophico-theologica selecta*, vol. 1, containing the *Monologium* and *Proslogium*, Tubingen, 1862). 'Special editions of the book *Cur Deus Homo* were published at Berlin, 1857, and at London, 1863. Anselm has been much studied of late years: a beautiful monograph by C. Romusat (*Saint Anselme de Canterbury*, 8vo, Paris, 1852); a study

by Bohringer (*Die Kirche Christi und ihre Zevgen*, 2, 224); and a copious treatise by Hasse (1. *Das Leben Anselm's*; 2. *Die Lehre Anselm's*, 2 vols. Leipzir, 1843-1852; an abridged translation by Turner, Lond. 1860, 12mo) give ample facilities for the study of his history and writings. Translations of the *Proslogium* and of the *Cur Deus Homo* are given in the *Bibliotheca Sacra*, vols. 8, 11, and 12. See also Gieseler, *Ch. Hist.* 3, 175; *Dogmengeschichte*, p. 510; Neander, *Ch. Hist.* 4, 237, and *Hist. of Dogmas*, 2, 516, et al; Hagenbach, *Hist. of Doctrines* (Smith's ed.), § 180; Bushnell, *Vicarious Sacrifice* (N. Y. 1866); *Meth. Quar. Review*, Oct. 1853, art. 6; Haureau, *Philos. Scholast.* 1, ch. 8; Mohler, *Anselm's Leben u. Schriften* (Tib. *Quartalschrift*, 1827, 1828); Franck, *Anselm von Canterbury* (Tibing. 1842, 8vo); Shedd, *Hist. of Doctrines*, 1. c. **SEE ATONEMENT.**

## Anselm

St., called Baduarius after the name of his family (Badagio), was born at Milan, 1036. He succeeded, in 1061, his uncle, Pope Alexander II, as bishop of Lucca, which see he resigned in order to be. come a monk at Clugny. He returned to his see at the express order of Pope Gregory VI, who employed him for important embassies, and made him a cardinal. He tried to prevail on the canons of his cathedral church to submit to the common life, but met with so decided a resistance that he had to leave again his see. Leo IX sent him as his legate to Lombardy, where he died at Mantua, March 18, 1086. He wrote an apology of Gregory VII, a refutation of the claims of the anti-pope Guibert, and a treatise against the right of the secular princes to dispose of the property of the church. The two former may be found in Canisins, *Antiquae Lectiones*, and in the *Bibl. Patrum*. The life of Anselm was written by the Jesuit Bota (*Notiz di San Anselmo*, Verona, 1773, 8vo).

## Anselm

son of the Margrave Otto the Rich, of Ascania, became bishop of Havelberg in 1126, and archbishop of Ravenna in 1154; was *Apocrisarius* of Emperor Lothaire II, and was sent as an ambassador to the emperor of Constantinople for the purpose of effecting a union between the Roman and Greek Churches. He died in 1159. He wrote *Three Books of Dialogues* with Nicetas, archbishop of Nicomedia, about the points in dispute between the Greek and Roman Churches, given by D'Achery in the

*Spicilegium*, 1, 161 (new ed.). — Dupin, *Hist. Eccl. Writers*, 2, 365; Cave, *Hist. Lit.* anno 1149; Landon, *Eccl. Dict.* s.v.

## Anselm

dean of the cathedral church of Laon, flourished at the end of the 11th century. He died July 15, 1117. He illustrated the entire Old and New Testaments with an Interlineary Glossary, compiled from the fathers, which has been several times printed, with the additions of Lyra and others, especially at Antwerp, in 1634; also, the Commentary on St. Matthew, and Explanations of various Passages in the Gospels, Epistles of St. Paul, Apocalypse, etc., which are printed under the name of Anselm of Canterbury, are attributed by many writers to this author. But Dupin asserts that they are from the pen of Herveus, a monk of Bourg, near Dol. — Cave, *Hist. Lit.* anno 1103; Dupin, *Hist. Eccl. Writers*, 2, 364.

## Ansgar

SEE ANSCHAR.

## Answer

(usually **ἄνθ**; *anah*, ἄποκρίνομαι) has other significations in Scripture besides the common one in the sense of *reply*.

**1.** Moses having composed a thanksgiving after the passage of the Red Sea, Miriam, it is said, “*answered*;” meaning that Moses with the men on one side, and Miriam with the women on the other side, sung the same song, as it were, in two choruses or divisions; of which one “*answered*” the other (**ἔ**Exodus 15:21). So also **ἔ**1 Samuel 29:5, where they sung in distinct choruses; comp. **ἔ**Numbers 21:17.

**2.** This word is likewise taken for to *accuse*, or to *defend judicially* (**ἔ**Genesis 30:33; **ἔ**Deuteronomy 31:21; **ἔ**Hosea 5:5).

**3.** To “*answer*” is likewise taken in a bad sense, as when it is said that a son *answers* his father insolently, or a servant his master (**ἔ**John 18:22; **ἔ**Romans 9:20; **ἔ**2 Corinthians 1:9).

**4.** To “*aswer*” is also used in Scripture for the *commencement* of a discourse, when no reply to any question or objection is intended. This mode of speaking is often used by the Evangelists: “And Jesus *answered and said*.” his a Hebrew idiom (**ἔ**Job 3:2; **ἔ**Song of Solomon 2:10;



<806>Zechariah 3:4; 4:11, 12; <0125>Matthew 11:25; 12:38; 17:4; <1005>Mark 9:5; <0740>Luke 7:40). *SEE AFFIRMATIVE*.

**ANSWER OF A GOOD CONSCIENCE** (συνειδήσεως ἀγαθῆς ἐπερώτημα), a phrase occurring <0021>1 Peter 3:21, very variously interpreted, but apparently signifying simply the ability to address God in prayer (as if a response to His searching of the heart) with a conscience free from a sense of guilt, or the seeking after Him with a pure conscience (see Alford, in loc.). *SEE CONSCIENCE*.

**Ant**

### Picture for Ant 1

(j | mḡ] *nemalah*’, either from an Arab. root, signifying *creeping*, or rather from l mī; to *cut off* [circumcise], from its *destructive* habits, or, still better, from its *insect* form; Sept. μύρμηξ, *Vulg.formica*) occurs <0005>Proverbs 6:6; 30:25. In both passages its provident habits are referred to, especially its providing its food in the summer. This has generally been supposed to imply that these insects hoard up grains of corn, chiefly wheat, for their supply during winter, having first bitten out the germ to prevent it from growing in their nests. Bochart has collected an immense array of the most eminent authors and naturalists of antiquity (Jewish, Greek, Roman, and Arabian), who all gravely propound this assertion (*Hieroz.* 3, 478 sq.; comp. Aristot. *Anim.* 9, 26; Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* 11:36; Horace, *Sat.* 1, 1, 38). But it is now ascertained beyond a doubt that no European ants, hitherto properly examined, feed on *corn* or *any other* kind of grain. (See Kirby and Spence’s *Entomology*, p. 313, 7th ed. London, 1856, where the question is fully discussed.) Bonnet found that, however long they had been kept without food, they would not touch corn. Nor do they attack the roots or stems of corn, nor any other vegetable matter. Nor has any species of ant been yet found, with food of *any kind* laid up in its nest. The truth is, that ants are chiefly carnivorous, preying indiscriminately on all the soft parts of other insects, and especially the viscera; also upon worms, whether dead or alive, and small birds or animals. If unable to drag their booty to the nest, they make an abundant meal upon it, and, like the bee, disgorge it, upon their return home, for the use of their companions; and they appear able to retain at pleasure the nutritious juices unchanged for a considerable time. Ants are also extremely fond of saccharine matter, which; they obtain from the exudation of trees, or from ripe fruits, etc.; but their favorite food is the

saccharine exudation from the body of the aphides, or plant-lice. Every one must have observed these insects on the rose-tree, etc. Each different species of vegetable has its peculiar species of aphid (Reaumur, 6:566). The aphides insert their tube or sucker between the fibres of vegetables, where they find a most substantial nutriment. This nutriment they retain a considerable time, if no ant approaches them. The ant has the talent of procuring it from the aphides at pleasure. It approaches the aphid, strikes it gently and repeatedly with its antennae, when it instantly discharges the juice by two tubes easily discerned to be extending out from its body. These creatures are the *milch kine* of the ants. By a remarkable coincidence, which M. Huber justly considers too much to be ascribed to chance, the aphides and the ants become torpid at the same degree of cold (27 deg. Fahr.), and revive together at the same degree of warmth (Huber, *Natural History of Ants*, p. 210, etc.).

In the *Introduction to Entomology*, by Kirby and Spence, some diffidence is expressed (2, 46) respecting the inference that *no* exotic ants have magazines of provisions, till their habits shall have been "more accurately explored." Still, are we not in possession of sufficient data to form a strong presumption in regard to the ants of *Palestine*, to which Solomon of course alludes in his writings? The ants of the Holy Land certainly have to encounter a degree of *cold* quite as severe as ever occurs in England (Kitto, *Physical Hist. of Palestine*, p. 210, 216). Is it not highly probable that the ants at such times become *torpid*, and need no magazine of provisions? And since we learn from the same authority (p. 31) that there are intervals, even in the depth of winter, when the sun shines, and there is no wind, when it is perfectly warm, sometimes almost hot, in the open air, may not the ants of Palestine and their food revive together at such times, as is the case in other countries, where ants may often be seen pursuing their avocations over the snow? With regard to Solomon's words respecting the ant, Kirby and Spence are of opinion that, "if they are properly considered, it will be found that the interpretation which seems to favor the ancient error respecting ants has been fathered upon them rather than fairly deduced from them. He does not affirm that the ant, which he proposes to the sluggard as an example, laid up in her magazines stores of grain against winter, but that, with considerable prudence and foresight, she makes use of *proper seasons* to collect a supply of provisions sufficient for her purposes. There is not a word in them implying that she stores up grain or other provisions. She prepares her bread and gathers her food

(namely, such food as is suited to her) in summer and harvest (that is, when it is most plentiful), and thus shows her wisdom and prudence by using the advantages offered to her.”

It is true that Col. Sykes speaks (*Transactions of Entomol. Soc.* 2, 103) of a species of Indian ant which he calls *Atta providens*, so called from the fact of his having found a large store of grass-seeds in its nest; but the amount of that gentleman’s observations merely go to show that this ant carries seeds underground, and brings them again to the surface after they have got wet during the monsoons, apparently to dry. “There is not,” writes Mr. F. Smith (*Catalogue of the Formicidae in the British Museum*, 1858, p. 180), “any evidence of the seeds having been stored for food;” he observes that the processionary ant of Brazil (*Ecodoma cephalotes*) carries immense quantities of portions of leaves into its underground nests, and that it was supposed that these leaves were for food; but that Mr. Bates satisfied himself that the leaves were for the purpose of lining the channels of the nest, and not for food. There is no evidence that any portion of plants ever forms an article of their Diet. The fact is, that ants seem to delight in running away with almost any thing they find — small portions of sticks, leaves, little stones — as any one can testify who has cared to watch the habits of this insect. This will explain the erroneous opinion which the ancients held with respect to that part of the economy of the ant now under consideration; nor is it, perhaps, necessary to conclude that the error originated in observers mistaking the cocoons for grains of corn, to which they bear much resemblance. It is scarcely credible that Aristotle, Virgil, Horace, etc., who all speak of this insect storing up *grains of corn*, should have been so far misled, or have been such bad observers, as to have taken the cocoons for grains. Ants do carry off grains of corn, just as they carry off other things, not, however, as was stated, for food, but for their nests. “They are great robbers,” says Dr. Thomson (*The Land and the Book*, p. 337), “and plunder by night as well as by day; and the farmer must keep a sharp eye to his floor, or they will abstract a large quantity of grain in a single night.” **SEE CISTERN.**

It is right to state that a well-known entomologist, the Rev. F. W. Hope, in a paper “On some Doubts respecting the (Economy of Ants)” (*Trans. Entom. Soc.* 2, 211), is of opinion that Colossians Sykes’s observations do tend to show that there are species of exotic ants which store up food for winter consumption; but it must be remembered that Mr. Bates’s

investigations are subsequent to the publication of that paper. (See *Encycl. Brit.* 8th ed. s.v.)

The particular species of ant referred to by Solomon has not been identified; and, in fact, ants have only latterly become the subjects of accurate observation. The investigations of Latreille (*Histoire Naturelle des Fourmis*, Par. 1802), Gould, Geer, Huber, and Kirby and Spence, have dissipated many erroneous notions respecting them, and revealed much interesting information concerning their domestic polity, language, migrations, affections, passions, virtues, wars, diversions, etc. (see *Penny Cyclopaedia*, s.v.). The following facts are selected as relevant to scriptural illustration. Ants dwell together in societies; and although they have “no guide, overseer, or ruler,” yet they have all one soul, and are animated by one object — their own welfare, and the welfare of each other. Each individual strenuously pursues his own peculiar duties, and regards (except in the case of females), and is regarded by every other member of the republic with equal respect and affection. They devote the utmost attention to their young. The egg is cleaned and licked, and gradually expands under this treatment till the worm is hatched, which is then tended and fed with the most affectionate care. They continue their assiduity to the pupa, or chrysalis, which is the third transformation. They heap up the pupae, which *greatly resemble so many grains of wheat, or rather rice*, by hundreds in their spacious lodges, watch them in an attitude of defense, carry them out to enjoy the radiance of the sun, and remove them to different situations in the nest, according to the required degree of temperature; open the pupae and, at the precise moment of the transformation, disinthrall the new-born insect of its habiliments.

## Picture for Ant 2

To some readers it may seem strange that ants should be considered four-winged insects, whereas they may have never seen a winged individual among the thousands of ants they may have looked upon. The fact is, this tribe presents the curious anomaly (paralleled also in the Termites, or white ants, of another order) of three forms of individuals — we might almost say, three sexes. The males and females are furnished with four wings on their leaving the chrysalis state, but soon drop them spontaneously. These are comparatively few in number; but there is another race, which are the workers, and which constitute the main body of the teeming population,

which never have any wings at all. These are sexless, but are considered as imperfectly developed females.

The Arabians held the wisdom of the ant in such estimation, that they used to place one of these insects in the hands of a newly-born infant, repeating these words: “May the boy turn out clever and skillful.” Hence, in Arabic, with the noun *nemleh*, “an ant,” is connected the adjective *nemie*, “quick,” “clever” (Bochart, *Hieroz.* 52, 494). The Talmudists, too, attributed great wisdom to this insect. It was, say they, from beholding the wonderful ways of the ant that the following expression originated: “Thy justice, O God, reaches to the heavens” (*Chulin*, 63).

It may not be out of place to adduce the parallel economy of a tribe of insects, which, though they belong to another zoological order, so greatly resemble ants in their most remarkable peculiarities as to be popularly associated with them. We refer to the white ants (Termites), so abundant in all tropical countries. These, too, form populous societies, living in commonwealth, in elaborate structures, which are constructed by the united labors of the whole. We have not any detailed accounts of the Oriental species; but in the minute and careful description, by Smeathnan, of the African kinds, he speaks of their magazines of stored food. These are “chambers of clay, always well filled with provisions, which, to the naked eye, seem to consist of the raspings of wood, and plants which the termites destroy, but are found by the microscope to be principally the gums and inspissated juices of plants. These are thrown together in little masses, some of which are finer than others, and resemble the sugar about preserved fruits; others are like tears of gum, one quite transparent, another like amber, a third brown, and a fourth quite opaque, as we see often in parcels of ordinary gums.”

### Picture for Ant 3

It may be observed that the word *chanamal*’ ( **חַנַּמַּל** ), translated “frost” in our version of <sup><1784></sup>Psalm 78:47, is thought by many to refer to some species of ant or kindred insect destructive of trees.

### Antaradus

(**Ἀντάραδος**, Ptol. 5, 15, § 16; Hierocles, p. 716), a city of Phoenicia, situated on the mainland opposite the island of Aradus (whence its name), which latter is alone referred to in Scripture (<sup><1108></sup>Genesis 10:18; <sup><1116></sup>1

Chronicles 1:16). **SEE ARVAD**. According to the *Antonine Itinerary* and the *Peutinger Tables*, it was 24 Roman miles from Balanea and 50 from Tripolis (Reland, *Paloest.* p. 216, 318). It was rebuilt, A.D. 346, by the Emperor Constantius, who named it *Constantia* after himself (Cedren. *Hist.* p. 246), but it appears under its old name likewise in the subsequent Church councils. During the Crusades it was a populous and well fortified town (William of Tyre, 7:15), and was known as *Tortosa* (Tasso, *Gerusal.* lib. 1:6; Wilken, *Kreuzz.* 1, 253; 2:200; 7:340, 713). It is now a mean village of 241 taxable Moslems and 44 Greeks (*Biblioth. Sacra*, 1848, p. 247). The walls, of heavy *bevelled* stones, are still remaining (Miarnot, *Mem. sur. les Phen.* in the *Acad. des Belles Lettres*, 34, 239, Edrisi, p. 129, 130, ed. Jaubert).

### Antediluvians

people who lived before the Deluge (q.v.), which occurred A.M. 1657. **SEE AGE**. All our authentic information respecting this long and interesting period is contained in forty-nine verses of Genesis (4:16; 6:8), more than half of which are occupied with a list of names and ages, invaluable for chronology, but conveying no particulars regarding the primeval state of man. The information thus afforded, although so limited in extent, is, however, eminently suggestive (see Clarkson, *Antediluvian Researches*, Lond. 1836; Boucher d. Perthes, *L'Homme Antedilucien*, Par. 1860; Stein, *De moribus ante diluvium*, Wittenb. 1783; Burton, *World before the Flood*, Lond. 1844; Redslob, *De Antediluvianis*, Hamb. 1847; Willesch, *De philosophia antediluvianorum*, Leipz. 1717; *Jour. Sac. Lit.* July, 1862, p. 376 sq.). Some additional information, though less direct, may be safely deduced from the history of Noah and the first men *after* the Deluge; for it is very evident that society did not begin afresh after that event, but that, through Noah and his sons, the new families of men were in a condition to inherit, and did inherit, such sciences and arts as existed before the Flood. This enables us to understand how settled and civilized communities were established, and large and magnificent works undertaken within a few centuries after the Deluge.

The scriptural notices show, **SEE ADAM**, that the father of men was something more than “the noble savage,” or rather the grown-up infant, which some have represented him. He was an instructed man; and the immediate descendants of a man so instructed could not be an ignorant or uncultivated people. It is not necessary, indeed, to suppose that they

possessed at first more cultivation than they required; and for a good while they did not stand in need of that which results from or is connected with the settlement of men in organized communities. They probably had this before the Deluge, and at first were possessed of whatever knowledge or civilization their agricultural and pastoral pursuits required. Such were their pursuits from the first; for it is remarkable that of the strictly savage or hunting condition of life there is not the slightest trace before the Deluge. After that event, Nimrod, although a hunter (<sup>(~~OLD~~)</sup>Genesis 10:9), was not a savage, and did not belong to hunting tribes of men. In fact, barbarism is not discoverable before the confusion of tongues, and was, in all likelihood, a degeneracy from a state of cultivation, eventually produced in particular communities by that great social convulsion. At least, that a degree of cultivation was the primitive condition of man, from which savage life in particular quarters was a degeneracy, and that he has not, as too generally has been supposed, worked himself up from an original savage state to his present position, has been powerfully argued by Dr. Philip Lindsley (*Am. Bib. Repos.* 4, 277-298; 6:127), and is strongly corroborated by the conclusions of modern ethnographical research; from which we learn that, while it is easy for men to degenerate into savages, no example has been found of savages rising into civilization but by an impulse from without administered by a more civilized people; and that, even with such impulse, the *vis inertiae* of established habits is with difficulty overcome. The aboriginal traditions of all civilized nations describe them as receiving their civilization from without — generally through the instrumentality of foreign colonists: and history affords no example of a case parallel to that which must have occurred if the primitive races of men, being originally savage, *had civilized themselves*.

All that was peculiar in the circumstances of the antediluvian period was eminently favorable to civilization. The *longevity* of the earlier seventeen or twenty centuries of human existence is a theme containing many problems. It may be here referred to for the purpose of indicating the advantages which must necessarily have therefrom accrued to the mechanical arts. In pottery, mining, metallurgy, clothmaking, the applications of heat and mixtures, etc., it is universally known that there is a tact of manipulation which no instruction can teach, which the possessor cannot even describe, yet which renders him powerful and unfailling, within his narrow range, to a degree almost incredible; and when he has reached his limit of life he is confident that, had he another sixty or seventy years to draw upon, he

could carry his art to a perfection hitherto unknown. Something like this must have been acquired by the antediluvians; and the paucity of objects within their grasp would increase the precision and success within the range. *SEE LONGEVITY.*

By reason of their length of life the antediluvians had also more encouragement in protracted undertakings, and stronger inducements to the erection of superior, more costly, more durable, and more capacious edifices and monuments, public and private, than exist at present. They might reasonably calculate on reaping the benefit of their labor and expenditure. The earth itself was probably more equally fertile, and its climate more uniformly healthful and more auspicious to longevity, and consequently to every kind of mental and corporeal exertion and enterprise, than has been the case since the great convulsion which took place at the Deluge.

But probably the greatest advantage enjoyed by the antediluvians, and which must have been in the highest degree favorable to their advancement in the arts of life, was the uniformity of language. Nothing could have tended more powerfully to maintain, equalize, and promote whatever advantages were enjoyed, and to prevent any portion of the human race from degenerating into savage life. *SEE CONFUSION OF TONGUES.*

The opinion that the old world was acquainted with *astronomy* (q.v.) is chiefly founded on the ages of Seth and his descendants being particularly set down (<sup>(~~QUBS~~)</sup>Genesis 5:6 sq), and the precise year, month, and day being stated in which Noah and his family, etc., entered the ark, and made their egress from it (<sup>(~~QUBS~~)</sup>Genesis 7:11; 8:13). The distinctions of day and night, and the lunar month, were of course observed; and the thirteenth rotation of the moon, compared with the sun's return to his primary position in the heavens, and the effects produced on the earth by his return, would point out the year. *SEE MONTH.* The variation between the rotations of the moon and sun easily became discoverable from the difference which in a very few years would be exhibited in the seasons; and hence it may be supposed that, although the calculations of time might be by lunar months or revolutions, yet the return of vegetation would dictate the solar year. *SEE YEAR.* The longevity of the antediluvian patriarchs, and the simplicity of their employments, favor this conjecture, which receives additional strength from the fact that the Hebrew for *year*, *hny*; implies an *iteration*, a return to the same point, a repetition (Gesenius, *Thes. Heb.* p. 1448); and



it is also remarkable that the Indians, Chinese, Babylonians, Egyptians, Greeks, and other nations, all deduce their origin from personages said to be versed in astronomy. *SEE TIME*. — The knowledge of *zoology* (q.v.) which Adam possessed was doubtless imparted to his children; and we find that Noah was so minutely informed on the subject as to distinguish between clean and unclean beasts, and that his instructions extended to birds of every kind (<sup><0002></sup>Genesis 7:2-4). — A knowledge of some essential principles in *botany* (q.v.) is shown by the fact that Adam knew how to distinguish “seed-bearing herb” and “tree in which is a seed-bearing fruit,” with “every green herb” (<sup><0002></sup>Genesis 1:29, 30). The trees of life and of knowledge are the only ones mentioned before the Fall; but in the history of Noah the vine, the olive, and the wood of which the ark was made (<sup><0004></sup>Genesis 6:14; 8:11; 9:20) are spoken of in such a manner as clearly to intimate a knowledge of their qualities. — With *mineralogy* (q.v.) the antediluvians were at least so far acquainted as to distinguish metals; and in the description of the garden of Eden gold and precious stones are noticed (<sup><0002></sup>Genesis 2:12).

That the antediluvians were acquainted with *music* (q.v.) is certain; for it is expressly said that Jubal (while Adam was still alive) became “the father of those who handle the *r/NK*, *kinnor*, and the *bgw* [ , *ug*, *ab*” (<sup><0002></sup>Genesis 4:21). The former, *SEE HARP*, was evidently a stringed instrument resembling a lyre; and the latter, *SEE LYRE*, was without doubt the Pandean pipe, composed of reeds of different lengths joined together. This clearly intimates considerable progress in the science; for it is not probable that the art of playing on wind and on stringed instruments was discovered at the same time. We may rather suppose that the principles of harmony, having been discovered in the one, were by analogy transferred to the other; and that Jubal, by repeated efforts, became the first performer on the harp and the pipe. *SEE ART*.

Our materials are too scanty to allow us to affirm that the antediluvians possessed the means of communicating their ideas by *writing* (q.v.) or by hieroglyphics, although tradition, and a hint or two in the Scriptures, might support the assertion. With respect to *poetry* (q.v.), the story of Lamech and his wives (<sup><0004></sup>Genesis 4:19-24) is evidently in verse, and is most probably the oldest specimen of Hebrew poetry extant; but whether it was written before or after the Flood is uncertain, although the probability is that it is one of those previously-existing documents which Moses transcribed into his writing.

With regard to *architecture* (q.v.), it is a singular and important fact that Cain, when he was driven from his first abode, built a city in the land to which he went, and called it Enoch, after his son. This shows that the descendants of Adam lived in houses and towns from the first, and consequently affords another confirmation of the argument for the original cultivation of the human family. What this “city” was is not mentioned, except in the term itself; and as that term is in the early Scriptures applied to almost every collection of human habitations, we need not attach any very exalted ideas to it in this instance. But if we take into view the requisites necessary to enable Noah to erect so stupendous a fabric as the ark (q.v.) must have been, it will not be difficult to conceive that the art of building had reached considerable advancement before the Deluge; nor can one reflect on the building of Babel without a conviction that it must have been through the great patriarchs who lived in the old world that so much knowledge was obtained as to lead to the attempt of erecting a fabric whose summit was intended to reach the clouds. It is not likely that the builders would, by their own intuitive genius, be equal to a task which they certainly were not inspired by Heaven to execute.

The *metallurgy* (q.v.) of the antediluvians appears to have originated with the line of Cain (<sup><OIDD></sup>Genesis 4:22), being carried to a high degree of perfection, so far as forging and tempering are concerned, by Tubal-Cain (q.v.). — Respecting *agriculture* (q.v.), which was evidently the first employment of Adam (<sup><OIDD></sup>Genesis 2:15; 3:17, 18), and, afterward, at first of Cain (<sup><OIDD></sup>Genesis 4:2), we shall only add a reference to the case of Noah, who, immediately after the Flood, became a husbandman, and planted a vineyard. He also knew the method of fermenting the juice of the grape; for it is said he drank of the wine, which produced inebriation (<sup><OIDD></sup>Genesis 9:20, 21). This knowledge he doubtless obtained from his progenitors anterior to the destruction of the old world.

*Pasturage* (q.v.) appears to have been coeval with husbandry. Abel was a keeper of sheep, while his brother was a tiller of the ground (<sup><OIDD></sup>Genesis 4:2); but there is no necessity for supposing that Cain’s husbandry excluded the care of cattle. The class of tent-dwelling pastors — that is, of those who live in tents that they may move with their flocks and herds from one pasture-ground to another — did not originate till comparatively late after the Fall; for Jabal, the seventh from Adam in the line of Cain, is said to have been the “father” or founder of that mode of life (<sup><OIDD></sup>Genesis 4:20). It is doubtful whether the manufacture of cloth is involved in the mention

of tents, seeing that excellent tent-coverings are even at this day made of skins; and we know that skins were the first articles of clothing used by fallen man (<sup><0021></sup>Genesis 3:21). The same doubt applies to the garment with which the sons of Noah covered their inebriated father (<sup><0023></sup>Genesis 9:23). But, upon the whole, there can be little doubt that, in the course of so long a period, the art of manufacturing cloths of hair and wool, if not of linen or cotton, had been acquired. *SEE WEAVING*. It is impossible to speak with any decision respecting the form or forms of *government* which prevailed before the Deluge. The slight intimations to be found on the subject seem to favor the notion that the particular governments were patriarchal, subject to a general theocratical control, God himself *manifestly* interfering to uphold the good and check the wicked. The right of property was recognised, for Abel and Jabal possessed flocks, and Cain built a city. As ordinances of religion, sacrifices certainly existed (<sup><0004></sup>Genesis 4:4), and some think that the Sabbath was observed; while some interpret the words, “Then men began to call upon the name of the Lord” (<sup><0026></sup>Genesis 4:26), to signify that public worship then began to be practiced. From Noah’s familiarity with the distinction of clean and unclean beasts (<sup><0002></sup>Genesis 7:2), it would seem that the Levitical rules on this subject were by no means new when laid down in the code of Moses. *SEE WORSHIP*.

*Marriage* (q.v.), and all the relations springing from it, existed from the beginning (<sup><0023></sup>Genesis 2:23-25); and, although polygamy was known among the antediluvians (<sup><0019></sup>Genesis 4:19), it was most probably unlawful; for it must have been obvious that, if more than one wife had been necessary for a man, the Lord would not have confined the first man to one woman. The marriage of the sons of Seth with the daughters of Cain appears to have been prohibited, since the consequence of it was that universal depravity in the family of Seth so forcibly expressed in this short passage, “All flesh had corrupted its way upon the earth” (<sup><0011></sup>Genesis 7:11). This sin, described Orientally as an intermarriage of “the sons of God” with “the daughters of men” (<sup><0002></sup>Genesis 6:2), appears to have been in its results one of the grand causes of the Deluge; for if the family of Seth had remained pure and obedient to God, he would doubtless have spared the world for their sake, as he would have spared Sodom and Gomorrah had ten righteous men been found there, and as he would have spared his own people, the Jews, had they not corrupted themselves by intermarriages with the heathen. Even the longevity of the antediluvians may have contributed to this ruinous result. Vastly more time was upon their hands

than was needful for clearing woodlands, draining swamps, and other laborious and tedious processes, in addition to their ordinary agriculture and care of cattie; so that the temptations to idleness were likely to be very strong; and the next step would be to licentious habits and selfish violence. The ample leisure possessed by the children of Adam might have been employed for many excellent purposes of social life and religious obedience, and undoubtedly it was so employed by many; but to the larger part it became a snare and the occasion of temptations, so that “the wickedness of man became great, the earth was corrupt before God, and was filled with violence” (*Crit. Bibl.* 4, 14-20; see also *Ant. U. Hist.* 1, 142-201). *SEE DELUGE.*

## Antelope

### Picture for Antelope 1

a term apparently corrupted from the epithet “*antholops*” (Gr. ἄνθος, *ornament*, and ὠψ, the *eye*), applied by the ancients to the gazelle from the proverbial beauty of its eyes. It is now the name (*antilopus*) of a division of the hollow-horned ruminants (genus *Clavicorna*), distinguished by certain peculiarities of the horn, the maxillary glands, and their slight figure (Brande’s *Dict.* s.v.). Although the word does not occur in our version of the Scriptures, yet there can be no doubt that in the Hebrew text several ruminants to which it is applicable are indicated under different denominations. In scientific nomenclature, the term antelope, at first applied to a single species, has gradually become generic, and is now the designation of a tribe, or even of a family of genera, containing a great many species. According to present usage, it embraces some species that are of considerable size, so as to be invariably regarded by the natives as having some affinity to cattle, and others delicate and rather small, that may be compared with young deer, to which, in truth, they bear a general resemblance. *SEE DEER.* The antelopes, considered as a family, may be distinguished from all others by their uniting the light and graceful forms of deer with the permanent horns of goats, excepting that in general their horns are round, annulated, and marked with strim, slender, and variously inflected, according to the subdivision or group to which they belong. They have usually large, soft, and beautiful eyes, tear-pits beneath them, and round tails. They are often provided with tufts of hair, or brushes, to protect the fore-knees from injury; they have inguinal pores; and are distinguished by very great powers of speed. Among the first of the

subordinate groups is the subgenus *oryx*, consisting of five or six species, of which we have to notice at least three. The *oryges* are all about the size of the stag of Europe, or larger, with long, annulated, slender horns, rising in continuation of the plane of the forehead, slightly divergent, regularly but not greatly curved, entirely straight or lyrated, and from three feet to three feet eight inches in length. The head is rather clumsy, and more or less pied with black and white; the neck ewed, or arched, like that of the camel; the carcass bulky, compared with the legs, which are slender, firm, and capable of sustaining great action; the tail extends only to the heel, or hough; the hair on the shoulders and neck is invariably directed forward, thus, no doubt, keeping the animal cool in flight (see *Penny Cyclopaedia*, s.v.; *Heuglin, Antilope Nordost-Africa's*, Jen. 1864)

1. The *yachmur*' (𐤆𐤍𐤓𐤕 <sup><545></sup> Deuteronomy 14:5; <sup><1023></sup> 1 Kings 4:23) is not, as in our Auth. Vers. "the fallow-deer" (Sept. δορκός, Vulg. *caprea*), but the *oryx leucoryx* of the moderns, the true *oryx* of the ancients, and of Niebuhr, who quotes R. Jona, and points out the Chaldaic *jachmura*, and describes it as a great goat. The Eastern Arabs still use the name *jazmur*. The *leucoryx*, as the name implies, is white, having a black mark down the nose, black cheeks and jowl, the legs, from the elbow and heel to the pastern joints, black, and the lower half of the thighs usually, and often the lower flank, bright rufous. The species now resides in pairs, in small families, and not unfrequently singly, on the mountain ranges along the sandy districts in the desert of Eastern Arabia, and on the banks of the Lower Euphrates; and may extend as far eastward as the west bank of the Indus, feeding on shrubby acacias, such as *tortilis* and *Ehrenbergi*. It was, no doubt, formerly, if not at present, found in Arabia Petraca, and in the eastern territories of the people of Israel; and from the circumstance of the generic name of wild cow or bull being common to this, as to other allied species, it was equally caught with nets and with the noose, and styled wat (*tao*, *to*, *theo*). To this species may be referred more particularly some of the notions respecting unicorns, since, the forehead being narrow, and the horns long and slender, if one be broken off near the root, the remaining one stands so nearly on the medial line, that, taken in connection with its white-colored hair, to uncritical inspection, a single-horned animal might appear to be really present. By nature vicious and menacing, from what may be observed in the Egyptian paintings of the industry which imposture exercised, we may conclude that human art, even in early ages, may have contributed to make artificial unicorns; and most probably those seen by

some of the earlier European travelers were of this kind. *SEE FALLOW DEER.*

## Picture for Antelope 2

2. The *teo'* (/aTj <sup><64B></sup>Deuteronomy 14:5, “wild ox;” Sept. ὄρυξ, Vulg. *oryx*) or *to'* (a/T, <sup><251D></sup>Isaiah 51:20, “wild bull;” Sept. σευτλίον, Vulg. *oryx*; the *oryx tao*, or Nubian oryx, of Ham. Smith) is either a species or distinct variety of leucoryx. The male, being nearly four feet high at the shoulder, is taller than that of the leucoryx; the horns are longer, the body comparatively lighter, and every limb indicative of vigor and elasticity; on the forehead there is a white spot, distinctly marked by the particular direction of the hair turning downward before the inner angle of the eye to near the mouth, leaving the nose rufous, and forming a kind of letter A. Under the eye, toward the cheek, there is a darkish spot, not very distinct; the limbs, belly, and tail are white; the body mixed white and red, most reddish about the neck and lower hams. It is possible that the name *tao* or *teo* is connected with the white spot on the chaffron. This species resides chiefly in the desert west of the Nile, but is most likely not unknown in Arabia; certain it is that both are figured on Egyptian monuments (the *Antelope defassa* of Wilkinson, *Anc. Eg.* 3, 18, cut 327), the leucoryx being distinguished by horns less curved, and by some indications of black on the face. *SEE WILD OX.*

## Picture for Antelope 3

3. The *oryx addax* may have been known to the Hebrews by the name of <sup>~/vyDi</sup>(*dishon'*, <sup><64B></sup>Deuteronomy 14:5, “pygarg;” Sept. πύγαργος, Vulg. *pygargus*). It is three feet seven inches at the shoulder, has the same structure as the others, but is somewhat higher at the croup; it has a coarse beard under the gullet, a black scalp and forehead, divided from the eyes and nose by a white bar on each side, passing along the brows and down the face to the cheek, and connected with one another between the eyes. The general color of the fur is white, with the head, neck, and shoulders more or less liver-color gray; but what distinguishes it most from the others are the horns, which in structure and length assimilate with those of the other species, but in shape assume the spiral flexures of the Indian antelope. The animal is figured on Egyptian monuments, and may be *thepygarg* or *dishon*, uniting the characters of a white rump with

strepsicerotine horns, and even those which Dr. Shaw ascribes to his “*lidmee*.” *SEE PYGARG*.

A subgenus of the antelope family is the *gazella*, of which one or more species appear to be designated in Scripture by the terms יבִּכְיָ *tsebi*’, דּוֹרְקָאֵץ. *SEE GAZELLE; SEE ZOOLOGY*.

### Antelucani

(*sc.* *SEE COETUS*), i.e. *before daylight*. In times of persecution the Christians, being unable to meet for divine worship in the open day, held their assemblies in the night. The like assemblies were afterward continued from feelings of piety and devotion, and called *antelucan* or *night assemblies*. This custom is noticed in Pliny’s *Letter to Trajan* (lib. 10, ep. 97). — Bingham, *Orig. Eccl.* bk. 13, ch. 10, § 11.

### Anterus

St., bishop of Rome, a Greek by birth, succeeded St. Pontianus, and was, according to Eusebius, the eighteenth, according to others the nineteenth, bishop of Rome. According to the same historian, he was elected in 238, and died one month later. But, according to Baronius, who is followed by most of the modern historians, his election falls into the year 235. Anterus ordered the acts of the martyrs to be collected, which is said to have occasioned the persecution in which he suffered martyrdom himself (see Baronius, ad ann. 237, and the notes of Pagi and Mansi).

### Anthedon

(Ἀνθηδών, apparently a Greek name, signifying flowery), a city on the coast of Palestine, 20 stadia from Gaza (Sozomen, *Hist. Eccl.* 5,9), to the south-west (comp. Ptolemy, in Reland, *Paloest.* p. 460). It was taken and destroyed by Alexander Jannaeus (Josephus, *Ant.* 13, 13, 3; comp. 15, 4), but restored by Gabinius (*ib.* 14, 5, 3), and added by Augustus to the dominions of Herod the Great (*ib.* 15, 7, 3), who changed its name to *Agrippias* (Ἀγριππιάς, *ib.* 13, 13, 3). In the *Chronicon Paschale* it appears as *Cariantfedon*, i.e. Keriath (“city”) of Anthedon (Reland, *Paloest.* p. 567). In the time of Julian it was much addicted to Gentile superstition (Sozomen, *ut sup.*), particularly the worship of Astarte (Venus), as appears from a coin of Antoninus and Caracalla (Vaillant, *Numism. Colon.* p. 115). Its bishops are named in several of the early

councils (Reland, *ib.* p. 568). The notices correspond very well to the position assigned by Van de Velde (*Map*) at *Tell Ajjur*, a small village on the shore near Gaza (Robinson, *Researches*, 2, 351).

## Anthem

(from ἀντί, *in return*, and ὕμνος, *a song*), a psalm or hymn, sung in parts alternately, and corresponding to the antiphonal singing of the primitive Church. It was introduced by Ignatius among the Eastern Churches and by Ambrose in the West. In modern times the word is used in a more confined sense, being applied to certain passages, usually taken out of the Scriptures, and adapted to a particular solemnity. Anthems were first introduced in the reformed service of the English Church in the beginning of the reign of Queen Elizabeth.

## Anthimus

(Martyr), bishop of Nicomedia, in Bithynia; beheaded in 303 by order of Diocletian, who at the same time put to death, in various ways, many others of the faithful. The Latins commemorate them April 27th. — Eusebius, *Hist.* lib. 8, cap. 4 and 6.

## Anthimus

bishop of Trebizond, and, in 535, patriarch of Constantinople, was deposed by Emperor Justinian as a Monophysite, and his works burned.

## Anthologion

(Ἀνθολόγιον), in Latin, *Florilegium*, a term used figuratively, like the classical word *Anthology* (ἀνθολογία, *floral discourse*), literally “a garland of flowers,” hence a collection of short sentences from celebrated authors. It is the technical name of one of the Church books in use among the Greeks. It contains principally the offices which are sung on the festivals of our Lord, the Virgin, and the chief saints; then those called “*communia*,” appointed for the festivals of the prophets, apostles, martyrs, pontiffs, etc. — Suicer, *Thesaurus*, p. 345.

## Anthony

St., the patriarch of Coenobites, and virtual founder of monasticism, was born A.D. 251, at Coma, in Egypt. His parents left him large possessions,



but the words of our Lord to the rich young Tuler so impressed his mind that he sold his possessions, gave the money to the poor, and retired into the desert, where he led an ascetic life. For more than twenty years, tried with various temptations, he dwelt apart, first in a cave, and then in a ruined house, having no communication with mankind but by a messenger, who brought him the necessaries of life. The fame of his sanctity attracted crowds of disciples, and he left his solitude to gather them into a fraternity. At the time of his death they numbered 15,000. He was visited by heathen philosophers, and Constantine the Great wrote to him, entreating his prayers. "Only in exceptional cases did Anthony leave his solitude, and then he made a powerful impression on both Christians and heathens with his hairy dress and his emaciated, ghost-like form. In the year 311, during the persecution under Maximinus, he appeared in Alexandria, in the hope of himself gaining the martyr's crown. He visited the confessors in the mines and prisons, encouraged them before the tribunal, accompanied them to the scaffold; but no one ventured to lay hands on the saint of the wilderness. In the year 351, when a hundred years old, he showed himself for the second and last time in the metropolis of Egypt to bear witness for the orthodox faith of his friend Athanasius against Arianism, and in a few days converted more heathen and heretics than had otherwise been gained in a whole year. He declared the Arian denial of the divinity of Christ worse than the venom of the serpent, and no better than heathenism, which worshipped the creature instead of the Creator. He would have nothing to do with heretics, and warned his disciples against intercourse with them. Athanasius attended him to the gate of the city, where he cast out an evil spirit from a girl. An invitation to stay longer in Alexandria he declined, saying, 'As a fish out of water, so a monk out of his solitude dies.' Imitating his example, the monks afterward forsook the wilderness in swarms whenever orthodoxy was in danger, and went in long processions, with wax tapers and responsive singing, through the streets, or appeared at the councils to contend for the orthodox faith with all the energy of fanaticism, often even with physical force" (Hook). In his last hours he retired to a mountain with two of his disciples, whom he desired to bury him like the patriarchs, and keep secret the place of his burial, thus rebuking the superstitious passion, for relics. His words are thus reported by Athanasius: "Do not let them carry my body into Egypt, lest they store it in their houses. One of my reasons for coming to this mountain was to hinder this. You know I have ever reproved those who have done this, and charged them to cease from the custom. Bury, then, my body in the earth,

in obedience to my word, so that no one may know the place, except yourselves. In the resurrection of the dead it will be restored to me incorruptible by the Savior. Distribute my garments as follows: let Athanasius, the bishop, have the one sheepskin and the garment I sleep on, which he gave me new, and which has grown old with me. Let Serapion, the bishop, have the other sheepskin. As to the hair shirt, keep it for yourselves. And now, my children, farewell; Anthony is going, and is no longer with you.” He died in 356, being one hundred and five years old, and unburdened by old age. His whole conduct indicates the predominance of a glowing and yet gloomy fancy, which is the proper condition of religious ascetism. Like many of the mystics, he affected to despise human science; one of his reported sayings is, “He who has a sound mind has no need of learning.” At the same time, Athanasius states that he was a diligent student of the Scriptures. “The whole Nicene age venerated in Anthony a model saint. This fact brings out most characteristically the vast difference between the ancient and the modern, the old Catholic and the evangelical Protestant conception of the nature of Christian religion. The specifically Christian element in the life of Anthony, especially as measured by the Pauline standard, is very small. Nevertheless, we can but admire the miserable magnificence, the simple, rude grandeur of this hermit sanctity, even in its aberration. Anthony concealed under his sheepskin a child-like humility, an amiable simplicity, a rare energy of will, and a glowing love to God, which maintained itself for almost ninety years in the absence of all the comforts and pleasures of natural life, and triumphed over all the temptations of the flesh. By piety alone, without the help of education or learning, he became one of the most remarkable and influential men in the history of the ancient church. Even heathen contemporaries could not withhold from him their reverence, and the celebrated philosopher Synesius, afterward a bishop, before his conversion reckoned Anthony among those rare men in whom flashes of thought take the place of reasonings, and natural power of mind makes schooling needless” (Hook). Although the father of monachism, St. Anthony is not the author of any monastic “rules;” those which the monks of the Eastern schismatic sects attribute to him are the production of St. Basil. Accounts of his life and miracles are given in the *Acta Sanctorum* of the Bollandists, under the date of the 17th of January, on which day his festival is kept. Many marvelous stories are told of him. The principal source of information concerning him is his life by Athanasius (*Opera*, vol. 1, ed. Benedict), which is supposed, however, to be much interpolated. On this biography Isaac Taylor remarks,

“It may be read with edification, taken for just so much as it is worth; but as an exemplar of the Christian character one may find as good, nay, some much better, among the monkish records of the worst times of Romanism. In all these fifty-four pages, scarcely so much as one sentence meets the eye of a kind to recall any notions or sentiments which are distinctively Christian. There is indeed an unimpeachable orthodoxy and a thoroughgoing submissiveness in regard to church authority; and there is a plenty of Christianized sooffeeism, and there is more than enough of demonology, and quite enough of miracle, but barely a word concerning the propitiatory work of Christ; barely a word indicating any personal feeling of the ascetic’s own need of that propitiation as the ground of his hope. Not a word of justification by faith; not a word of the gracious influence of the Spirit in renewing and cleansing the heart; not a word responding to any of those signal passages of Scripture which make the gospel ‘glad tidings’ to guilty man. Drop a very few phrases borrowed from the Scriptures, and substitute a few drawn from the Koran, and then this memoir of St. Anthony, by Athanasius, might serve, as to its temper, spirit, and substance, nearly as well for a Mohammedan dervish as for a Christian saint” (Taylor, *Ancient Christianity*, 1, 278). His seven epistles to the different monasteries in Egypt, translated out of the E:’gyptian tongue into Greek, are given with the commentaries of Dionysius the Carthusian upon Dionysius the Areopagite, printed at Cologne, 1536, and in the *Eibl. Patrum*, 4, 85. — *Bibliotheca Sacra*, vol. 1, 468 sq.; Gieseler, *Ch. Hist.* 1, 172, 270; Neander, *Ch. Hist.* 2, 228 sq.; Butler, *Lives of Saints*, 1, 165; Newman, *Church of the Fathers* (Lond. 1842); Hook, *Eccles. Biography*, 1, 229; Schaff, in *Meth. Quar. Rev.* 1864, p. 29 sq.

**ST. ANTHONY’S FIRE.** — Butler, in his *Lives of the Saints*, gives the following account of the origin of this name: “In 1089 a pestilential erysipelatous distemper, called the *sacred fire*, swept off great numbers in most provinces of France; public prayers and processions were ordered against this scourge. At length it pleased God to grant many miraculous cures of this dreadful distemper to those who implored his mercy through the intercession of St. Anthony, especially before his relics; the church [of La Mothe St. Didier, near Vienne, in Dauphine] in which they were deposited was resorted to by great numbers of pilgrims, and his patronage was implored over the whole kingdom against this disease.” The “order of Canons Regular of St. Anthony,” a religious fraternity founded about 1090

for the relief of persons afflicted with the fire of St. Anthony, survived in France till 1790. *SEE ANTHONY, ST., ORDER OF.*

## Anthony

St., of Padua, born at Lisbon in 1195, was at first an Augustinian monk; joined in 1220 the Franciscans, went in 1221 as missionary to Africa, lived for some time as hermit in Sicily, labored with great effect as preacher of repentance throughout Italy, and was the leader of the rigorous party in the Franciscan order against the mitigations introduced by the general Elias. *SEE FRANCISCANS.* Tradition ascribes to him the most astounding miracles, e.g. that the fishes came to listen to his open-air sermons, etc. He died at Padua in 1231, and was canonized in 1232. He is commemorated on June 13. He is patron saint of Padua, and also venerated with great distinction in Portugal. His works (sermons, a mystical explanation of the Scriptures, etc.) are of no great importance. They have been published, together with those of St. Francis of Assisi, by De la Haye, Antwerp, 1623. See Wadding, *Annales minor.*; Trithem and Bellarmin, *De Script. eccles.*; Dirks, *Life of St. Anthony of Padua* (transl. from the French, N. Y. 1866).

## Anthony De Dominis

*SEE DOMINIS.*

## Anthony De Rosellis

of Arezzo, about the year 1450 was made secretary of the Emperor Frederick III. He died at Padua in 1467, leaving a work entitled *Monarchia*, in five parts, on the powers of the emperor and the pope, in which he endeavors to show that the pope has not authority in temporal matters, and that in spiritual affairs he is subject to the Church. This remarkable work was printed at Venice in 1483, 1587, and is to be found in Goldastus, *Monarch.* 1, 252-556. It is, of course, placed upon the *Index Expurgatorius*. — *Cave, Hist. Lit.* anno 1450; Landon, s.v.

## Anthony Of Lebrija

or, with a Latin name, *Antonious Nebrissensis*, a Spanish theologian and historian, born in 1442, and died in 1522. He was appointed by Cardinal Ximenes professor at the university Alcala de Henares, and colaborer at the Complutensian Bible Polyglot. He was also biographer of Ferdinand the Catholic. He wrote, besides a number of works on classical antiquity, a

*Dictionarium quadruplex* (Alvala, 1532, fol.); *Quinquagena locorum S. Scripturae non vulgariter enarratorum* (Paris, 1520; Basle, 1543), a remarkable book, in an exegetical point of view, because it takes the original text for its basis. — Prescott, *Ferdinand and Isabella*, 1, 456.

### Anthony, St., Orders of

**1.** The monastic orders of the Eastern (Greek, Armenian, Jacobite, Coptic, Abyssinian) churches call themselves either after St. Anthony or St. Basil. Neither Anthony himself nor his disciples had founded a religious order, but when the rule of Basil began to spread in the Eastern churches, and most of the monks called themselves after him, some, out of veneration for Anthony, preferred to assume his name. Among the Eastern churches united with Rome, the Chaldeans, Maronites, and United Armenians have orders of Antonian monks. The Chaldeans have only one convent, Man Hormes, near Mosul, called after St. Hormisdas. The Maronite Antonians are subdivided into three classes: the Aleppines, who have their monasteries in the cities, and the Baladites and Libanensians, whose monasteries are on the Lebanon. Together, they have about 60 monasteries, with 1500 monks. The Armenian Antonians are divided into two classes — an older branch on the Lebanon, and a younger one established by Mekhitar. *SEE MEKHITAR*. The Antonians of the Eastern churches together number about 3000. — Helyot, *Ord. Religieux*, 2, 504; P. Karl vom heil. Aloys, *Jahrbuch*, 1862, p. 70.

**2.** A military order, founded by Albert of Bavaria, count of Hainault, Holland, and Zealand, in 1382, when he was about to make war on the Turks, and styled “The Order of the Knights of St. Anthony.” They wear a collar of gold, fashioned like the girdle of a hermit, to which is appended a bell and crutch, such as are represented in pictures of St. Anthony. — Helyot, *Ordres Relg.* 2, 506; Landon, s.v.

**3.** A congregation of Regular Canons, founded in 1095 at Vienna (see Reimbold, *De Antonianis*, Lips. 1737). The so-called “relics of St. Anthony” were brought from the East in 1070 by Josselin of Touraine, who founded for their reception the “Church of St. Anthony,” in La Mothe St. Didier, of which town he was lord. The disease vulgarly called “St. Anthony’s fire” was then very prevalent; and it is reported that wonderful cures were wrought at the shrine of St. Anthony. Two gentlemen, named Gaston, who devoted all their property to the work, assisted by seven

others, built, for their accommodation, a hospital in the town. One account says that Gaston's son had been cured, and that this charity was the fulfillment of a vow. It is to these hospitallers that the order of St. Anthony owes its origin. The order soon took root in most of the kingdoms of Europe, and even in Asia and Africa. Gaston was made grand-master of the order, and all the other establishments recognised that at La-Mothe, or, as it came now to be called, St. Antoine, as their chief. Eventually, all these houses became so many commanderies, which were divided into (1.) *General*, i.e. dependent immediately on that in the city of St. Antoine; and (2.) *Subaltern*, i.e. dependent on one or other of the general commanderies. The hospitallers were bound to a uniform and common mode of life, and bore a figure resembling the Greek *Tau* on their dress. In 1297, Aimon de Montagni, the seventeenth master, perceiving that the malady which had been the origin of the order was fast disappearing, and fearing lest, with the cessation of the disease, the order itself should cease, demanded of Pope Boniface VIII a new form of constitution. This the pope granted, and the new hospitallers of St. Anthony became regular canons, following the rule of St. Augustine; and the hospital founded by Gaston, and the church built by Josselin, being united to the priory of Benedictines, which previously existed there, and which was ceded to the new order, together formed the abbey-in-chief of the order of St. Anthony, which in after ages received vast possessions and privileges. After many disorders, the fraternity fell into decay in the 18th century, and was united in 1775 to the order of Malta, which it enriched by the addition of 42 houses. The Antonians soon repented of having entered this union, and reclaimed against it in 1780, but in vain. A single commandery, Hoechst, in Germany, existed until 1803, when the order became entirely extinct. — Helyot, *Ordres Religieux*, 1, 264; Landon, s.v.

### Anthropolatrae

(*ἀνθρωπολάτραι*, *man-worshippers*), a name by which the Apollinarians stigmatized the orthodox, because they maintained that Christ was a perfect man, and had a reasonable soul and body. Apollinarius denied this, maintaining that the divine nature in Christ supplied the place of a rational soul, constituting, in fact, his mind. — Bingham, *Org. Ecclesiastes* bk. 1, ch. 2, § 16; Farrar, s.v.

## Anthropology

(ἄνθρωπολογία, a *discourse on man*) is that part of scientific theology which treats of man, his nature, relations, etc., as distinguished from theology proper (the doctrine of God) and Christology (the doctrine of Christ). Theological anthropology distinguishes itself from physiological anthropology by viewing man not as a natural being, but in his relation *to God*. It may be divided into two chief parts: the doctrine of the original condition of man before the fall, and the doctrine of the fall and of sin which through the fall came into the human race, propagated itself, and took effect in every individual.

It must be admitted that a scientific anthropology is not possible in theology without physiological anthropology, that is, without a knowledge of the natural organism of man. But physiological anthropology is only the basis of the theological, and the completest knowledge of man in an anatomical, physiological, and even psychological point of view is unable to disclose the *religious nature of man*. All that we may learn of the latter in a psychological way is a view of man in his individualism, as a sample of the race; but only the history of mankind in connection with the revelations of God can open to us a full look upon his religious nature. It is therefore safe to assert that, as theology must be anthropological, thus anthropology must be theological; and Harless (preface to his manual of *Ethical Theology*) is right in recommending to theologians not to neglect the physiological researches on the nature of man. The question of body and soul (or, according to the Trichotomists, body, soul, and spirit), as well as the question on the origin of the soul (pre-existence, traducianism, and creatianism), belong to theological anthropology, only in so far as they may contribute to an understanding of man's religious nature. History knows as little of the original condition of man (state of innocence) as natural history knows of paradise. The true procedure of the dogmatic theologian will be to comprehend in his own mind the few but grand hints of the Scriptures on the subject (image of God), and then by exegetical, historical, and philosophical means, so to elaborate them as to show, behind the figurative expressions, the higher *idea* of humanity; for upon the correct comprehension of this idea depends the correct conception of sin, whether it is to be viewed as a mere negation, a natural deficiency, or both as a privation and deprivation, or deprivation of human nature.

In Genesis we find the biblical narrative of the origin of sin, and this narrative is reproduced daily in the experience of mankind. Even when the full Augustinian idea of original sin may not be adhered to, the consciousness of an aggregate guilt of the race, in which the individual man has his part, is the true deeply religious view, confirmed both by Scripture and experience. Psychological observations, and the study of the Scriptures, complete and illustrate each other nowhere so fully as in the doctrine of sin. Paul, Augustine, and Luther spoke from their personal experience as well as from the depths of human nature. The abstract intellect may always lean toward Pelagianism, but religious experience attests that the intellect alone cannot comprehend the depth of sin (Hundeshagen, *Weg zu Christo*, 1, 136 sq.). — Hagenbach, *Encyklopadie*, 7th ed., p. 308 sq. *SEE THEOLOGY*.

### Anthropomorphism

(from *ἄνθρωπος*, *a man*, and *μορφή*, *a form*), 1. A term used to signify the “representation of divinity under a human form;” and the nations or sects who have followed this practice have been sometimes called Anthropomorphites (q.v.). The Egyptians represented deities under human forms, as well as those of animals, and sometimes under a combination of the two. The ancient Persians, as Herodotus tells us (1, 131), adored the Supreme Being under no visible form of their own creation, but they worshipped on the tops of mountains, and sacrificed to the sun and moon, to earth, fire, water, and the winds. The Hebrews were forbidden (<sup>(~~Q~~)</sup>Exodus 20:4, 5) to make any image or the representation of any animated being whatever. The Greeks were essentially anthropomorphists, and could never separate the idea of superior powers from the representation of them under a human form; hence, in their mythology and in their arts, each deity had his distinguishing attributes and a characteristic human shape. Jews, Christians, and Mohammedans revere God as a spirit, and therefore reject all representations of Deity in human form.

2. The term is also used to denote that *figure* of speech by which the sacred writers attribute to God parts, actions, and affections which properly belong to man; as when they speak of the *eyes* of God, his *hand*, etc. Anthropomorphism (*ἄνθρωπόμορφος*) differs from *anthropopathy* (*ἄνθρωποπαθής*) in this: the first is the attributing to God *any thing* whatever which, strictly speaking, is applicable to man only; the second is the act of attributing to God *passions* which belong to man’s nature.



Instances of both are found in the Scriptures, by which they adapt themselves to human modes of speaking, and to the limited capacities of men (see Klugling, *Ueb. d. Anthropomorph smus d. Bibel*, Danz. 1806; Gelpe, *Apologie d. anthropomorph. u. anthropopath. Darstellung Gottes*, Leips. 1842). These anthropopathies we must, however, interpret in a manner suitable to the majesty of the Divine nature. Thus, when the members of a human body are ascribed to God, we must understand by them those perfections of which such members are in us the instruments. The *eye*, for instance, represents God's knowledge and watchful care; the *arm* his power and strength; his *ear* the regard he pays to prayer and to the cry of oppression and misery, etc. Farther, when human affections are attributed to God, we must so interpret them as to imply no imperfection, such as perturbed feeling, in him. When God is said to repent, the antecedent, by a frequent figure of speech, is put for the consequent; and in this case we are to understand an altered mode of proceeding on the part of God, which in man is the effect of repenting.

Anthropomorphic phrases, generally considered, are such as ascribe to the Deity mixed perfections and human imperfections. These phrases may be divided into three classes, according to which we ascribe to God:

1. Human actions (*ἀνθρωποποιήσις*);
2. Human affections, passions, and sufferings (anthropopathy);
3. Human form, human organs, human members (anthropomorphism).

A rational being, who receives impressions through the senses, can form conceptions of the Deity only by a consideration of his own powers and properties (*Journal Sac. Lit.* 1848, p. 9 sq.). Anthropomorphic modes of thought are therefore unavoidable in the religion of mankind; and although they can furnish no other than corporeal or sensible representations of the Deity, they are nevertheless true and just when we guard against transferring to God qualities pertaining to the human senses. It is, for instance, a proper expression to assert that God *knows* all things; it is improper, that is, tropical or anthropomorphic, to say that he *sees* all things. Anthropomorphism is thus a species of *accommodation* (q.v.), inasmuch as by these representations the Deity, as it were, lowers himself to the comprehension of men. We can only think of God as the archetype of our own spirit, and the idea of God can no longer be retained if we lose sight of this analogy. Anthropomorphism must be supplanted by

Christianity; anthropopathism is not supplanted, but spiritualized and refined. Only what is false must be rejected — that crudeness which transfers to God human passions (πάθη) and defects, for want of recollecting the elevation of the Supreme Being, as well as his relationship to man. Christianity must teach us to distinguish what is owing to the corrupting influence of sin from what constitutes the true analogy between God and man. In heathenism a false anthropopathism prevailed, since polytheism presented in its gods the apotheosis of human qualities, not only of virtues, but of vices, and withal a deification of the power manifested in Nature. Among the common, carnally-minded Jews there was a corresponding crudeness in their views of the Divine attributes; for omnipotence was represented as unlimited caprice, and punitive justice as perfectly analogous to human wrath. McCosh remarks that “of all systems, Pantheism is the most apt, in our times, to land in Anthropomorphism. For, if God and his works be one, then we shall be led to look on humanity as the highest manifestation of the divinity, and the natural devoutness of the heart will find vent in hero-worship, or the foolish raving about great men, which has been so common among the eminent literary men of the age now passing away, the issue of the Pantheism which rose like a vapor in Germany, and came over like a fog into Britain and America” (*Intuitions of the Mind*, pt. 3, § 5). See Seiler, *Bibl. Hermeneutik*, p. 56; Penny *Cyclopaedia*, s.v.; Home, *Introduction*, 1, 362; Neander, *Hist. of Dogmas*, 1, 102 sq.; Tappe, *De Anthropopatica* (Dorp. 1815).

### Anthropomorphites

*SEE ANTHROPOMORPHISM*, a sect of ancient heretics, who were so denominated because they understood every thing spoken in Scripture in a literal sense, and particularly that passage of Genesis in which it is said “God made man after his own image.” Hence they maintained that God had a human shape (see Fremling, *De Anthroponmorphitis*, Lund. 1787). They were also called AUDIANI, from Audius, a Syrian who originated their sect. The orthodox bishops revailed on the emperor to banish Audius to Syria, where he labored for the propagation of Christianity among the Goths, built convents, and instituted several bishops, and died about 372. In consequence of repeated persecutions, the sect ceased to exist toward the close of the 5th century. Origen wrote against certain monks in Egypt who were Anthropomorphites; but whether they inherited their views from Audius, or professed them independently of him, is still doubtful. Anthropomorphites appeared again in the 10th century, and in the 17th

under Paul Felgenhauer (q.v.). “Anthropomorphism has been recently revived by the Mormons. In Elder Moffat’s *Latter-Day Saints’ Catechism*, God is described as an intelligent material personage, possessing body, parts, and passions, and unable to ‘occupy two distinct places at once’” (Williams, *Note to Browne on 39 Articles*, p. 19). — Neander, *Ch. Hist.* 2, 690, 705-6; Landon, s.v.

## Anthropopathy

*SEE ANTHROPOMORPHISM.*

## Antibaptists

(from *ἀντί*, *against*, and *βαπτίζω*, *to baptize*), those who *oppose baptism*. Of this description there are two sorts:

1. Those who oppose it altogether, as the Friends, usually called Quakers, who have from the beginning rejected it as an ordinance, declaring it to be superseded by the baptism of the Spirit, under whose peculiar administration Christians live, and whose influences can be and are received (as they maintain) without any sacramental medium for their conveyance. But though these are Antilaptists essentially, they are not so technically.
2. The class of persons to whom that name properly belongs are those who deny the necessity of baptism to any except new converts. “Baptism,” they tell us, “is a proselyting ordinance, to be applied only to those who come over to Christianity from other religions, and not to their descendants, whether infant or adult.” This they infer from the words of the commission, and from the practice of the apostles and first Christians. It has been stated that there are in Ireland several growing societies of Antibaptists. *SEE BAPTISM.*

## Antiburghers

a branch of seceders from the Church of Scotland, who differ from the Established Church chiefly in matters of church government; and from the Burghers (q.v.), with whom they were originally united (in the Erskine secession), respecting the lawfulness of taking the Burgess oath, which ran thus: “I profess and allow with my heart the true religion presently professed within this realm and authorized by the laws thereof; I shall abide thereat and defend the same to my life’s end; renouncing the Roman

religion called Papistry.” The seceders could not agree in their interpretation of this oath, some of them construing it into a virtual approval of the National Church, others maintaining that it was merely a declaration of Protestantism and a security against Popery. The contest was soon embittered by personal asperities, and in 1747 a schism took place. Those who rejected the oath were called the General Associate Synod, or Antiburghers, the others were known as the Associate Synod, or Burghers. The former party were, in matters of church government, rigid adherents of the old Presbyterian system. (Marsden, *Churches and Sects*, 1, 293; Eadie, *U. P. Church*, in the *Encyc. Metrop.*) *SEE ERSKINE; SEE SECEDERS; SEE SCOTLAND, CHURCH OF.*

### Antichrist

(ἀντίχριστος, *against Christ*; others, *instead of Christ* [see below]), a term which has received a great variety of interpretations. Although the word Antichrist is used only by the Apostle John (Epistle 1 and 2), yet it has been generally applied also

- (1) to the “Little Horn” of the “King of Fierce Countenance” (Daniel 7 and 8);
- (2) to the “false Christ” predicted by our Savior (Matthew 14);
- (3) to the “Man of Sin” of St. Paul (2 Thessalonians); and
- (4) to the “Beasts” of the Apocalypse (Revelations 13, 18).

**I.** *Meaning of the word.* — Some maintain (e.g. Greswell) that Antichrist can mean only “false Christ,” taking ἀντί in the sense of “instead.” But this is undue refinement: ἀντί bears the sense of “against” as well as “instead of,” both in classical and N.T. usage. So ἀντικτήσεσθαι means to *gain instead of*, while ἀντιλέγειν means to *speak against*. The word doubtless includes both meanings — “pseudo-Christ” as well as “opposed to Christ,” much as “anti-pope” implies both rivalry and antagonism. According to Bishop Hurd, it signifies “a person of power actuated with a spirit opposite to that of Christ.” For, to adopt the illustration of the same writer, “as the word *Christ* is frequently used in the apostolic writings for the doctrine of Christ, in which sense we are to understand to ‘put on Christ,’ to ‘grow in Christ,’ or to ‘learn Christ,’ so *Antichrist*, in the abstract, may be taken for a doctrine subversive of the Christian; and when applied to a particular man, or body of men, it denotes one who sets himself against the spirit of

that doctrine.” It seems, however, that the Scriptures employ the term both with a general and limited signification. In the general sense, with which Bishop Hurd’s idea mainly agrees, every person who is hostile to the authority of Christ, as Lord or head of the Church, and to the spirit of his religion, is called Antichrist; as when the Apostle John, referring to certain false teachers who corrupted the truth from its simplicity, says, “Even now are there many Antichrists” (<sup><6128></sup>1 John 2:18; 4:3), many who corrupt the doctrine and blaspheme the name of Christ, i.e. Jewish sectaries (Lucke, *Comment.* in loc.).

**II. Types and Predictions of Antichrist in O.T. 1. Balaam.** As Moses was the type of Christ, so Balaam, the opponent of Moses, is to be taken as an O.T. type of Antichrist (<sup><6316></sup>Numbers 31:16; comp. <sup><6100></sup>Jude 1:9-11; <sup><6124></sup>2 Peter 2:14-16; <sup><6124></sup>Revelation 2:14). **SEE BALAAM.**

**2. Antiochus Epiphanes, the “King of Fierce Countenance”** (<sup><2783></sup>Daniel 8:23-25): “And in the latter time of their kingdom, when the transgressors are come to the full, a king of fierce countenance, and understanding dark sentences, shall stand up. And his power shall be mighty, but not by his own power; and he shall destroy wonderfully, and shall prosper, and practice, and shall destroy the mighty and the holy people. And through his policy also he shall cause craft to prosper in his hand; and he shall magnify *himself* in his heart, and by peace shall destroy many: he shall also stand up against the Prince of princes; but he shall be broken without hand.” (Comp. also chapters 11, 12.) Most interpreters concur in applying this passage to Antiochus Epiphanes as a type of Antichrist. Antiochus is here set forth (ch. 8) as a theocratic anti-Messiah, opposed to the true Messiah, who, it will be remembered, is generally described in O.T. as a king. Jerome (quoted in Smith, *Dictionary*, s.v.) argues as follows: “All that follows (from ch. 11:21) to the end of the book applies personally to Antiochus Epiphanes, brother of Seleucus, and son of Antiochus the Great; for, after Seleucus, he reigned eleven years in Syria, and possessed Judaea; and in his reign there occurred the persecution about the Law of God, and the wars of the Maccabees. But our people consider all these things to be spoken of Antichrist. who is to come in the last time . . . It is the custom of Holy Scripture to anticipate in types the reality of things to come. For in the same way our Lord and Savior is spoken of in the 72d Psalm, which is entitled a Psalm of Solomon, and yet all that is there said cannot be applied to Solomon. But in part, and as in a shadow and image of the truth, these things are foretold of Solomon, to be more perfectly fulfilled in our Lord

and Savior. As, then, in Solomon and other saints the Savior has types of His coming, so Antichrist is rightly believed to have for his type that wicked king Antiochus, who persecuted the saints and ‘defiled the Temple’ (Hieron. *Op.* 3, 1127, Par. 1704). *SEE ANTIOCHUS EPIPHANES.*

**3.** *The Little Horn* (<sup><200></sup>Daniel 7). Here the four beasts indicate four kings; their kingdoms are supposed to be the Assyrian, Persian, Grecian, and Syrian (some say Roman) empires. The last empire breaks up into ten, after which the king rises up and masters three (ver. 24) of them. It is declared (ver. 25) that he shall speak great words against the Most High, and shall wear out the saints of the Most High, and think to change times and laws; and they shall be given into his hand until a time and times and the dividing of time” — indicating a person, as well as a power or polity. It is likely that this prediction refers also to Antiochus as the type of Antichrist, at least primarily. *SEE HORN, LITTLE.*

### III. *Passages in N.T.* —

**1.** In <sup><40></sup>Matthew 24, Christ himself foretells the appearance of false Messiahs; thus, ver. 5: “For many shall come in my name, saying I am Christ, and shall deceive many;” also ver. 23, 24: “Then if any man shall say unto you, Lo, here *is* Christ or there, believe it not; for there shall arise false Christs, and false prophets, and shall show great signs and wonders; insomuch that, if *it were* possible, they shall deceive the very elect.” (Comp. <sup><413></sup>Mark 13:21, 22.) In these passages *anti-Christian* teachers and their works are predicted. Christ teaches “that

**(1)** in the latter days of Jerusalem there should be sore distress, and that in the midst of it there should arise impostors who would claim to be the promised Messiah, and would lead away many of their countrymen after them; and that

**(2)** in the last days of the world there should be a great tribulation and persecution of the saints, and that there should arise at the same time false Christs and false prophets, with an unparalleled power of leading astray. In type, therefore, our Lord predicted the rise of the several impostors who excited the fanaticism of the Jews before their fall. In antitype He predicted the future rise of impostors in the last days, who should beguile all but the elect into the belief of their being God’s prophets, or even his Christs. Our Lord is not speaking of any one individual (or polity), but rather of those forerunners of the Antichrist who are his servants and actuated by his

spirit. They are **ψευδόχριστοι** (false Christs), and can deceive almost the elect, but they are not specifically **ὁ ἀντίχριστος** (the Antichrist); they are **ψευδοπροφήται** (false prophets), and can show great signs and wonders, but they are not **ὁ ψευδοπροφήτης** (*the* false prophet) (Revelations 16:14).’

**2. St. Paul’s Man of Sin.** Paul specifically *personifies* Antichrist, <sup><SAB></sup>2 Thessalonians 2:3, 4: “Let no man deceive you by any means; for *that day shall not come*, except there come a falling away first, and that man of-sin be revealed, the son of perdition; who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he, as God, sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God;” also ver. 8-10: “And then shall that Wicked be revealed, whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming: *even him*, whose coming is after the working of Satan, with all power, and signs, and lying wonders, and with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish.” Here he “who opposeth himself” (**ὁ ἀντικείμενος**, *the Adversary*, ver. 4) is plainly Antichrist. Paul tells the Thessalonians that the spirit of Antichrist, or Antichristianism, called by him “the mystery of iniquity,” was already working; but Antichrist himself he characterizes as “the Man of Sin,” “the Son of Perdition,” “the Adversary to all that is called God,” “the one who lifts himself above all objects of worship;” and assures them that he should not be revealed in person until some present obstacle to his appearance should have been taken away, and until the predicted **ἀποστασία** should have occurred. Comp. <sup><SOD></sup>1 Timothy 4:1-3; <sup><SRI></sup>2 Timothy 3:1-5. **SEE MAN OF SIN.**

**3. The Antichrist of John.** The Apostle John also personifies Antichrist, alluding, as St. Paul does, to previous oral teaching on the subject, and applying it to a class of opponents of Christ: <sup><RDB></sup>John 2:18: “Little children, it is the last time: and as ye have heard that Antichrist shall come, even now are there many Antichrists; whereby we know that it is the last time;” and to *a spirit* of opposition; <sup><RDB></sup>John 4:3: “And every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh, is not of God. And this is that *spirit* of Antichrist, whereof ye have heard that it should come; and even now already is it in the world.” The Apostle here teaches “that the spirit of the Antichrist could exist even then, though the coming of the Antichrist himself was future, and that all who denied the Messiahship and Sonship of Jesus were Antichrists, as being types of the final Antichrist who was to come. The teaching of John’s Epistles, therefore, amounts to this, that *in*

*type*, Cerinthus, Basilides, Simon Magus and those Gnostics who denied Christ's Sonship, and all subsequent heretics who should deny it, were Antichrists, as being wanting in that divine principle of love which with him is the essence of Christianity; and he points on to the final appearance of the Antichrist that was "to come" in the last times, according as they had been orally taught, who would be the *antitype* of these his forerunners and servants." Comp. also <sup><G01></sup>1 John 4:1-3, <sup><G02></sup>2 John 1:7. "From John and Paul together we learn

- (1) that the Antichrist should come;
- (2) that he should not come until a certain obstacle to his coming was removed;
- (3) nor till the time of, or rather till after the time of the **ἀποστασία**;
- (4) that his characteristics would be
  - (a) open opposition to God and religion;
  - (b) a claim to the incommunicable attributes of God;
  - (c) iniquity, sin, and lawlessness;
  - (d) a power of working lying miracles;
  - (e) marvellous capacity of beguiling souls;
- (5) that he would be actuated by Satan;
- (6) that his spirit was already at work manifesting itself partially, incompletely, and typically, in the teachers of infidelity and immorality already abounding in the Church."

*The Obstacle* (τὸ κατέχον). — Before leaving the apostolical passages on Antichrist, it is expedient to inquire into the meaning of the "obstacle" alluded to in the last paragraph: that which "*withholdeth*" (τὸ κατέχον, <sup><S06></sup>2 Thessalonians 2:6); described also in ver. 7 as a person: "*he who now letteth*" (ὃ κατέχων). The early Christian writers generally consider "the obstacle" to be the Roman empire; so "Tertullian (*De Resur. Carn.* c. 24, and *Apol.* c. 32); St. Chrysostom and Theophylact on 2 Thessalonians 2; Hippolytus (*De Antichristo*, c. 49); St. Jerome on Daniel 7; St. Augustine (*De Civ. Dei*, 20, 19); St. Cyril of Jerusalem (*Catech.* 15, 6; see Dr. H. More's Works, Luke 2, ch. 19, p. 690; Mede, bk. 3, ch. 13, p. 656; Alford, *Gk. Test.* 3, 57; Wordsworth, *On the Apocalypse*, p. 520). Theodoret and Theodore of Mopsuestia hold it to be the determination of God.



Theodoret's view is embraced by Pelt; the Patristic interpretation is accepted by Wordsworth. Ellicott and Alford so far modify the Patristic interpretation as to explain the obstacle to be the restraining power of human law (τὸ κατέχον) wielded by the empire of Rome (ὃ κατέχων) when Tertullian wrote, but now by the several governments of the civilized world. The explanation of Theodoret is untenable on account of Paul's further words, 'until he be taken out of the way,' which are applied by him to the obstacle. The modification of Ellicott and Alford is necessary if we suppose the ἀποστασία to be an *infidel* apostasy still future; for the Roman empire is gone, and *this* apostasy is not come, nor is the Wicked One revealed. There is much to be said for the Patristic interpretation in its plainest acceptation. How should the idea of the Roman empire being the obstacle to the revelation of Antichrist have originated? There was nothing to lead the early Christian writers to such a belief. They regarded the Roman empire as idolatrous and abominable, and would have been more disposed to consider it as the precursor than as the obstacle to the Wicked One. Whatever the obstacle was, Paul says that he told the Thessalonians what it was. Those to whom he had preached knew, and every time that his Epistle was publicly read (~~1~~ 1 Thessalonians 5:27), questions would have been asked by those who did not know, and thus the recollection must have been kept up. It is very difficult to see whence the tradition could have arisen, except from Paul's own teaching. It may be asked, Why then did he not express it in writing as well as by word of mouth? St. Jerome's answer is sufficient: 'If he had openly and unreservedly said, "Antichrist will not come unless the Roman empire be first destroyed," the infant church would have been exposed in consequence to persecution (*ad Algas*. Qu. 11, vol. 4, p. 209, Par. 1706). Remigius gives the same reason: 'He spoke obscurely for fear a Roman should perhaps read the Epistle, and raise a persecution against him and the other Christians, for they held that they were to rule for ever in the world' (*Bib. Patr. Max.* 8, 1018; see Wordsworth, *On the Apocalypse*, p. 343). It would appear, then, that the obstacle *was* probably the Roman empire, and on its being taken out of the way there did occur the 'falling away.' Zion the beloved city became Sodom the bloody city — still Zion though Sodom, still Sodom though Zion. According to the view given above, this would be the description of the church in her present estate, and this will continue to be our estate, until the time, times, and half time, during which the evil element is allowed to remain within her, shall have come to their end."

#### 4. *Passages in the Apocalypse.* —

(1) *The Beast from the Sea.* The Apocalypse symbolizes the final opposition to Christianity as a beast out of the pit (<sup><610></sup>Revelation 11:7): “And when they shall have finished their testimony, the beast that ascendeth out of the bottomless pit shall make war against them, and shall overcome them, and kill them;” out of the sea (13): “And I stood upon the sand of the sea, and saw a beast rise up out of the sea, having seven heads and ten horns, and upon his horns ten crowns, and upon his heads the name of blasphemy. And the beast which I saw was like unto a leopard, and his feet were as *the feet* of a bear, and his mouth as the mouth of a lion; and the dragon gave him his power, and his seat, and great authority” (comp. the whole chapter, and <sup><610></sup>Revelation 17:1-18). The “beast” is here similar to the Little Horn of Daniel. “The Beast whose power is absorbed into the Little Horn has ten horns (<sup><207></sup>Daniel 7:7), and rises from the sea (<sup><207></sup>Daniel 7:3): the Apocalyptic Beast has ten horns (<sup><610></sup>Revelation 13:1), and rises from the sea (ibid.). The Little Horn has a mouth speaking great things (<sup><207></sup>Daniel 7:8, 11, 20): the Apocalyptic Beast has a mouth speaking great things (<sup><610></sup>Revelation 13:5). The Little Horn makes war with the saints, and prevails (<sup><207></sup>Daniel 7:21): the Apocalyptic Beast makes war with the saints, and overcomes them (<sup><610></sup>Revelation 13:7). The Little Horn speaks great words against the Most High (<sup><207></sup>Daniel 7:25): the Apocalyptic Beast opens his mouth in blasphemy against God (<sup><610></sup>Revelation 13:6). The Little Horn wears out the saints of the Most High (<sup><207></sup>Daniel 7:25): the woman who rides on, i.e. directs, the Apocalyptic Beast, is drunken with the blood of saints (<sup><610></sup>Revelation 17:6). The persecution of the Little Horn is to last a time, and times and a dividing of times, i.e. three and a half times (<sup><207></sup>Daniel 7:25): power is given to the Apocalyptic Beast for forty-two months, i.e. three and a half times (<sup><610></sup>Revelation 13:5).” These and other parallelisms show that as the Little Horn was typical of an individual that should stand to the Church as the leading type of Antichrist, so John’s Apocalyptic Beast was symbolical of a later individual, who should embody the elements of a similar Antichristian power with respect to the Christians.

(2) *The Second Beast and the False Prophet* (Revelations 13:11-18; 19:11-21). In these passages we find described a second beast, coming up out of the earth, who is accompanied by (or identical with) “the False Prophet.” The following views are from Smith, s.v.: “His characteristics are

**[1]** ‘doing great wonders, so that he maketh fire to come down from heaven on the earth in the sight of men’ (Revelations 13:13). This power of miracle-working, we should note, is not attributed by John to the First Beast; but it is one of the chief signs of Paul’s Adversary, ‘whose coming is with all power, and signs, and lying wonders’ (<sup><66310></sup>2 Thessalonians 2:9).

**[2]** ‘He deceiveth them that dwell on the earth by the means of those miracles which he had power to do in the sight of the Beast’ (<sup><66314></sup>Revelation 13:14). ‘He wrought miracles with which he deceived them that received the mark of the Beast and worshipped the image of the Beast’ (<sup><66320></sup>Revelation 19:20). In like manner, no special power of beguiling is attributed to the First Beast; but the Adversary is possessed of ‘all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish because they received not the love of the truth that they might be saved’ (<sup><51210></sup>2 Thessalonians 2:10).

**[3]** He has horns like a lamb, i.e. he bears an outward resemblance to the Messiah (<sup><66311></sup>Revelation 13:11); and the Adversary sits in the temple of God showing himself that he is God (<sup><51204></sup>2 Thessalonians 2:4).

**[4]** His title is The False Prophet, ὁ Ψευδοπροφήτης (Revelations 16:13; 19:20); and our Lord, whom Antichrist counterfeits, is emphatically the Prophet, ὁ Προφήτης. (The Ψευδοπροφήται of <sup><41204></sup>Matthew 24:24, are the forerunners of ὁ Ψευδοπροφήτης, as John the Baptist of the True Prophet.) It would seem that the Antichrist appears most distinctly in the Book of the Revelation by this Second Beast or the False Prophet, especially in the more general or representative character. He is not, however, necessarily a person, but rather the symbol of some power that should arise, who will ally itself with a corrupt religion (for the two Apocalyptic beasts are designated as distinct), represent itself as her minister and vindicator (<sup><66312></sup>Revelation 13:12), compel men by violence to pay reverence to her (<sup><66314></sup>Revelation 13:14), breathe a new life into her decaying frame I by his use of the secular arm in her behalf (<sup><66315></sup>Revelation 13:15), forbidding civil rights to those who renounce her authority and reject her symbols (<sup><66317></sup>Revelation 13:17), and putting them to death by the sword (<sup><66315></sup>Revelation 13:15).” *SEE BEAST.*

**IV. Interpretations.** — Who or what is Antichrist? The answers to this question are legion. The *Edinburgh Encyclopoedia* (s.v.) enumerates fourteen different theories, and the list might be greatly enlarged. We give

- (1) a brief summary of the Scripture testimony;
- (2) the views of the early Christians;
- (3) the views held in the Middle Ages;
- (4) from the Reformation to the present time.

In this sketch, we make use, to a considerable extent, of information from various sources, from which paragraphs have already been cited.

**1. Scripture Teaching.** — The sum of Scripture teaching with regard to the Antichrist, then, appears to be as follows: Already, in the times of the apostles, there was the mystery of iniquity, the spirit of Antichrist, at work. It embodied itself in various shapes — in the Gnostic heretics of John's days; in the Jewish impostors who preceded the fall of Jerusalem; in all heresiarchs and unbelievers, especially those whose heresies had a tendency to deny the incarnation of Christ; and in the great persecutors who from time to time afflicted the church. But this Antichristian spirit was originally, and is now again diffused; it has only at times concentrated itself in certain personal or distinct forms of persecution, which may thus be historically enumerated: 1. Antiochus Epiphanes, the consummation of the Hellenizing policy of the Greco-Syrian monarchy, and denoted by the Little Horn and fierce king of Daniel, 2. The apostate Jewish faith, especially in its representatives who opposed Christianity in its early progress, and at length caused the downfall of the Jewish nation, as represented by the allusions in our Savior's last discourse and in John's epistles. 3. The Roman civil power (the first beast of Revelation) abetting the pagan mythology (the second beast, or false prophet) in its violent attempts to crush Christianity, at first insidious, but finally open, as culminating in Nero and Domitian. It is this phase which seems incipiently alluded to by Paul. All these have again their refulfilment (so to speak) in the great apostasy of the papal system. (Compare especially the characteristics of the *Second Beast*, above.) There is also dimly foreshadowed some future contest, which shall arouse the same essential elements of hostility to divine truth. *SEE BABYLON; SEE GOG.*

**2. Early Christian Views.** — The early Christians looked for Antichrist in a person, not in a polity or system. "That he would be a man armed with

Satanic powers is the opinion of Justin Martyr, A.D. 103 (*Dial.* 371, 20, 21, Thirlbii. 1722); of Irenaeus, A.D. 140 (*Op.* 5, 25, 437, Grabii. 1702); of Tertullian, A.D. 150 (*De Res. Carn.* c. 24; *Apol.* c. 32); of Origen, A.D. 184 (*Op.* 1, 667, Delarue, 1733); of his contemporary, Hippolytus (*De Antichristo*, 57, Fabricii, Hamburgi. 1716); of Cyprian, A.D. 250 (*Ep.* 58; *op.* 120, Oxon. 1682) of Victorinus, A.D. 270 (*Bib. Patr. Magna*, 3, 136, Col. Agrip. 1618); of Lactantius, A.D. 300 (*Dyv. Inst.* 7, 17); of Cyril of Jerusalem, A.D. 315 (*Catech.* 15, 4); of Jerome, A.D. 330 (*Op.* 4, pars 1, 209, Parisiis, 1693); of Chrysostom, A.D. 347 (*Comm. in 2 Thessalonians*); of Hilary of Poitiers, A.D. 350 (*Comm. in Matthew*); of Augustine, A.D. 354 (*De Civit. Dei*, 20, 19); of Ambrose, A.D. 380 (*Comm. in Luc.*). The authors of the Sibylline Oracles, A.D. 150, and of the Apostolical Constitutions, Celsus (see *Orig. c. Cels.* lib. 6), Ephraem Syrus, A.D. 370, Theodoret, A.D. 430, and a few other writers, seem to have regarded the Antichrist as the devil himself, rather than as his minister or an emanation from him. But they may, perhaps, have meant no more than to express the identity of his character and his power with that of Satan. Each of the writers to whom we have referred gives his own judgment with respect to some particulars which may be expected in the Antichrist, while they all agree in representing him as a person about to come shortly before the glorious and final appearance of Christ, and to be destroyed by His presence. Justin Martyr speaks of him as the man of the apostasy, and dwells chiefly on the persecutions which he would cause. Irenaeus describes him as summing up the apostasy in himself; as having his seat at Jerusalem; as identical with the Apocalyptic Beast (c. 28); as foreshadowed by the unjust judge; as being the man who ‘should come in his own name,’ and as belonging to the tribe of Dan (c. 30). Tertullian identifies him with the Beast, and supposes him to be about to arise on the fall of the Roman Empire (*De Res. Cam.* c. 25). Origen describes him in Eastern phrase as the child of the devil and the counterpart of Christ. Hippolytus understands the Roman Empire to be represented by the Apocalyptic Beast, and the Antichrist by the False Prophet, who would restore the wounded Beast by his craft and by the wisdom of his laws. Cyprian sees him typified in Antiochus Epiphanes (*Exhort. ad Mart.* c. 11). Victorinus, with several others, misunderstanding Paul’s expression that the mystery of iniquity was in his day working, supposes that the Antichrist will be a revived hero; Lactantius, that he will be a king of Syria, born of an evil spirit; Cyril, that he will be a magician, who by his arts will get the mastery of the Roman Empire. Jerome describes him as the son of the

devil, sitting in the Church as though he were the Son of God; Chrysostom as ἀντίθεός τις, sitting in the Temple of God, that is, in all the churches, not merely in the Temple at Jerusalem; Augustine as the adversary holding power for three and a half years—the Beast, perhaps, representing Satan’s empire. The primitive belief may be summed up in the words of Jerome (*Comm. on Daniel*): ‘Let us say that which all ecclesiastical writers have handed down, viz., that at the end of the world, when the Roman Empire is to be destroyed, there will be ten kings, who will divide the Roman world among them; and there will arise an eleventh little king, who will subdue three of the ten kings, that is, the king of Egypt, of Africa, and of Ethiopia, as we shall hereafter show; and on these having been slain, the seven other kings will also submit. “And behold,” he says, “in the ram were the eyes of a man” — this is that we may not suppose him to be a devil or a daemon, as some have thought, but a man in whom Satan will dwell utterly and bodily — “and a mouth speaking great things;” for he is “the man of sin, the son of perdition, who sitteth in the temple of God, making himself as God”’ (*Op.* 4, 511, Col. Agrip: 1616). In his *Comment. on Daniel 11*, and in his reply to Algasia’s eleventh question, he works out the same view in greater detail, the same line of interpretation continued. Andreas of Casarea, A.D. 550, explains him to be a king actuated by Satan, who will reunite the old Roman Empire and reign at Jerusalem (*In Apoc.* c. 13); Aretas, A.D. 650, as a king of the Romans, who will reign over the Saracens in Bagdad (*In Apoc.* c. 13).”

**3. Middle-Age Views.** — In the Middle Age it was the prevailing opinion that Antichrist would either be brought forth by a virgin, or be the offspring of a bishop and a nun. About the year 950, *Adso*, a monk in a monastery of Western Franconia, wrote a treatise on Antichrist, in which he assigned a later time to his coming, and also to the end of the world (see Schrockh, *Kirchengesch.* 21, p. 243). He did not distinctly state whom he meant to be understood by Antichrist (Hagenbach, *Hist. of Doctrines*, § 203). “A Frank king,” he says, “will reunite the Roman Empire, and abdicate on Mount Olivet, and, on the dissolution of his kingdom, the Antichrist will be revealed.” The same writer supposes that he will be born in Babylon, that he will be educated at Bethsaida and Chorazin, and that he will proclaim himself the Son of God at Jerusalem (*Tract. in Antichr. apud August. Opera*, 9, 454, Paris, 1637). In the singular predictions of Hildegarde († 1197), Antichrist is foretold as the spirit of doubt. She states that the exact season of Antichrist is not revealed, but describes his

manifestation as an impious imitation or “parody of the incarnation of the Divine Word” (*Christian Remembrancer*, 44, 50). **SEE HILDEGARDE.** But “the received opinion of the twelfth century is brought before us in a striking manner in the interview between Richard I and the abbot Joachim of Floris († 1202) at Messina, as the king was on his way to the Holy Land. ‘I thought,’ said the king, ‘that Antichrist would be born in Antioch or in Babylon, and of the tribe of Dan, and would reign in the temple of the Lord in Jerusalem, and would walk in that land in which Christ walked, and would reign in it for three years and a half, and would dispute against Elijah and Enoch, and would kill them, and would afterward die; and that after his death God would give sixty days of repentance, in which those might repent which should have erred from the way of truth, and have been seduced by the preaching of Antichrist and his false prophets.’ This seems to have been the view defended by the archbishops of Rouen and Auxerre, and by the bishop of Bayonne, who were present at the interview, but it was not Joachim’s opinion. He maintained the seven heads of the Beast to be Herod, Nero, Constantius, Mohammed, Melsemut, who were past; Saladin, who was then living; and Antichrist, who was shortly to come, being already born in the city of Rome, and about to be elevated to the apostolic see (Roger de Hoveden, in *Richard I*, anno 1190). In his own work on the Apocalypse, Joachim speaks of the second Apocalyptic Beast as being governed by ‘some great. prelate who will be like Simon Magus, and, as it were, universal pontiff throughout the world, and be that very Antichrist of whom St. Paul speaks.’ These are very noticeable words. Gregory I had long since (A.D. 590) declared that any man who held even the shadow of the power which the popes of Rome soon after his time arrogated to themselves would be the precursor of Antichrist. Arnulphus, bishop of Orleans (or perhaps Gerbert), in an invective against John XV at the Council of Rheims, A.D. 991, had declared, that if the Roman pontiff was destitute of charity and puffed up with knowledge, he was Antichrist; if destitute both of charity and of knowledge, that he was a lifeless stone (Mansi, 9, 132, Ven. 1774); but Joachim is the first to suggest, not that such and such a pontiff was Antichrist, but that the Antichrist would be a *Universalis Pontifex*, and that he would occupy the apostolic see. Still, however, we have no hint of an *order* of men being the Antichrist; it is a living individual man that Joachim contemplates.” Amalrich of Bena († 12th century) seems to have been the first to teach explicitly that *the* pope (i.e. the papal system) is Antichrist: Quia Papa esset Antichristus et Roma Babylon et ipse sedet in monte Oliveti. i.e. in pinguedine potestatis

(according to Caesarius of Heisterbach; comp. Engelhardt, *Kirchenhistorische Abhandlungen*, p. 256, quoted by Hagenbach). The German emperors in their contests with the popes, often applied the title Antichrist to the latter; we find instances of this as early as the times of the Hohenstaufen. Emperor Louis, surnamed the Bavarian, also called Pope John XXII the *mystical* Antichrist (Schrockh, 31, p. 108). John Aventinus, in his *Annalium Boiorum*, libri 8, p. 651, Lips. 1710), himself the Romish writer, speaks of it as a received opinion of the Middle Age that the reign of Antichrist was that of Hildebrand († 1085), and cites Eberhard, archbishop of Salzburg (12th century), as asserting that Hildebrand had, “in the name of religion, laid the foundation of the kingdom of Antichrist 170 years before his time.” He can even name the ten horns. They are the “Turks, Greeks, Egyptians, Africans, Spaniards, English, French, Germans, Sicilians, and Italians, who now occupy the provinces of Rome; and a little horn has grown up with eyes and mouth, speaking great things, which is reducing three of these kingdoms i.e. Sicily, Italy, and Germany — to subserviency; is persecuting the people of Christ and the saints of God with intolerable opposition; is confounding things human and divine, and attempting things unutterable, execrable.” Pope Innocent III (A.D. 1213) designated Mohammed as Antichrist; and as the number of the beast, 666, was held to indicate the period of his dominion, it was supposed that the Mohammedan power was soon to fall.

The Waldenses have a treatise (given in Leger, *Hist. des Eglises Vaudoises*) concerning Antichrist of the 12th century (Gieseler, Maitland, and others, dispute the date, but the best authorities now agree to it). It treats of Antichrist as the whole anti-Christian principle concealing itself under the guise of Christianity, and calls it a “system of falsehood adorning itself with a show of beauty and piety, yet (as by the names and offices of the Scriptures, and the sacraments, and various other things may appear) very unsuitable to the Church of Christ. The system of iniquity thus completed, with its ministers, great and small, supported by those who are induced to follow it with an evil heart, and blindfold — this is the congregation which, taken together, comprises what is called Antichrist or Babylon, the fourth beast, the whore, the man of sin, the son of perdition.” It originated, indeed, “in the times of the apostles, but, by gaining power and worldly influence, it had reached its climax in the corruption of the Papal Church.



“Christ never had an enemy like this; so able to pervert the way of truth into falsehood, insomuch that the true church, with her children, is trodden under foot. The worship that belongs alone to God he transfers to Antichrist himself — to the creature, male and female, deceased — to images, carcasses, and relics. The sacrament of the Eucharist is converted into an object of adoration, and the worshipping of God alone is prohibited. He robs the Savior of his merits, and the sufficiency of his grace in justification, regeneration, remission of sins, sanctification, establishment in the faith, and spiritual nourishment; ascribing all these things to his own authority, to a form of words, to his own works, to the intercession of saints, and to the fire of purgatory. He seduces the people from Christ, drawing off their minds from seeking those blessings in him, by a lively faith in God, in Jesus Christ, and in the Holy Spirit, and teaching his followers to expect them by the will, and pleasure, and works of Antichrist.

“He teaches to baptize children into the faith, and attributes to this the work of regeneration; thus confounding the work of the Holy Spirit in regeneration with the external rite of baptism, and on this foundation bestows orders, and, indeed, grounds all his Christianity. He places all religion and holiness in going to mass, and has mingled together all descriptions of ceremonies, Jewish, heathen, and Christian — and by means thereof, the people are deprived of spiritual food, seduced from the true religion and the commandments of God, and established in vain and presumptuous hopes. All his works are done to be seen of men, that he may glut himself with insatiable avarice, and hence every thing is set to sale. He allows of open sins without ecclesiastical censure, and even the impenitent are not excommunicated” (Neander, *Church History*, 4, 605 sq.).

The Hussites followed the Waldenses in this theory of Antichrist, applying it to the papal system., So did Wickliffe and his followers: Wickliffe, *Trialogus* (cited by Schrockh, 34, 509); Janow, *Liber de Almtichristo* (*Hist. et Monum. J. Huss*, vol. 1). Lord Cobham (Sir John Oldcastle), executed as a Wickliffite, 1417, declared to King Henry V that, “as sure as God’s word is true, the pope is the great Antichrist foretold in Holy Writ” (*New Genesis Dict.* s.v. Oldcastle).

**4.** *From the Reformation downward.* — One of the oldest German works in print, the first mentioned by Panzer in the *Annalen der Alteren deutschen Literatur*, is *Das Buch yom Entkrist* (The Book of Antichrist),

or, also, “*Bichlin von des Endte Christs Leben und Regierung durch verhengniss Gottes, wie er die Welt tuth verkeren mit seiner falschen Lere und Rat des Teufels,*” etc. “Little Book concerning Antichrist’s Life and Rule through God’s Providence, how he doth pervert the World with his false Doctrine and Counsel of the Devil,” etc. (reprinted at Erfurt, 1516). As early as 1520 Luther began to doubt whether the pope were not Antichrist. In a letter to Spalatin, Feb. 23, 1520, he says, “Ego sic angor ut prope non dubitem papam esse proprie Antichristun.” In the same year, when he heard of Eck’s success in obtaining the bull against him from the pope, Luther exclaimed, “At length the mystery of Antichrist must be unveiled” (Ranke, *Hist. of Reformation*, Uk. 2, ch. 3). In the Reformation era the opinion that the papal system is Antichrist was generally adopted; and it is the prevalent opinion among Protestants to this day, although, as will appear below, some writers make Rome only *one* form of Antichrist. The various classes of opinion, and the writers who maintain them, are given by Smith, s.v., as follows: Bullinger (1504), Chytraeus (1571), Aretius (1573), Foxe (1586), Napier (1593), Mede (1632), Jurieu (1685), Bp. Newton (1750), Cunninghame (1813), Faber (1814), Woodhouse (1828), Habershon (1843), identify the False Prophet, or Second Apocalyptic Beast, with Antichrist and with the papacy; Marlorat (1574), King James I (1603), Daubuz (1720), Galloway (1802), the First Apocalyptic Beast; Briihtman (1600), Pareus (1615), Vitringa (1705), Gill (1776), Bachmair (1778), Fraser (1795), Croly (1828), Fysh (1837), Elliott (1844), both the Beasts. That the pope and his system are Antichrist was taught by Luther, Calvin, Zwingli, Melancthon, Bucer, Beza. Calixtus, Bengel, Michaelis, and by almost all Protestant writers on the Continent. Nor was there any hesitation on the part of English theologians to seize the same weapon of offense. Bishop Bale (1491), like Luther, Bucer, and Melancthon, pronounces the pope in Europe and Mohammed in Africa to be Antichrist. The pope is Antichrist, say Cranmer (*Works*, 2, 46, Camb. 1844), Latimer (*Works*, 1, 149, Camb. 1844), Ridley (*Works*, p. 53, Camb. 1841), Hooper (*Works*, 2, 44, Camb., 1852), Hutchinson (*Works*, p. 304, Camb., 1842), Tyndale (*Works*, 1, 147, Camb. 1848), Sandys (*Works*, p. 11, Camb. 1841), Philpot (*Works*, p. 152, Camb. 1842), Jewell (*Works*, 1, 109, Camb. 1845), Rogers (*Workes*, p. 182, Camb. 1854), Fulke (*Works*, 2, 269, Camb. 1848), Bradford (*Works*, p. 435, Camb. 1848). Nor is the opinion confined to these 16th century divines, who may be supposed to have been specially incensed against popery. King James held it (*Apol. pro Juram. Fidel.* Lond. 1609) as strongly as Queen Elizabeth (see, Jewell,

*Letter to Bulling*. May 22, 1559, *Zurich Letters*, First Series, p. 33, Camb. 1842); and the theologians of the 17th century did not repudiate it, though they less and less dwelt upon it as their struggle came to be with Puritanism in place of popery. Bishop Andrewes maintains it as a probable conclusion from the Epistle to the Thessalonians (*Resp. ad Bellarm.* p. 304, Oxon. 1851); but he carefully explains that King James, whom he was defending, had expressed his private opinion, not the belief of the church, on the subject (*ibid.* p. 23). Bramhall introduces limitations and distinctions (*Works*, 3, 520, Oxf. 1845); significantly suggests that there are marks of Antichrist which apply to the General Assembly of the Kirk of Scotland as much as to the pope or to the Turk (*ibid.* 3, 287), and declines to make the Church of England responsible for what individual preachers or writers had said on the subject in moments of exasperation (*ib.* 2, 582). From this time onward, in the Church of England, the less evangelical divines are inclined to abandon the theory of the Reformers, while, of course, the Romanizers oppose it. Yet it appears, from the list above, that some of the best interpreters in that church, as well as in other branches of Protestantism, maintain the old interpretation of the prophecies of Daniel, Paul, and John.

Some writers have gone back to the old idea of an *individual* Antichrist yet to come, e. p. “Lacunza or Benezra (1810), Burgh, Samuel Maitland, Newman (*Tracts for the Times*, No. 83), Charles Maitland (*Prophetic Interpretation*). Others prefer looking upon him as long past, and fix upon one or another persecutor or heresiarch as the man in whom the predictions as to Antichrist found their fulfillment. There seems to be no trace of this idea for more than 1600 years in the church.: But it has been taken up by two opposite classes of expounders — by Romanists who were anxious to avert the application of the Apocalyptic prophecies from the papacy, and by others, who were disposed, not indeed to deny the prophetic import of the Apocalypse, but to confine the seer’s ken within the closest and narrowest limits that were possible. Alcasar, a Spanish Jesuit, taking a hint from Victorinus, seems to have been the first (A.D. 1604) to have suggested that the Apocalyptic prophecies did not extend further than to the overthrow of paganism by Constantine. This view, with variations by Grotius, is taken up and expounded by Bossuet, Calmet, De Sacy, Eichhorn, Hug, Herder, Ewald, Moses Stuart, Davidson. The general view of the school is that the Apocalypse describes the triumph of Christianity over Judaism in the first, and over heathenism in the third century. Mariana sees Antichrist in Nero; Bossuet in Dipoletian and in

Julian; Grotius in Caligula; Wetstein in Titus; Hammond in Simon Magus (*Works*, 3, 620, Lond. 1631); Whitby in the Jews (*Comm.* 2, 431, Lond. 1760); Le Clerc in Simon, son of Giora, a leader of the rebel Jews; Schottgen in the Pharisees; Nossett and Krause in the Jewish zealots; Harduin in the High-priest Ananias; F. D. Maurice in Vitellius (*On the Apocalypse*, Camb. 1860).”

**5.** The same spirit that refuses to regard Satan as an individual, naturally looks upon the Antichrist as an evil principle not embodied either in a person or in a polity. “Thus Koppe, Storr, Nitzsch, Pelt. (See Alford, *Gk. Test.* 3, 69.) Some of the Romish theologians find Antichrist in rationalism and radicalism, others in Protestantism as a whole. Some Protestants fix it in Romanism as a whole, others in Jesuitism; others, again, in the latest forms of infidelity, while some of the ultra Lutherans find it in modern radicalism, political and religious. Any view of this kind, when carried so far as to exclude all personal identification, is certainly too vague to be satisfactory. But, at the same time, the just conclusion seems to be that Antichrist is not to be confined to any single person or power, but is essentially a great principle or system of falsehood, having various manifestations, forms of working, and degrees, as especially exemplified in Antiochus Epiphanes, Jewish bigotry, and pagan intolerance; while it is undeniable that later Romanism exhibits some of the most prominent characteristics of Antichrist in a manner so striking and peculiar as to assure us that the system is not only one among the many species of Antichrist, but that it stands in the fore-front, and is pointed at by the finger of prophecy as no other form of Antichrist is.

**V. Time of Antichrist.** — A vast deal of labor has been spent upon computations based upon the “time, times, and dividing of time” in Daniel (~~2025~~ 7:25), and upon the “number of the Beast” (666) given in ~~6638~~ Revelation 13:18. We can only refer to the commentators and writers on prophecy for these, as it would take too much space to enumerate them. As to Daniel’s “time, times, and dividing of time,” it is commonly interpreted to mean 1260 years. “The papal power was completely established in the year 755, when it obtained the exarchate of Ravenna. Some, however, date the rise of Antichrist in the year of Christ 606, and Mede places it in 456. If the rise of Antichrist be not reckoned till he was possessed of secular authority, his fall will happen when this power shall be taken away. If his rise began, according to Mede, in 456, he must have fallen in 1716; if in 606, it must be in 1866; if in 755, in 2015. If, however,

we use prophetic years, consisting of three hundred and sixty days, and date the rise of Antichrist in the year 755, his fall will happen in the year of Christ 2000” (Watson, s.v.). As to the “number of the beast,” the interpretation suggested by Irenaeus is one of the most plausible. The number is “the number of a man” (<sup><66318></sup>Revelation 13:18); and Irenaeus names **Λατεινος** as fulfilling the conditions (see Alford, *Comm.*, who considers this the nearest approach to a complete solution). But human ingenuity has found the conditions fulfilled also in the name of Mohammed, Luther, Napoleon, and many others. After all the learning and labor spent upon the question, we must confess that it is yet left unsolved.

**VI. Jewish and Mohammedan Traditions of Antichrist.** — Of these we take the following account from Smith, s.v.

**1.** “The name given by the Jews to Antichrist is (**SWI ymāḥ**) *Armillus*. There are several rabbinical books in which a circumstantial account is given of him, such as the ‘Book of Zerubbabel,’ and others printed at Constantinople. Buxtorf gives an abridgment of their contents in his *Lexicon*, under the head ‘Armillus,’ and in the fiftieth chapter of his *Synagoga Judaica* (p. 717). The name is derived from <sup><23104></sup>Isaiah 11:4, where the Targum gives ‘By the word of his mouth the wicked Armillus shall die,’ for ‘with the breath of his lips shall he slay the wicked.’ There will, say the Jews, be twelve signs of the coming of the Messiah:

**(1.)** The appearance of three apostate kings who have fallen away from the faith, but in the sight of men appear to be worshippers of the true God.

**(2.)** A terrible heat of the sun.

**(3.)** A dew of blood (<sup><2021></sup>Joel 2:30).

**(4.)** A healing dew for the pious.

**(5.)** A darkness will be cast upon the sun (<sup><2023></sup>Joel 2:31) for thirty days (<sup><2342></sup>Isaiah 24:22).

**(6.)** God will give universal power to the Romans for nine months, during which time the Roman chieftain will afflict the Israelites; at the end of the nine months God will raise up the Messiah Ben-Joseph — that is, the Messiah of the tribe of Joseph, named Nehemiah — who will defeat the Roman chieftain, and slay him.

**(7.)** Then there will arise Armillus, whom the Gentiles or Christians call Antichrist. He will be born of a marble statue in one of the churches in Rome. He will go to the Romans and will profess himself to be their Messiah and their God. At once the Romans will believe in him and accept him for their king. Having made the whole world subject to him, he will say to the Idumaeans (i.e. Christians), ‘Bring me the law which I have given you.’ They will bring it with their book of prayers; and he will accept it as his own, and will exhort them to persevere in their belief of him. Then he will send to Nehemiah, and command the Jewish Law to be brought him, and proof to be given from it that he is God. Nehemiah will go before him, guarded by 30,000 warriors of the tribe of Ephraim, and will read, ‘I am the Lord thy God: thou shalt have none other gods but me.’ Armillus will say that there are no such words in the Law, and will command the Jews to confess him to be God as the other nations had confessed him. But Nehemiah will give orders to his followers to seize and bind him. Then Armillus, in rage and fury, will gather all his people in a deep valley to fight with Israel, and in that battle the Messiah Ben-Joseph will fall, and the angels will bear away his body and carry him to the resting-place of the Patriarchs. Then the Jews will be cast out by all nations, and suffer afflictions such as have not been from the beginning of the world, and the residue of them will fly into the desert, and will remain there forty and five days, during which time all the Israelites who are not worthy to see the redemption shall die.

**(8.)** Then the great angel Michael will rise and blow three mighty blasts of a trumpet. At the first blast there shall appear the true Messiah Ben-David and the prophet Elijah, and they will manifest themselves to the Jews in the desert, and all the Jews throughout the world shall hear the sound of the trump, and those that have been carried captive into Assyria shall be gathered together; and with great gladness they shall come to Jerusalem. Then Armillus will raise a great army of Christians, and lead them to Jerusalem to conquer the new king. But God shall say to Messiah, ‘Sit thou on my right hand,’ and to the Israelites, ‘Stand still and see what God will work for you to-day.’ Then God will pour down sulphur and fire from heaven (<sup>382</sup>Ezekiel 38:22), and the impious Armillus shall die, and the impious Idumaeans (i.e. Christians), who have destroyed the house of our God and have led us away into captivity, shall perish in misery; and the Jews shall avenge themselves upon them, as it is written: ‘The house of Jacob shall be a fire, and the house of Joseph a flame, and the house of

Esau (i.e. the Christians) for stubble, and they shall kindle in them and devour them: there shall not be any remaining of the house of Esau, for the Lord hath spoken it' (<sup>3018</sup>Obadiah 1:18).

**(9.)** On the second blast of the trumpet the tombs shall be opened, and Messiah Ben-David shall raise Messiah Ben-Joseph from the dead.

**(10.)** The ten tribes shall be led to Paradise, and shall celebrate the wedding-feast of the Messiah. And the Messiah shall choose a bride among the fairest of the daughters of Israel, and children and children's children shall be born to him, and then he shall die like other men, and his sons shall reign over Israel after him, as it is written: 'He shall prolong his days' (<sup>2530</sup>Isaiah 53:10), which Rambam explains to mean, 'He shall live long, but he too shall die in great glory, and his son shall reign in his stead, and his sons' sons in succession' (Buxtorfii *Synagoga Judaica*, p. 717, Basil, 1661).

**2.** Mussulmans, as well as Jews and Christians, expect an Antichrist. They call him *Al Dajjal*, from a name which signifies an impostor, or a liar; and they hold that their prophet Mohammed taught one of his disciples, whose name was Tamini Al-Dari, every thing relating to Antichrist. On his authority, they tell us that Antichrist must come at the end of the world; that he will make his entry into Jerusalem, like Jesus Christ, riding on an ass; but that Christ, who is not dead, will come at his second advent to encounter him; and that, after having conquered him, he will then die indeed. That the beast described by John in the Revelation will appear with Antichrist, and make war against the saints; that Imam Mahdi, who remains concealed among the Mussulmans, will then show himself, join Jesus Christ, and with him engage Dajjal; after which they will unite the Christians, and the Mussulmans, and of the two religions will make but one (D'Herbelot, *Bibl. Orient.* s.v. Daggial, etc.).

“These Mohammedan traditions are an adaptation of Christian prophecy and Jewish legend, without any originality or any beauty of their own. They too have their signs which are to precede the final consummation. They are divided into the greater and lesser signs. Of the greater signs the first is the rising of the sun from the west (comp. <sup>4209</sup>Matthew 24:29). The next is the appearance of a beast from the earth, sixty cubits high, bearing the staff of Moses and the seal of Solomon, with which he will inscribe the word 'Believer' on the face of the faithful, and 'Unbeliever' on all who have not accepted Islamism (comp. <sup>6111</sup>Revelation 13). The third sign is the capture

of Constantinople; while the spoil of which is being divided, news will come of the appearance of Antichrist, and every man will return to his own home. Antichrist will be blind of one eye and deaf of one ear, and will have the name of Unbeliever written on his forehead (Revelation 13). It is he that the Jews call Messiah Ben-David, and say that he will come in the last times and reign over sea and land, and restore to them the kingdom. He will continue forty days, one of these days being equal to a year, another to a month, another to a week, the rest being days of ordinary length. He will devastate all other places, but will not be allowed to enter Mecca and Medina, which will be guarded by angels. Lastly, he will be killed by Jesus at the gate of Lud. For when news is received of the appearance of Antichrist, Jesus will come down to earth, alighting on the white tower at the east of Damascus, and will slay him; Jesus will then embrace the Mohammedan religion, marry a wife, and leave children after him, having reigned in perfect peace and security, after the death of Antichrist, for forty years. (See Poccoke, *Porta Mosis*, p. 258, Oxon. 1655; and Sale, *Koran, Preliminary Discourse.*)” (Smith, s.v.)

**VII. Literature.** — Besides the writers mentioned in the course of this article, consult the commentators on Daniel, and on the Thessalonians and Apocalypse. Compare the references under REVELATION *SEE REVELATION*. Special dissertations on the text in <sup>2</sup> Thessalonians 2:3-13, by Koppe (Getting. 177,6); Beyer (Lips. 1824); Schott (Jen. 1832). For a copious list of works during the controversy on this subject between the Reformers and the Roman Catholics, see Walch, *Bibliotheca Theologica*, 2, 217 sq. There are works more or less copious on the general subject, among others, by Raban Maurus, *De ortu, vita et moribus Antichristi* (1505, 4to); Danaeus, *De Antichristo* (Genev. 1577, 1756, 8vo, transl. *A Treatise touching Antichrist*, fol., Lond. 1589); Abbott, *Defence of the Reformed Catholicke* (Lond. 1607); Malvenda, *De Antichristo*, fol. (Romans 1604, Val. 1621); Downame, *Concerning Antichrist* (Lond. 1603); Lessius, *De Antichristo* (Antw. 1611); Grotius, *In locis N.T. de Antichristo* (Amst. 1640); Ness, *Person and Period of Antichrist* (Lond. 1679); Nisbet, *Mysterious Language of Paul*, etc. (Canterb. 1808; which makes the “man of sin” refer not to the Church of Rome, but to the times in which Paul wrote); Maitland, *The Prophecies concerning Antichrist* (Lond. 1830); M’Kenzie, *Antichrist and the Church of Rome identified* (Edinburgh, 1835); Cameron, *The Antichrist* (Lond. 1844); Bonar, *Development of Antichrist* (Lond. 1853); Harrison, *Prophetic Outlines*



(London, 1849); Knight, *Lectures on the Prophecies concerning Antichrist* (London, 1855). Compare also *Warburtonian Lecture* (1848); Bellarmine, *De Antichristo, quod nihil commune habeat cum, Romano pontifice; Opp.* 1, 709; Mede, *Works*, 2; Hammond, *Works*, 4, 733; Cocceius, *De Antichristo; Opp.* 9; More, *Theol. Works*, p. 385; Barlow, *Remains*, p. 190, 224; Calmet, *Dissertt.* 8, 351; Turretin, *Opp.* 4; Priestly, *Evidences*, 2; Williams, *Characters of O.T.* p. 349; Cassells, *Christ and Antichrist* (Phila. Presb. Board, 12mo); Keith, *History and Destiny of the World and the Church* (Lond. 1861, 8vo). See also Eden, *Theol. Dict.*; Watson, *Theol. Dict.* s.v.; Todd, *Discourses on Antichrist* (Dubl. 1846, 8vo); Benson, *On the Man of Sin*; Newton, *On the Prophecies*. **SEE ANTICHRISTIANISM.**

## Antichristianism

a term that conveniently designates, in a collective manner, the various forms of hostility which Christianity has met with at different times. It is equivalent to “the spirit of Antichrist” (τὸ τοῦ Ἀντιχρίστου) in the apostolic age (<sup><614B></sup>1 John 4:3). — **SEE ANTICHRIST.** Indeed it exhibited itself against the true religion in the persecutions which the Jews underwent from Antiochus Epiphanes (q.v.), and may be traced in the history of the protosaint Abel (q.v.). It was this that Enoch (q.v.) and Noah denounced in their preaching (<sup><611A></sup>Jude 1:14; <sup><611B></sup>2 Peter 2:5-7); that “vexed the righteous soul” of Lot; and that, in fine, has broken forth in all ages as the expression of the world’s malignity against the good (comp. <sup><615B></sup>John 15:18-21; <sup><612></sup>2 Timothy 3:12). Since the days of persecution it has been confined chiefly to intellectual modes of opposition, and has received the names of Infidelity, Deism, Rationalism, etc. **SEE APOLOGETICS.** The Scriptures, however, appear to point to a time when the Antichristian elements shall again array themselves in forms of palpable violence. **SEE GOG.** For “the carnal mind” (τὸ φρόνημα τῆς σαρκός, native will) is no less than ever opposed (ἔχθρα) to the divine economy and purposes (<sup><617></sup>Romans 8:7). It is the same “mystery of iniquity” already foreseen by Paul as then “working” to successive developments (<sup><617></sup>2 Thessalonians 2:7); “that ἀνομία in the hearts and lives, in the speeches and writings of men, which only awaits the removal of the hindering power to issue in that concentrated manifestation of ὁ ἄνομος, which shall usher in the times of the end” (Alford, *Gr. Test.* prol. to vol. 3, p. 68). A stream of Antichristian sentiment and conduct pervades the whole history of the world. The power of evil which we see at work calls forth Antichristian formations, now in one shape, now in another; and so, according to the prophets, it will be until the final triumph

of the kingdom of Christ (Olshausen, *Commentary*, 5,321 sq., Am. ed.).  
*SEE MYSTERY OF INIQUITY; SEE INFIDELITY.*

### Antidicomarianites or Antimarians

a sect of Christian disciples who appeared in Arabia at the end of the fourth century, and taught that Mary had children by Joseph after the Lord's birth. They were not heretics, but doubtless honest opponents of the growing Mariolatry of the time. — Gieseler, *Ch. Hist.* div. 1, § 97; Walch, *Hist. der Ketzereien*, 3, 578; Epiphanius, *Haeres.* 78, § 19.

### Antidoron

(ἀντίδωρον, a gift in return or exchange), the title given to the bread which, in the Greek Church, is distributed to the people after the mass. It receives its name from its being received *instead* of the ἅγιον δῶρον, or holy communion, by those who were not prepared to receive the latter, though also by those who were. It was also called *eulogia*, or the "blessed" bread, and was sometimes sent by the bishop of one church to him of another in token of intercommunion. — Goar, *Rit. Graec.* p. 154.

### Antigonus

(Ἀντίγονος, a frequent Greek name, signifying apparently *against* his parent), the name of two members of the Asmonsean family.

1. A son of John Hyrcanus, and grandson of Simon Maccabaeus. His brother, Aristobulus, made him his associate in the kingdom, but was at length prevailed upon by their common enemies to put him to death B.C. 105 (Josephus, *Ant.* 13, 18 and 19).
2. A son of Aristobulus (brother to Hyrcanus and Alexandra), sent as a prisoner to Rome, with his father and brother, by Pompey, who had taken Jerusalem. After remaining in Italy for some time, he returned to Judaea, and, after a variety of fortunes, was established king and high-priest, Herod being compelled to fly to Rome, B.C. 40. Having obtained assistance from Antony and Caesar, Herod returned, and, after a firm and protracted resistance on the part of Antigonus, retook Jerusalem and repossessed himself of the throne. Antigonus surrendered to Sosius, the Roman general, but he was carried to Antioch, and, at the solicitation of Herod, was there ignominiously put to death by Antony, B.C. 37. He was the last of the Maccabaeian princes that sat on the throne of Judaea (Josephus, *Ant.* 14,

13-16; *Wars*, 1, 18, 3; Dio Cass. 49, 22; respecting the date, see Wernsdorf, *De fide Macc.* p. 24; Ideler, *Chronol.* 1, 399).

## Antigua

a British West India island, of the Leeward group, which in 1848 had a population of 36,190 souls. It is the see of a bishop of the Church of England, whose diocese comprises, beyond Antigua, the British islands of St. Christopher's (population in 1848 23,127), — Nevis (population in 1851 10,200), Barbuda (population 600), Montserrat (population in 1850 7800), Dominica (population in 1842 18,291), Tortola (population in 1844 6689), Anguilla (population in 1844 2934), and the Danish islands St. Croix (population in 1850 23,720) and St. Thomas (population 13,666). The diocese had, in 1859, twenty-seven clergymen in the British islands (including two archdeacons) and three in the Danish islands. See *Clergy List for 1860* (Lond. 1860, 8vo). *SEE AMERICA*.

## Antileb'anon

*SEE ANTILIBANUS*.

## Antilegomena

(ἀντιλεγόμενα, *contradicted or disputed*), an epithet applied by the early Christian writers to denote those books of the New Testament which, although known to all the ecclesiastical writers, and sometimes publicly read in the churches, were not for a considerable time admitted to be genuine, or received into the canon of Scripture. These books are so denominated in contradistinction to the *homologoumena* (ὁμολογούμενα), or universally acknowledged writings. The following is a catalogue of the *Antilegomena*: *The Second Epistle of Peter; the Epistle of James; the Epistle of Jude; the Second and Third Epistles of John; the Apocalypse, or Revelation of John; the Epistle to the Hebrews*.

The earliest notice which we have of this distinction is that contained in the *Ecclesiastical History* of Eusebius, who flourished A.D. 270-340. He seems to have formed a triple, or, as it appears to some, a quadruple division of the books of the New Testament, terming them —

- 1, the *homologoumena* (received);
- 2, the *antilegomena* (controverted);

3, the *notha* (spurious); and

4, those which he calls the *utterly spurious*, as being not only spurious in the same sense as the former, but also *absurd* or *impious*.

Among the *spurious* he reckons the *Acts of Paul*, the *Shepherd of Hermas*, the *Revelation of Peter*, the *Epistle of Barnabas*, and the *Instructions of the Apostles*. He speaks doubts fully as to the class to which the Apocalypse belongs, for he himself includes it among the *spurious*: he then observes that some reject it, while others reckon it among the *acknowledged* writings (*homologoumena*). Among the *spurious* writings he also enumerates the Gospel according to the Hebrews. He adds, at the same time, that all these may be classed among the *antilegomena*. His account is consequently confused, not to say contradictory. Among the *utterly spurious* he reckons such books as the heretics brought forward under pretense of their being genuine productions of the apostles, such as the so-called *Gospels of Peter, Thomas, and Matthias*, and the *Acts of Andrew, John, and the other apostles*. These he distinguishes from the *antilegomena*, as being works which not one of the ancient ecclesiastical writers thought worthy of being cited. Their style he considers so remote from that of the apostles, and their contents so much at variance with the genuine doctrines of Scripture, as to show them to have been the inventions of heretics, and not worthy of a place even among the *spurious* writings. These latter he has consequently been supposed to have considered as the compositions of orthodox men, written with good intentions, but calculated by their: titles to mislead the ignorant, who might be disposed to account them as apostolical productions, to which honor they had not even a dubious claim. (See Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* 3, 5, 25.) The same historian has also preserved the testimony of Origen, who, in his *Commentary on John* (cited by Eusebius), observes: “Peter, upon whom the Church of Christ is built, against which the gates of hell shall not prevail, has left one epistle undisputed; it may be, also, a second, but of this there is some doubt. What shall we say of him who reclined on the breast of Jesus, John, who has left one Gospel, in which he confesses that he could write so many that the whole world could not contain them? He also wrote the Apocalypse, being commanded to conceal, and not to write, the voices of the seven thunders. He has also left us an epistle consisting of very few lines (στίχοι); it may be also a second and third are from him, but all do not concur in their genuineness; both together do not contain a hundred *st'chi*” (for the signification of this word, see *Christian*

*Remembrancer*, 3, 465 sq.). And again, in his *Homilies*, “The epistle with the title ‘*To the Hebrews*’ has not that peculiar style which belongs to an apostle who confesses that he is but *rude in speech*, that is, in his phraseology. But that this epistle is more pure Greek in the composition of its phrases, every one will confess who is able to discern the difference of style. Again, it will be obvious that the ideas of the apostle are admirable, and not inferior to any of the books acknowledged to be apostolic. Every one will confess the truth of this who attentively reads the apostle’s writings. . . . I would say, that the thoughts are the apostle’s, but that the diction and phraseology belong to some one who has recorded what the apostle has said, and as one who has noted down at his leisure what his master dictated. If, then, any Church considers this epistle as coming from Paul, let him be commended for this, for neither did these eminent men deliver it for this without cause: but who it was that really wrote the epistle God only knows. The account, however, that has been current before our time is, according to some, that Clement, who was bishop of Rome, wrote the epistle; according to others, that it was written by Luke, who wrote the *Gospel* and the *Acts*” (Euseb. *Hist. Eccles.* 6, 25).

Upon other occasions Origen expresses his doubts in regard to the *antilegomena*, as, where, in his commentary on John’s Gospel, he speaks of the reputed (φερομένη) *Epistle of James*, and in his commentary on Matthew, where he uses the phrase, “If we acknowledge the Epistle of Jude;” and of the Second and Third Epistles of John he observes, that “all do not acknowledge them as *genuine*,” by which epithet, we presume, he means written by the person to whom they are ascribed. It is remarkable that Eusebius (2, 23; 3, 25) classes the Epistle of James, the Acts of Paul, the Shepherd of Hermas, and the Epistle of Barnabas, at one time with the *spurious*, and at another with the *antilegomena*. By the word *spurious*, in this instance at least, he can mean no more than that the genuineness of such books was disputed; as, for instance, the *Gospel of the Hebrews*, which was received by the Ebionites as a genuine production of the Evangelist Matthew. This is the work of which Jerome made a transcript, as he himself informs us, from the copy preserved by the zeal of Pamphilus in the Caesarean Library. He also informs us that he translated it into Greek, and that it was considered by most persons as the original Gospel of Matthew (*Dialog. contra Pelag.* 3, 2, and *Comment. in Matthew* 12). Whether the Shepherd of Hermas was ever included among the *antilegomena* seems doubtful. Eusebius informs us that “it was disputed,

and consequently not placed among the *homologoumena*. By others, however, it is judged most necessary, especially to those who need an elementary introduction hence we know that it has been already in public use in our churches, and I have also understood, by tradition, that some of the most ancient writers have made use of it" (3, 3). Origen speaks of *The Shepherd* as "commonly used by the Church, but not received as divine by the unanimous consent of all." He therefore cites it, not as authority, but simply by way of illustration (lib. 10, in *Epist. ad Roman.*). Eusebius further informs us that in his own time there were some in the Church of Rome who did not regard the Epistle to the Hebrews as the production of the Apostle Paul (Paul 6:25; 3:3). Indeed, it was through the influence of Jerome that the Church of Rome, at a much later period, was with much difficulty brought to acknowledge it as canonical. "The most ancient Latin or Western Church did not rank it among the canonical writings, though the epistle was well known to them, for Clement of Rome has quoted from it many passages. It is true that some Latin writers in the fourth century received it, among whom was Jerome himself; yet even in the time of Jerome the Latin Church had not placed it among the canonical writings" (Marsh's *Michaelis*, 4, 266). "The reputed Epistle to the Hebrews," says Jerome, "is supposed not to be Paul's on account of the difference of style, but it is believed to have been written by Barnabas, according to Tertullian, or by Luke the Evangelist; according to others, by Clement, afterward bishop of the Roman Church, who is said to have reduced to order and embellished Paul's sentiments in his own language; or at least that Paul, in writing to the Hebrews, had purposely omitted all mention of his name, in consequence of the odium attached to it, and wrote to them eloquently in Hebrew, as a Hebrew of the Hebrews, and that what he thus eloquently wrote in Hebrew was still more eloquently written in Greek, and that this was the cause of the difference in style" (*Ex Catalog.*). And again, in his epistle to Dardanus, "I must acquaint our people that the epistle which is inscribed 'To the Hebrews' is acknowledged as the Apostle Paul's, not only by the Churches of the East, but by all the Greek ecclesiastical writers, although most [of the Latins?] conceive it to be either written by Barnabas or Clement, and that it matters nothing by whom it was written, as it proceeds from a churchman (*ecclesiastici viri*), and is celebrated by being daily read in the churches. But if *the custom of the Latins does not receive it among canonical Scriptures*, nor the Greek Churches the Apocalypse of St. John, I, notwithstanding, receive them both, not following the custom of the present age, but the authority of ancient writers; not referring to

them as they are in the habit of doing with respect to apocryphal writings, and citations from classical and profane authors, but as canonical and ecclesiastical." "Peter also," says Jerome, "wrote two epistles called Catholic; the second of which is denied by most on account of the difference of style (*Ex Catalog.*). Jude is rejected by most in consequence of the citation from the apocryphal book of Enoch. Notwithstanding, it has authority by use and antiquity, and is accounted among the Holy Scriptures" (*Ibid.*) and in his *Letter to Paulinus*: "Paul wrote to seven churches, but the Epistle to the Hebrews is by most excluded from the number;" and in his commentary on Isaiah, he observes that "the Latin usage does not receive the Epistle to the Hebrews among the canonical books." Contemporary with Jerome was his antagonist Ruffinus, who *reckons fourteen* epistles of Paul, two of Peter, one of James, three of John, and the Apocalypse.

It seems doubtful whether, antecedent to the times of Jerome and Ruffinus, any councils, even of single churches, had settled upon the canon of Scripture, and decided the question respecting the antilegomena, for the removal of doubts among their respective communities; for it seems evident that the general or oecumenical council of Nice, which met in the year 325, formed no catalogue. The first catalogue, indeed, which has come down to us is that of an anonymous writer of the third century. He reckons thirteen epistles of Paul, accounts the Epistle to the Hebrews the work of an Alexandrian Marcionite, mentions the Epistle of Jude, two of John, and the revelations of John and Peter, saying, with respect to them, that "some among us are opposed to their being read in the church" (see Hug's *Introduction*, § 14). But soon after the council of Nice public opinion turned gradually in favor of the antilegomena, or controverted books; for we then find them for the first time cited without any marks of doubt as to their canonicity. Thus, in the year 348, Cyril of Jerusalem enumerates fourteen epistles of Paul and seven Catholic epistles. Gregory of Nazianzus, who, according to Cave (*Historia Literaria*), was born about the time of the Nicene Council, and died in 389, enumerates all the books now received except the Apocalypse. Epiphanius, who was chosen bishop of Constantia in A.D. 367 or 368, and composed his catalogue of ecclesiastical writers in 392, cites, in his *Panarium*, the different books of the New Testament in a manner which shows that he received all that are in the present canon. Of the Apocalypse he says that it was "generally or by most received;" and, speaking of the Alogians, who rejected all John's

writings, he observes, "If they had rejected the Apocalypse only, it might have been supposed that they had acted from a nice critical judgment, as being circumspect in regard to an apocryphal or mysterious book; but to reject all John's writings was a sign of an anti-Christian spirit."

Amphilochius also, bishop of Iconium, in Lycaonia, who was contemporary with Epiphanius, and is supposed to have died soon after the year 394, after citing the fourteen epistles of Paul, in his *Iambics*, adds, "But some say the Epistle to the Hebrews is spurious, not speaking correctly, for it is a genuine gift. Then the Catholic epistles, of which some receive seven, others only three, one of James, one of Peter, one of John; while others receive three of John, two of Peter, and Jude's. The Revelation of John is approved by some, while many say it is spurious." The eighty-fifth of the *Apostolical Canons*, a work falsely ascribed to Clement of Rome, but written at latest in the fourth century, enumerates *fourteen* epistles of Paul, *one* of Peter, *three* of John, one of *James*, one of Jude, two of Clement, and the (so-called) *Apostolical Constitutions*, among the canonical books of Scripture. This latter book, adds the pseudo-Clement, it is not fit to publish before all, "because of the mysteries contained in it." The first council that is supposed to have given a list of the canonical books is the much agitated council of Laodicea, supposed to have been held about the year 360 or 364 by thirty or forty bishops of Lydia and the neighboring parts; but the fifty-ninth article, which gives a catalogue of the canonical books, is not generally held to be genuine. Its genuineness, indeed, has been questioned by both Roman Catholic and Protestant historians. In his *Introduction* to the Old Testament Jahn refers to this canon as the work of "an anonymous framer." Among the canonical books included in the pretended fifty-ninth canon of this council are the seven Catholic epistles, viz., one of James, two of Peter, three of John, one of Jude; fourteen of Paul, in the following order, viz., Romans, 1 and 2 Corinthians, Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, and 2 Thessalonians, Hebrews, 1 and 2 Timothy, Titus, and Philemon. The Apocalypse is not named. Jerome and Augustine, whose opinions had great influence in settling the canon of Scripture, essentially agreed in regard to the books of the New Testament. St. Augustine was present in the year 393 at the council of Hippo, which drew up a catalogue of all the books of Scripture, agreeing in all points, so far as the New Testament was concerned, with the canon universally received, with the exception, perhaps, of the Hebrews, for the ancient doubt still appears through the wording of the acts of this council. They commence with enumerating only



*thirteen* epistles of Paul, and then add one, by the same author, to the Hebrews." They then mention *two* of Peter, three of John, one of James, and the Apocalypse, with a proviso that the churches beyond the sea be consulted with respect to this canon. And to the same effect the council of Carthage, held in the year 397, having adopted the same catalogue, the bishops assembled in council add, "But let this be known to our brother and fellow-priest (consacerdoti) Boniface [bishop of Rome], or to the other bishops of those parts, that we have received those [books] from the fathers to be read in the church." The same catalogue is repeated in the epistle of Innocent I, bishop of Rome, to St. Exupere, bishop of Toulouse, in the year 404, which, by those who acknowledge its genuineness, is looked upon as a confirmation of the decrees of Hippo and Carthage. It was still more formally confirmed in the Roman synod presided over by Pope Gelasius in 494, "if, indeed," to use the words of the learned Roman Catholic Jahn, "*the acts of this synod are genuine*" (see his *Introduction*). But, however this may be, the controversy had now nearly subsided, and the antilegomena were henceforward put on a par with the acknowledged books, and took their place beside them in all copies of the Scriptures. Indeed, subsequently to the eras of the councils of Hippo and Carthage, we hear but a solitary voice raised here and there against the genuineness of the *antilegomena*. Theodore; bishop of Mopsuestia, for instance, the celebrated Syrian commentator and preacher, who died about A.D. 428, is accused by Leo of Byzantium of having "abrogated and antiquated the Epistle of James, and afterward other Catholic epistles" (see Canisii *Thesaurus*, 1, 577). And Cosmas Indicopleustes, so called from the voyage which he made to India about the year 535 to 547, in his *Christian Topography*, has the following observations in reference to the authority of these books: "I forbear to allege arguments from the Catholic epistles, because from ancient times the Church has looked upon them as of doubtful authority. . . . Eusebius Pamphilus, in his *Ecclesiastical History*, says that at Ephesus there are two monuments, one of John the Evangelist, and another of John, an elder, who wrote two of the Catholic epistles, the second and third inscribed after this manner, 'The elder to the elect lady,' and 'The elder to the beloved Gaius,' and both he and Irenaeus say that but two are written by the apostles, the first of Peter, and the first of John . . . . Among the Syrians are found only the three before mentioned, viz., the Epistle of James, the Epistle of Peter, and the Epistle of John; they have not the rest. It does not become a perfect Christian to confirm any thing by doubtful books, when the books in the Testament acknowledged by all

(*homologoumena*) have sufficiently declared all things to be known about the heavens, and the earth, and the elements, and all Christian doctrine.”

The most ancient Greek manuscripts which have come down to our times contain the *Antilegomena*. From this circumstance it is extremely probable that the copies from which they were transcribed were written after the controversies respecting their canonicity had subsided. The Alexandrian manuscript in the British Museum (now generally admitted to have been written in the fourth or early in the fifth century) contains all the books now commonly received, together with some others, with a table of contents, in which they are cited in the following order: “Seven Catholic epistles, fourteen of Paul, the Revelation of John, the First Epistle of Clement, the Second Epistle of Clement, and the Psalms of Solomon (which latter have, however, been lost from the MS.)” (It is observable that Eusebius classes the First Epistle of Clement among the *Homologoumena*, or universally received books; but by this he probably meant no more than that it was acknowledged by all to be the genuine work of Clement.) The order of all the epistles is the same as in our modern Bibles, except that the Epistle to the Hebrews is placed after the Second Epistle to the Thessalonians. In the Vatican manuscript B, which, in respect of antiquity, disputes the precedence with the Alexandrian, the Apocalypse is wanting, but it contains the remaining *antilegomena*. (The omission of this last book may be owing simply to the loss of the last part of the codex, in consequence of which the concluding chapters of the Hebrews, and the whole of 1 and 2 Timothy, Titus, and Philemon are likewise missing.) The Syrian canon of the New Testament did not include all the *antilegomena*. All the manuscripts of the Syrian version (the Peshito, a work of the second century) which have come down to us omit the Second Epistle of Peter, the Second and Third of John, that of Jude, and the Apocalypse. Nor are these books received to this day either by the Jacobite or Nestorian Christians. These are all wanting in the Vatican and Medicean copies, written in the years 548 and 586, and in the beautiful manuscript of the Peshito, preserved in the British Museum, and the writing of which was concluded at the monastery of Bethkoki, A.D. 768, on 197 leaves of vellum, in the Estrangelo character.

In the inquiring age immediately preceding the Reformation the controversy respecting the *antilegomena* was revived, especially by Erasmus and Cardinal Cajetan; by the latter, however, upon principles so questionable as to expose him to the charge of assailing the authority of the

Epistle to the Hebrews with the same weapons which the Emperor Julian had employed to impugn the authority of Matthew's Gospel. The doubts thus raised were in a great measure silenced by the decree of the council of Trent, although there have not been wanting learned Roman Catholic divines since this period who have ventured to question at least the Pauline authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews. It is well known that Luther, influenced in this instance not so much by historicocritical as by dogmatical views, called the Epistle of James "an epistle of straw" (*epistola straminea*). He also wished the *antilegomena* to be distinguished from the other books in his translation of the Bible. In consequence of this, the Epistle to the Hebrews, the Epistles of James and Jude, and the Apocalypse have no numbers attached to them in the German copies of the Bible up to the middle of the seventeenth century; and it is observed by Tholuck (*Commentary on Hebrews*, in *Biblical Cabinet*) that "the same plan should have been adopted with respect to second Peter and second and third John, but it did not seem proper to detach them from the *Homologoumena* which belonged to them. Thus he wished at the same time to point out what were the "right noble chief books of Scripture." We are informed by Father Paul Sarpi (*Hist. of the Council of Trent*, bk. 2, ch. 43, t. 1, p. 235; and ch. 476, p. 240) that one of the charges collected from the writings of Luther in this council was "that no books should be admitted into the canon of the Old Testament which were not in the canon of the Jews, and that from the New should be excluded the Epistle to the Hebrews, the Epistle of James, the Second Epistle of Peter, the Second and Third of John, and the Apocalypse." Tholuck states that the "Evangelical Churches, both Lutheran and Reformed, adopted the same canon with respect to the New Testament as that of the council of Trent" (*Comment. on Heb.* vol. 1, Introd., ch. 1, § 3, note b). Some, or all, of the *antilegomena* have been again impugned in recent times, especially in Germany. See each in its place. **SEE CANON** ((of Scripture).

### Antilib'anus

(Ἀντιλίβανος, *opposite Libanus*, Judith 1:7), the eastern of the two great parallel ridges of mountains that enclose the valley of Coele-Syria proper (Strabo, 16:754; .Ptol. 5,15, § 8; Pliny, 5,20). It is now called *Jebel esh-Shurki*. The Hebrew name of Lebanon (Sept. Λίβανος, Vulg. *Libanus*), which signifies "whitish," from the gray color of the limestone, comprehends the two ridges of Libanus and Antilibanus, as they are distinguished in classical usage. The general direction of the Antilebanon

range is from north-east to south-west. Nearly opposite Damascus it bifurcates into diverging ridges; the easternmost of these, the HERMON *SEE HERMON* of the O.T. (*Jebel esh-Sheikh*), continues its south-west course, and attains, in its greatest elevation, a point about 10,000 feet above the sea. The other ridge takes a more westerly course, is long and low, and at length unites with the other bluffs and spurs of Libanus. The former of these branches was called by the Sidonians *Sirien*, and by the Amorites *Shenir* (<sup><BRB></sup>Deuteronomy 3:9), both names signifying “a coat of mail” (Rosenmuller, *Alterth.* 2, 235). In <sup><R4D></sup>Deuteronomy 4:9 it is called Mount *Sion*, “an elevation.” In the later books (<sup><204B></sup>Song of Solomon 4:8; <sup><BRB></sup>1 Chronicles 5:23) *Shenir* is distinguished from Hermon properly so called; and in its Arabic form, *Sunir*, this was applied, in the Middle Ages, to Antilibanus, north of Hermon (Abulfeda, *Tab. Syr.* p. 164). The geological formations seem to belong to the Upper Jura classification of rocks, oolite and Jura dolomite prevailing. The poplar is characteristic of its vegetation. The outlying promontories, in common with those of Libanus, supplied the Phoenicians with abundance of timber for ship-building. — Grote, *Hist. of Greece*, 3, 358; Ritter, *Erdkunde*, XV, 2, 156 sq., 495; Raumer, *Palest.* p. 29-35; Burckhardt, *Syria*; Robinson, *Researches*, 3, 344, 345. *SEE LEBANON*.

### Antimensium

(from *ἀντί*, *instead of*, and *nmensa*, *a table*), a consecrated table-cloth, occasionally used in the Greek Church in places where there was no altar. It answers to the Latin *altare portabile*, or portable altar. The origin of this cloth is said to be the following: When the bishop consecrated a church, a cloth, which had been spread on the ground and over the communion-table, was torn in pieces and distributed among the priests, who carried away each a fragment to serve to cover the tables in their churches and chapels; not that it was necessary such cloths should be laid on all tables, but only on those which either were not consecrated or whose consecration was doubtful.

### Anti-mission Baptists

*SEE BAPTISTS*.

## Antinomians

(from *ἀντί*, *against*, and *νόμος*, the *law*), those who reject the moral law as not binding upon Christians. Some go farther than this, and say that good works hinder salvation, and that a child of God cannot sin; that the moral law is altogether abrogated as a rule of life; that no Christian believeth or worketh any good, but that Christ only believeth and worketh, etc. Wesley defines Antinomianism as “the doctrine which makes void the law through faith.” Its root lies in a false view of the atonement; its view of the imputation of Christ’s righteousness implies that he performs for men the obedience which they ought to perform, and therefore that God, in justice, can demand nothing further from man. As consequences of this doctrine, Antinomianism affirms that Christ abolished the moral law; that Christians are therefore not obliged to observe it; that a believer is not obliged to use the ordinances, and is freed from “the bondage of good works;” and that preachers ought not to exhort men unto good works: not unbelievers, because it is hurtful; not believers, because it is needless (Wesley, *Works*, 5,196).

1. Antinomianism, i.e. faith without works, is one of the forms of error against which the Epistle of James is directed, showing that even in the apostolic age it had made its appearance. So the tract of Augustine (*contra adversairium legis et prophetarum*) indicates the existence of such opinions in the fourth century.
2. But the full development of Antinomianism is due to John Agricola († 1566), one of the early coadjutors of Luther. *SEE AGRICOLA*. Some of the expressions of Luther and Melancthon, as to justification and the law, in the ardor of their controversy with Rome, were hasty and extravagant: e.g. Luther declared that “in the new covenant there is no longer a constraining and forcing law; and that those who must be scared and driven by laws are unworthy the name of Christians” (Luther, *Werke*, Walch’s ed. 18, 1855). So, in his writings against the Zwickau enthusiasts, he was hasty enough to say, “These teachers of sin annoy us with Moses; we do not wish to see or hear Moses; for Moses was given to the Jews, not to us Gentiles and Christians; we have our Gospel and New Testament; they wish to make Jews of us through Moses; but they shall not” (*Werke*, 20, 203). Melancthon (*Loci Communes*, 1st ed. by Augusti, p. 127) declares that “it must be admitted that the Decalogue is abrogated.” But these unguarded expressions did not set forth the real views of Luther and

Melancthon. So, in the “Instructions to the Pastors of the Saxon Electorate” (1527), it was enjoined that “all pastors must teach and enforce diligently the ten commandments, and not only the commandments themselves, but also the penalties which God has affixed to the violation of them.” Agricola saw in these instructions what he thought was a backsliding from the true doctrine of justification by faith only, and charred Luther and Melancthon bitterly with dereliction in faith and doctrine. He affirmed that the Decalogue is *not* binding on Christians, and that true repentance comes, not from preaching the law, but by faith. Luther confuted Agricola, who professed to retract at Torgau (1527); but Melancthon remarked that “Agricola was not convinced, but overborne” (*Corpus Refornatorum*, 1, 914). Accordingly, in 1537, when Agricola was established at Wittenberg, he wrote a number of propositions, published anonymously, under the title *Positiones inter fratres sparce*, on the nature of repentance and its relations to faith, in which his heresy was taught again, even in language so extreme as the following: “Art thou steeped in sin — an adulterer or a thief? If thou believest, thou art in salvation. All who follow Moses must go to the Devil; to the gallows with Moses.” After a while Agricola confessed the authorship of these theses; and Luther replied in a series of disputations (*Werke*, Walch, 20, 2034; ed. Altenb. 7:310 sq.), in which he refuted the doctrines of Agricola, but dealt gently with him personally. Finding mildness of no avail, Luther attacked Agricola violently in 1539 and 1540, classing him with the Anabaptist fanatics, and calling him very hard names. About this time Agricola had a call to Berlin, retracted again, and was reconciled to Luther (Dec. 9, 1540). He continued, however, to be violently attacked by Flacius. After the death of Agricola, Antinomian opinions were in particular advocated in Germany by Amsdorf (q.v.), who maintained that good works are an obstacle to salvation, and by Otto of Nordhausen, who repeated the opinions of Agricola. In the *Formula Concordice* (pt. 2, cap. 5, § 11) we find the following condemnation of these heresies: “*Et juste datnantur Antinomi adversarii legis, qui pcedicationem legis ex ecclesiae explodunt et affrmannt, non ex lege, sed ex solo Evangelio peccata arguenda et contritionem docendam esse.*”

**3.** Similar sentiments were maintained in England during the protectorate of Oliver Cromwell, especially by his chaplain Saltmarsh, and some of the so-called “sectaries,” who expressly maintained that, as the elect cannot fall from grace nor forfeit the divine favor, the wicked actions they commit are

not really sinful, nor to be considered as instances of their violation of the divine law; and that, consequently, they have no occasion either to confess their sins or to break them off by repentance.

**4.** Antinomianism arose also, in the 17th century, from ultra-Calvinism, especially as taught by Dr. Crisp (1, 1642). It is true he acknowledges that, “In respect of the rules of righteousness, or the matter of obedience, we are under the law still, or else,” as he adds, “we are lawless, to live every man as seems good in his own eyes, which no true Christian dares so much as think of.” The following sentiments, however, among others, are taught in his sermons: “The law is cruel and tyrannical, requiring what is naturally impossible.” “The sins of the elect were so imputed to Christ, as that, though he did not commit them, yet they became actually his transgressions, and ceased to be theirs.” “The feelings of conscience, which tell them that sin is theirs, arise from a want of knowing the truth.” “It is but the voice of a lying spirit in the hearts of believers that saith they have yet sin wasting their consciences, and lying as a burden too heavy for them to bear.” “Christ’s righteousness is so imputed to the elect, that they, ceasing to be sinners, are as righteous as he was, and all that he was.” “An elect person is not in a condemned state while an unbeliever; and should he happen to die before God calls him to believe, he would not be lost.” “Repentance and confession of sin are not necessary to forgiveness. A believer may certainly conclude before confession, yea, as soon as he hath committed sin, the interest he hath in Christ, and the love of Christ embracing him” (Crisp, *Works*, 2, 261-272; Orme, *Life of Baxter*, 2, 232).

This form of High Calvinism, or Antinomianism, absolutely “withers and destroys the consciousness of human responsibility. It confounds moral with natural impotency, forgetting that the former is a crime, the latter only a misfortune; and thus treats the man dead in trespasses and sins as if he were already in his grave. It prophesies smooth things to the sinner going on in his transgressions, and soothes to slumber and the repose of death the souls of such as are at ease in Zion. It assumes that, because men can neither believe, repent, nor pray acceptably, unless aided by the grace of God, it is useless to call upon them to do so. It maintains that the Gospel is only intended for elect sinners, and therefore it ought to be preached to none but such. In defiance, therefore, of the command of God, it refuses to preach the glad tidings of mercy to every sinner. In opposition to Scripture, and to every rational consideration, it contends that it is not man’s duty to believe the truth of God — justifying the obvious inference that it is not a

sin to reject it. In short, its whole tendency is to produce an impression on the sinner's mind that, if he is not saved, it is not his fault, but God's; that, if he is condemned, it is more for the glory of the Divine Sovereignty than as the punishment of his guilt. So far from regarding the moral cure of human nature as the great object and design of the Gospel, Antinomianism does not take it in at all, but as it exists in Christ, and becomes ours by a figure of speech. It regards the grace and the pardon as every thing, the spiritual design or effect as nothing. Hence its opposition to progressive, and its zeal for imputed sanctification: the former is intelligible and tangible, but the latter a mere figment of the imagination. Hence its delight in expatiating on the eternity of the Divine decrees, which it does not understand, but which serve to amuse and to deceive, and its dislike to all the sober realities of God's present dealings and commands. It exults in the contemplation of a Christ who is a kind of concretion of all the moral attributes of his people; to the overlooking of that Christ who is the Head of all that in heaven and on earth bear his likeness, and while unconscious of possessing it. It boasts in the doctrine of the perseverance of the saints, while it believes in no saint but one, that is Jesus, and neglects to persevere" (Orme's *Life of Baxter*, 2, 243).

The chief English writers of the 17th century who have been charged as favoring Antinomianism, besides Crisp, are Richardson, Saltmarsh, Hussey, Eaton, Town, etc.' These were answered by Gataker, Witsius, Bull, Ridgely, and especially by Baxter and Williams. For Baxter's relation to the controversy, see Orme, *Life of Baxter*, vol. 2, chap. 9, where it is stated that "Baxter saw only the commencement of the controversy, which agitated the Dissenters for more than seven years after he had gone to his rest († 1691). He was succeeded by his friend Dr. Williams († 1716), who, after incredible exertion and no small suffering, finally cleared the ground of the Antinomians."

In the eighteenth century Antinomianism again showed itself, both in the Church of England and among the Dissenters, as an offshoot of what was called High Calvinism. Its most powerful opponents were John Fletcher, in his *Checks to Antinomianism* (Works, N. Y. ed. 4 vols. 8vo) and John Wesley, *Works* (N. Y. ed. 7 vols. 8vo). The error of Antinomianism lies chiefly in the sharp contrast which it draws between the law and the Gospel. Wesley saw this, and dwells, in many parts of his writings, on the relation and connection of law and Gospel. We give an instance: "There is no contrariety at all between the law and the Gospel. Indeed, neither of



them supersedes the other, but they agree perfectly well together. Yea, the very same words, considered in different respects, are parts both of the law and of the Gospel. If they are considered as commandments, they are parts of the law; if as promises, of the Gospel. Thus, 'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart,' when considered as a commandment, is a branch of the law; when regarded as a promise, is an essential part of the Gospel-the Gospel being no other than the commands of the law proposed by way of promise. There is, therefore, the closest connection that can be conceived between the law and the Gospel. On the one hand, the law continually makes way for, and points us to the Gospel; on the other, the Gospel continually leads us to a more exact fulfilling of the law. The law, for instance, requires us to love God, to love our neighbor, to be meek, humble, or holy. We feel that we are not sufficient for these things; yea, that 'with man this is impossible.' But we see a promise of God to give us that love. We lay hold of this Gospel, of these glad tidings; it is done unto us according to our faith; and 'the righteousness of the law is fulfilled in us' through faith which is in Christ Jesus. The moral law, contained in the Ten Commandments, and enforced by the prophets, Christ did not take away. It was not the design of his coming to revoke any part of this. This is a law which never can be broken, which 'stands fast as the faithful witness in heaven.' The moral stands on an entirely different foundation from the ceremonial or ritual law, which was only designed for a temporary restraint upon a disobedient and stiffnecked people; whereas this was from the beginning of the world, being written, not in tables of stone, but on the hearts of all men" (*Sermons*, 1, 17, and 223). The heresy showed itself at a later period, especially through the influence of Dr. Robert Hawker (q.v.), vicar of Charles the Martyr, Plymouth, who was a very popular preacher, and "poisoned the surrounding region" with Antinomian tendencies. Against him, Joseph Cottle wrote *Strictures on the Plymouth Antinomians*, and Burt, *Observations on Hawker's System of Theology*. See Robert Hall, *Works* (N. Y. 2:458); Bennett, *History of the Dissenters*, p. 344. A full account of the Antinomians of the Crispian type, and of the controversy about it, is given in Nelson, *Life of Bishop Bull* (vol. 7 of Bull's Works, ed. of 1827). On the English Antinomianism, see further, Gataker, *God's Eye on Israel* (Lond. 1645, 4to); *Antidote against Error* (London, 1670, 4to); Williams (Daniel), *Works*, vol. 2 (1738-50); Witsius, *Animadversions Irenicæ* (Miscell. ed. 1736, 2:591 sq.); Wesley, *Works*, 1, 225; 5, 196; 6, 68 et al.; Neal, *History of the Puritans*, 4; Fletcher, *Works* (4 vols. N. Y.); Andrew Fuller, *Gospel worthy of all Acceptation; Antinomianism*

contrasted with Scripture (*Works*, edition of 1853); Watson, *Theol. Institutes*, 2, 140. On Agricola and the German Antinomianism, consult Nitzsch, *De Antinomismo Agricole* (Wurtemb. 1804); Elwert, *De Antinomia Agricolke* (Tur. 1836); Nitzsch, in *Studien u. Kri.* 1846, pt. 1 and 2; also Schulze, *Hist. Antinomorumn seculo Lutheri* (Vitemb. 1708); Wewetzer, *De Antinomismo Agricolke* (Strals. 1829); Murdoch's Mosheim, *Ch. Hist.* c. 16, pt. 2, ch. 1, § 25; Herzog, *Real-Encyklopadie*, 1, 375, sq. **SEE ANTONIANS.**

## An'tioch

### Picture for An'tioch 1

(Ἀντιόχεια, from *Antiohus*), the name of two places mentioned in the New Testament.

**1. ANTIOCH IN SYRIA.** — A city on the banks of the Orontes, 300 miles north of Jerusalem, and about 30 from the Mediterranean. This metropolis was situated where the chain of Lebanon, running northward, and the chain of Taurus, running eastward, are brought to an abrupt meeting. Here the Orontes breaks through the mountains; and Antioch was placed at a bend of the river, partly on an island, partly on the level which forms the left bank, and partly on the steep and craggy ascent of Mount Silpius, which rose abruptly on the south. It was in the province of Seleucis, called Tetrapolis, from containing the four cities Antioch, Seleucia, Apamea, and Laodicea; of which the first was named after Antiochus, the father of the founder; the second after himself; the third after his wife Apama; and the fourth in honor of his mother. The same appellation (*Tetrapolis*, Τετράπολις) was given also to Antioch, because it consisted of four townships or quarters, each surrounded by a separate wall, and all four by a common wall. The first was built by Seleucus Nicator, who peopled it with inhabitants from Antigonian; the second by the settlers belonging to the first quarter; the third by Seleucus Callinicus; and the fourth by Antiochus Epiphanes (Strabo, 16:2; 3:354). It was the metropolis of Syria (Tac. *Hist.* 2, 79), the residence of the Syrian kings, the Seleucidae (1 Maccabees 3:37; 7:2), and afterward became the capital of the Roman provinces in Asia. It ranked third, after Rome and Alexandria, among the cities of the empire (Josephus, *War*, 3, 2, 4), and was little inferior in size and splendor to the latter or to Seleucia (Strabo, 16:2; 3:355, ed. Tauch.). Its suburb Daphne was celebrated for its grove and fountains (Strabo, 16:2; 3:356,

ed. Tauch.), its asylum (2 Maccabees 4:33), and temple dedicated to Apollo and Diana. The temple and the village were deeply bosomed in a thick grove of laurels and cypresses which reached as far as a circumference of ten miles, and formed in the most sultry summers a cool and impenetrable shade. A thousand streams of the purest water, issuing from every hill, preserved the verdure of the earth and the temperature of the air (Gibbon, ch. 23). Hence Antioch was called *Epidaphnes* (Ἀντιόχεια ἡ ἐπὶ Δάφνη, Josephus, *Ant.* 17, 2, 1; *Epidaphnes cognominata*, Plin. *Hist. Nat.* 5, 18). It was very populous; within 150 years after its erection the Jews slew 100,000 persons in it in one day (1 Maccabees 11:47). In the time of Chrysostom the population was computed at 200,000, of whom one half, or even a greater proportion, were professors of Christianity (Chrysos. *Adv. Jud.* 1, 588; *Hom. in Ignat.* 2, 597; *In Matthew Hom.* 85, 7:810). Chrysostom also states that the Church at Antioch maintained 3000 poor, besides occasionally relieving many more (*In Matthew Hom.* 7, 658). Cicero speaks of the city as distinguished by men of learning and the cultivation of the arts (*Pro Archia*, 3). A multitude of Jews resided in it. Seleucus Nicator granted them the rights of citizenship, and placed them on a perfect equality with the other inhabitants (Josephus, *Ant.* 12, 3, 1). These privileges were continued to them by Vespasian and Titus — an instance (Josephus remarks) of the equity and generosity of the Romans, who, in opposition to the wishes of the Alexandrians and Antiocheans, protected the Jews, notwithstanding the provocations they had received from them in their wars (*Apion*, 2, 4). They were also allowed to have an archon or ethnarch of their own (Josephus, *War*, 7, 3, 3). Antioch is called *libera* by Pliny (*Hist. Nat.* 5, 18), having obtained from Pompey the privilege of being governed by its own laws (see Smith, *Dict. of Class. Geogr.* s.v.).

The Christian faith was introduced at an early period into Antioch, and with great success (<sup><4119></sup>Acts 11:19, 21,24). The name “Christians” was here first applied to its professors (<sup><4125></sup>Acts 11:26). No city, after Jerusalem, is so intimately connected with the history of the apostolic Church. One of the seven deacons or almoners appointed at Jerusalem was Nicolas, a proselyte of Antioch (<sup><4165></sup>Acts 6:5). The Christians who were dispersed from Jerusalem at the death of Stephen preached the Gospel at Antioch (<sup><4119></sup>Acts 11:19). It was from Jerusalem that Agabus and the other prophets who foretold the famine came to Antioch (<sup><4127></sup>Acts 11:27, 28); and Barnabas and Saul were consequently sent on a mission of charity from

the latter city to the former (<sup><411D></sup>Acts 11:30; 12:25). It was from Jerusalem, again, that the Judaizers came who disturbed the Church at Antioch (<sup><415D></sup>Acts 15:1); and it was at Antioch that Paul rebuked Peter for conduct into which he had been betrayed through the influence of emissaries from Jerusalem (<sup><421D></sup>Galatians 2:11, 12). Antioch soon became a central point for the diffusion of Christianity among the Gentiles, and maintained for several centuries a high rank in the Christian world (see Semler, *Initia societatis Christ. Antiochiae*, Hal. 1767). A controversy which arose between certain Jewish believers from Jerusalem and the Gentile converts at Antioch respecting the permanent obligation of the rite of circumcision was the occasion of the first apostolic council or convention (<sup><415D></sup>Acts 15:1). Antioch was the scene of the early labors of the Apostle Paul, and the place whence he set forth on his first missionary labors (<sup><411D></sup>Acts 11:26; 13:2). Ignatius was the second bishop or overseer of the Church, for about forty years, till his martyrdom in A.D. 107. In the third and following centuries a number of councils were held at Antioch, **SEE ANTIOCH, COUNCILS OF**, and in the course of the fourth century a new theological school was formed there, which thence derived the name School of Antioch. **SEE ANTIOCH, SCHOOL OF**. Two of its most distinguished teachers were the presbyters Dorotheus and Lucian, the latter of whom suffered martyrdom in the Diocletian persecution, A.D. 312 (Neander, *Ahegemeine Geschichte*, 1, 3, p. 1237; Gieseler, *Lerbuch*, i. 272; Lardner, *Credibility*, pt. 2, ch.55, 58). Libanius (born A.D. 314), the rhetorician, the friend and panegyrist of the Emperor Julian, was a native of Antioch (Lardner, *Testimonies of Ancient Heathens*, ch. 49; Gibbon, *Decline and Fall*, etc. ch. 24). It had likewise the less equivocal honor of being the birthplace of his illustrious pupil, John Chrysostom, born A. D. 347, died A.D. 407 (Lardner, *Credibility*, pt. 2, ch. 118; Neander, *Allgemeine Geschichte*, 2, 3, p. 1440-1456, Hug, *Antiochia*, Berl. 1863). On the further history of the Church of Antioch, see **ANTIOCH, PATRIARCHATE OF**.

## Picture for An'tioch 2

Antioch was founded, B.C. 300, by Seleucus Nicator, with circumstances of considerable display, which were afterward embellished by fable. The situation was well chosen, both for military and commercial purposes. Antioch grew under the successive Seleucid kings till it became a city of great extent and of remarkable beauty. Some of the most magnificent buildings were on the island. One feature, which seems to have been characteristic of the great Syrian cities — a vast street with colonnades,

intersecting the whole from end to end — was added by Antiochus Epiphanes. Some lively notices of the Antioch of this period, and of its relation to Jewish history, are supplied by the books of Maccabees (see especially 1 Maccabees 3:37; 11:13; 2 Maccabees 4:7-9; 5:21; 11:36). The early emperors raised there some large and important structures, such as aqueducts, amphitheatres, and baths. Herod the Great contributed a road and a colonnade (Josephus, *Ant.* 16, 5, 3; *War.* 1, 21, 11). In A.D. 260 Sapor, the Persian king, surprised and pillaged it, and multitudes of the inhabitants were slain or sold as slaves. It has been frequently brought to the verge of utter ruin by earthquakes (A.D. 340, 394, 396, 458, 526, 528); by that of A.D. 526 no less than 250,000 persons were destroyed, the population being swelled by an influx of strangers to the festival of the Ascension. The Emperor Justinian gave forty-five centenaries of gold (\$900,000) to restore the city. Scarcely had it resumed its ancient splendor (A.D. 540) when it was again taken and delivered to the flames by Chosroes. In A.D. 658 it was captured by the Saracens. Its “safety was ransomed with 300,000 pieces of gold, but the throne of the successors of Alexander, the seat of the Roman government in the East, which had been decorated by Caesar with the titles of free, and holy, and inviolate, was degraded under the yoke of the caliphs to the secondary rank of a provincial town” (Gibbon, 51). In A.D. 975 it was retaken by Nicephoras Phocas. In A.D. 1080 the son of the governor Philaretus betrayed it into the hands of Soliman. Seventeen years after the Duke of Normandy entered it at the head of 300,000 crusaders; but, as the citadel still held out, the victors were in their turn besieged by a fresh host under Kerboga and twenty-eight emirs, which at last gave way to their desperate valor (Gibbon, 58). In A.D. 1268 Antioch was occupied and ruined by Boadoebar or Bibars, sultan of Egypt and Syria; this first seat of the Christian name being depopulated by the slaughter of 17,000 persons, and the captivity of 100,000. About the middle of the fifteenth century the three patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem convoked a synod, and renounced all connection with the Latin Church (see Cellar. *Notit.* 2, 417 sq.; Richter, *Wallfahrt*, p. 281; Mannert, VI, 1, 467 sq.).

### Picture for An'tioch 3

Antioch at present belongs to the pashalic of Haleb (Aleppo), and bears the name of *Antakia* (Pococke, 2 - 277 sq.; Niebuhr, 3, 15 sq.). The inhabitants are said to have amounted to twenty thousand before the earthquake of 1822, which destroyed four or five thousand. On the south-west side of the

town is a precipitous mountain ridge, on which a considerable portion of the old Roman wall of Antioch is still standing, from 30 to 50 feet high and 15 feet in thickness. At short intervals 400 high square towers are built up in it, containing a staircase and two or three chambers, probably for the use of the soldiers on duty. At the east end of the western hill are the remains of a fortress, with its turrets, vaults, and cisterns. Toward the mountain south-southwest of the city some fragments of the aqueducts remain. After heavy rains antique marble pavements are visible in many parts of the town; and gems, carnelians, and rings are frequently found. The present town stands on scarcely one third of the area enclosed by the ancient wall, of which the line may be easily traced; the entrance to the town from Aleppo is by one of the old gates, called Bab Bablous, or Paul's gate, not far from which the members of the Greek Church assemble for their devotions in a cavern dedicated to St. John (Madox's *Excursions*, 2, 74; Buckingham, 2:475; Monro's *Summer Ramble*, 2, 140-143; Conybeare and Howson's *Life and Epistles of St. Paul*, 1, 121-126). The great authority for all that is known of ancient Antioch is Muller's *Antiquitates Antiochenoe* (Gott. 1839). Modern *Antakia* is a shrunken and miserable place. Some of the walls, shattered by earthquakes, are described in Chesney's account of the *Euphrates Expedition* (1, 310 sq.; comp. the history, *ib.* 2, 423 sq.), where also is given a view of the gateway which still bears the name of St. Paul.

### Antioch, Councils Of

Among the more important of the councils held at Antioch are the following:

In 252, by the patriarch Fabius, or Fabianus, or his successor, Demetrius, concerning the Novatian heresy (Labbe, 1:719). In 264, against Paul of Samosata (*ibid.* p. 843). In 269, when Paul was deposed and anathematized (*ibid.* p. 893). In 330, against the patriarch Eustathius, who was falsely accused of Sabellianism and adultery, and deposed. In 341 (*Conc. in Enoeniis*), on occasion of the dedication of the great church of Antioch; ninety-seven bishops were present, of whom forty at least were Arians. This synod was probably orthodox in its commencement, but degenerated into a pseudo-synod, in which, after the departure of the orthodox majority, the remaining Arians condemned Athanasius; and, in all probability, the "Three Chapters", *SEE CHAPTERS*, were then composed. In 344, by the Arian bishops, in which the μαρκόστιχος, or long confession of faith, was drawn up. In 354, by thirty Arian bishops, who

again condemned Athanasius, because he had returned to his see without being first synodically declared innocent (*Soz.* lib. 4, cap. 8). In 358, at which Homousianism and Homoiousianism were both condemned. In 363, in which Acacius of Caesarea and other Arians admitted the Nicene faith (*ibid.* 2, 825). In 367, in which the word “consubstantial” was rejected (*ibid.*). In 380, in which Meletius, at the head of one hundred and forty-five bishops, confirmed the faith of the council of Rome in 378 (*Vales. ad Theod.* lib. 5, cap. 3). In 433, in which John of Antioch and Cyril were reconciled (Labbe, 3, 1265). In 435, in which the memory of Theodorus of Mopsuestia was defended and Proclus’s work on him approved. In 440, against Theodorus of Mopsuestia. In 451, on the conversion of the Eutychians (Labbe, 4). In 560, in defense of the council of Chalcedon. In 781, for the worship of images, under Theodorus. In 1806 the bishops of the united Greek Church held, under the presidency of the papal patriarch, a synod, known under the name synod of Antioch, in the convent of Carrapha, in the diocese of Beyrft, and endorsed the Gallican and and-papal resolutions of the synod of Pistoja (q.v.). Nevertheless their proceedings received the approbation of the papal delegate, and were published, with his approbation, in 1810, in the Arabic language. But in 1834 Pope Gregory XVI ordered the Melchite patriarch to furnish an Italian translation of the proceedings, and then condemned them by a brief of Sept. 16, 1835. — Landon, *Manual of Councils*; Smith, *Tables of Church Hist.*

### Antioch, Patriarchate Of

Tradition reports that St. Peter was the first bishop of Antioch, but there is no historical proof of it. It is certain, however, that the Church of Antioch stood prominent in the early ages of the Church, and its see was held by Ignatius and other eminent men. Its bishops, ranked in the early Church only after those of Rome and Alexandria. When the bishop of Constantinople received his rank next to that of Rome, Antioch occupied the fourth rank among the episcopal sees. In the fifth century the bishop of Antioch received, together with the bishops of the other prominent sees, the title patriarch (q.v.). In the fourth century this powerful Church included not less than a hundred thousand persons, three thousand of whom were supported out of the public donations. It is painful to trace the progress of declension in such a church as this. But the period now referred to, namely, the age of Chrysostom, toward the close of the fourth century, may be considered as the brightest of its history subsequent to the

apostolic age, and that from which the Church at Antioch may date its fall. It continued, indeed, outwardly prosperous; but superstition, secular ambition, the pride of life; pomp and formality in the service of God in place of humility and sincere devotion; the growth of faction and the decay of charity, showed that real religion was fast disappearing, and that the foundations were laid of that great apostasy which, in two centuries from this time, overspread the whole Christian world, led to the entire extinction of the Church in the East, and still holds dominion over the fairest portions of the West. For many years, up to the accession of Theodosius, the Arians filled the see; and after the council of Chalcedon Peter Fullo and others who refused to acknowledge that synod occupied the patriarchal throne; but of them all the worst was Severus, the abettor of the Monophysite heresy (A.D. 512-518). His followers were so many and powerful, that they were able to appoint a successor of the same opinions; and from that time to the present there has been a Monophysitic or Jacobite patriarch of Antioch, who, however, fixed his see, not at Antioch itself, like all the former, but at Tacrita, in Mesopotamia, and at the present day in Diarbekir. The rest of the patriarchate of Antioch, after the separation between the Eastern and Western Churches, constituted a part of the Greek Church. In it there is still a patriarch of Antioch, yet with only a small district, and subordinate to the patriarch of Constantinople. For those Greeks and Jacobites who were prevailed upon to enter into a union with the Roman Church, two patriarchs, bearing the title patriarch of Antioch, are appointed, one for the united Greeks, and one for the united Syrians.

The provinces of the ancient patriarchate were as follows:

1. Syria Prima.
2. Phoenicia Prima.
3. Phoenicia Secunda.
4. Arabia.
5. Cilicia Prima.
6. Cilicia Secunda.
7. Syria Secunda.
8. The Euphratean province.
9. Province of Osrhoene.
10. Mesopotamia.
11. Isauria.



The province of Theodorias, composed of a few cities in the two Syrias, was afterward formed by the Emperor Justinian. It is a question whether the region of Persia, which in the time of Constantine the Great was filled with Christians, was included in the patriarchate of Antioch. Peter, patriarch of Antioch in the eleventh century, William of Tyre, and the Arabic canons, assert that such was the case. The Christians now in Persia are Nestorians, and disclaim any subjection to the see of Antioch. It was the ancient custom of this patriarchate for the patriarch to consecrate the metropolitans of his diocese, who in their turn consecrated and overlooked the bishops of their respective provinces; in which it differed from the Church of Alexandria, where each individual diocese depended immediately upon the patriarch, who appointed every bishop. The patriarch of the Syrian Jacobites styles himself "Patriarch of Antioch, the city of God, and of the whole East." — Lardner, *Works*, 4, 558 sq.; *Historia Patriarcharum Antioch.* in Le Quien, *Oriens Christian.* tom. 2; Boschii *Tract. hist. chronol. de Patriarchis Antioch.* (Venet. 1748). **SEE JACOBITES** and **SEE GREEK CHURCH.**

### Antioch, School Of

a theological seminary which arose at the end of the fourth century, but which had been prepared for a century before by the learned presbyters of the Church of Antioch. It distinguished itself by diffusing a taste for *scriptural* knowledge, and aimed at a middle course in Biblical Hermeneutics, between a rigorously literal and an allegorical method of interpretation (see Minter, *Ueb. d. Antiochien. Schulen*, in Staudlin, *Archlv.* 1, 1, 1). Several other seminaries sprung up from it in the Syrian Church. As distinguished from the school of Alexandria, its tendency was logical rather than intuitional or mystical. The term *school of Antioch* is used also to denote the theological tendencies of the Syrian Church clergy. Nestorianism arose out of the bosom of this school. Gieseler gives the following names as belonging to it: *Julius Africanus* of Nicopolis (A.D. 232); *Dorotheus* (A.D. 290); *Lucian* (A.D. 311). — Neander, *Ch. Hist.* 2, 150, 352, etc.; Gieseler, *Ch. Hist.* per. 1, div. 3, § 63; Neander, *Hist. of Dogmas*, 1, 265; 2, 328.

### Picture for Antioch 4

**2. ANTIOCH IN PISIDIA**, being a border city, was considered at different times as belonging to different provinces (see Cellar. *Ndtit.* 2, 187 sq.).

Ptolemy (5, 5) places it in Pamphylia, and Strabo (12, 577) in Phrygia (see Smith's *Dict. of Class. Geog.* s.v.). It was, founded by Seleucus Nicator, and its first inhabitants were from Magnesia on the Maeander. After the defeat of Antiochus (III) the Great by the Romans, it came into the possession of Eumenes, king of Pergamos, and was afterward transferred to Amyntas. On his death the Romans made it the seat of a proconsular government, and invested it with the privileges of a *Colonia Juris Italici*, which included a freedom from taxes and a municipal constitution similar to that of the Italian towns (Ulpianus, lib. 50). Antioch was noted in early times for the worship of Men Arcaeus, or Lunus. Numerous slaves and extensive estates were annexed to the service of the temple; but it was abolished after the death of Amyntas (Strabo, 12, 8; 3, 72). When Paul and Barnabas visited this city (<sup><4134></sup>Acts 13:14), they found a Jewish synagogue and a considerable number of proselytes, and met with great success among the Gentiles (ver. 48); but, through the violent opposition of the Jews, were obliged to leave the place, which they did in strict accordance with their Lord's injunction (ver. 51, compared with <sup><4104></sup>Matthew 10:14; <sup><4105></sup>Luke 9:5). On Paul's return from Lystra he revisited Antioch for the purpose of strengthening the minds of the disciples (<sup><442></sup>Acts 14:21). He probably visited Antioch again at the beginning of his second journey, when Silas was his associate, and Timothy, who was a native of this neighborhood, had just been added to the party (<sup><581></sup>2 Timothy 3:11). *SEE PAUL.*

## Picture for An'tioch 5

Till within a very recent period Antioch was supposed to have been situated where the town of *Ak-Sheker* now stands (Olivier, 6:396); but the researches of the Rev. F. Arundell, British chaplain at Smyrna in 1833 (*Discoveries*, 1, 281), confirmed by the still later investigations of Mr. Hamilton, secretary of the Geographical Society (*Researches*, 1, 472), have determined its site to be adjoining the town of *Yalo-batch* and consequently that Ak-Sheker is the ancient Philomelion described by Strabo (12, 8; 3, 72, ed. Tauch.): "In Phrygia Paroreia is a mountainous ridge stretching from east to west; and under this on either side lies a great plain, and cities near it; to the north Philomelion, and on the other side Antioch, called Antioch near Pisidia; the one is situated altogether on the plain; the other on an eminence, and has a colony of Romans." According to Pliny, Antioch was also called Caesarea (5, 24). Mr. Arundell observed the remains of several temples and, churches, besides a theater and a

magnificent aqueduct; of the latter twenty-one arches still remained in a perfect state. Mr. Hamilton copied several inscriptions, all, with one exception, in Latin. Of one the only words not entirely effaced were “*Antiocheae Caesari.*” (See Arundell’s *Discoveries in Asia Minor*, Lond. 1834, 1:268-312; Hamilton’s *Researches in Asia Minor*, Lond. 1842, 1:472-474; 2:413-439; Laborde’s *Asia Minor*; Calmet, *Plates*, 7; Conybeare and Howson, *Life and Epistles of St. Paul*, 2, 170.) **SEE PISIDIA.**

### Antiochi’a

a more exact method of Anglicizing (1 Maccabees 4:35; 6:63; 2 Maccabees 4:33; 5:21) the name ANTIOCH **SEE ANTIOCH** [in Syria] (q.v.).

### Antio’chian

(Ἀντιοχεύς), an inhabitant (2 Maccabees 4, 9-19) of the city ANTIOCH **SEE ANTIOCH** [in Syria] (q.v.).

### Anti’ochis

(Ἀντιοχίς, fem. of *Antiochus*), the concubine of Antiochus Epiphanes, who gave her the cities of Tarsus and Mallo, that she might receive their revenues for her own benefit, like the modern “pinmoney” (comp. Cicero, *Ad Verrem*, 5). This was regarded by the inhabitants as an insupportable mark of contempt, and they took up arms against the king, who was obliged to march in person to reduce them (2 Maccabees 4:30). B.C. 168.

### Anti’ochus

#### Picture for Anti’ochus 1

(Ἀντίοχος, *opponent*), the name especially of several of the Syrian kings, whose history, so far as relates to Jewish affairs, is contained particularly in the Books of the Maccabees, and is predicted with remarkable minuteness in the 11th chapter of Daniel. The name was first borne by one of the generals of Philip, whose son Seleucus, by the help of the first Ptolemy, established himself (B.C. 312) as ruler of Babylon. The year 312 is, in consequence, the era from which, under that monarchy, time was computed, as, for instance, in the Books of Maccabees. ‘For eleven years more the contest in Asia continued, while Antigonus (the “one-eyed”) was grasping at universal supremacy. At length, in 301, he was defeated and

slain in the decisive battle of Ipsus, in Phrygia. Ptolemy, son of Lagus, had meanwhile become master of Southern Syria, and Seleucus was too much indebted to him to be disposed to eject him by force from this possession. In fact, the first three Ptolemies (B.C. 323-222) looked on their extra-Egyptian possessions as their sole guarantee for the safety of Egypt itself against their formidable neighbor, and succeeded in keeping the mastery, not only of Palestine and Coele-Syria, and of many towns on that coast, but of Cyrene and other parts of Libya, of Cyprus, and other islands, with numerous maritime posts all round Asia Minor. A permanent fleet was probably kept up at Samos (Polyb. 5, 35, 11), so that their arms reached to the Hellespont (5, 34, 7); and for some time they ruled over Thrace (18, 34, 5). Thus Syria was divided between, two great powers, the *northern* half falling to Seleucus and his successors, the *southern* to the Ptolemies; and this explains the titles “king of the north” and “king of the south,” in the 11th chapter of Daniel. The line dividing them was drawn somewhat to the north of Damascus, the capital of Coele-Syria.

The most compact and unbroken account of the kings of this, the Seleucid or Syrian, dynasty is to be found in Appian’s book (*De Rebus Syriacis*), at the end. A sufficiently detailed statement of the reign of each may be found in Smith’s *Dict. of Class. Biog.* s.v. On the dates, see Clinton’s *Fasti Hellenici*, vol. 3, Appendix, ch. 3 The reigns are as follows:

1. Seleucus I, Nicator, B.C. 312-280.
2. Antiochus I, Soter, his son, 280-261.
3. Antiochus II, Theos, his son, 261-246.
4. Seleucus II, Callinicus, his son, 246-226.
5. (Alexander, or) Seleucus III, Ceraunus, his son, 226-223.
6. Antiochus III, the Great, his brother, 223-187.
7. Seleucus IV, Philopator, his son, 187-176.
8. Antiochus IV, Epiphanes, his brother, 176-164.
9. Antiochus V, Eupator, his son (a minor), 164-162.
10. Demetrius I, Soter, son of Seleucus Philopator, 162-150.

- 11.** Alexander Balas, *a usurper*, who pretended to be son of Antiochus Epiphanes, and was acknowledged by the Romans, 152-146.
- 12.** Antiochus VI, Dionysus (a minor), son of the preceding. He was murdered by the usurper Trypho, who contested the kingdom till 137.
- 13.** Demetrius II, Nicator, son of Demetrius Soter, reigned 146 - 141, when he was captured by the Parthians.
- 14.** Antiochus VII, Sidetes, his brother, 141-128.
- 15.** Demetrius II, Nicator, a second time, after his release from Parthia, 128-125.
- 16.** Seleucus V, his son, assassinated immediately by his mother, 125.
- 17.** Antiochus VIII, Grypus, his brother, shared his kingdom with the following, 125-96.
- 18.** Antiochus IX, Cyzicenus, his half-brother, 111- 95.
- 19.** Seleucus VI, Epiphanes, eldest son of Antiochus Grypus, kills Antiochus Cyzicenus, 96 - 95.
- 20.** Antiochus X, Eusebes, son of Antiochus Cyzicenus, asserts his claims to his father's share of the dominions, kills Seleucus Epiphanes, and prevails over the successors of the latter, but gives way to Tigranes, 95 - 83.
- 21.** Philip, second son of Antiochus Grypus, succeeds to the claims of his brother Seleucus against Antiochus Eusebes, until the accession of Tigranes, cir. 94 - 83.
- 22.** Antiochus XI, Epiphanes II, his brother, associated with him in the contest in which he lost his life, cir. 94.
- 23.** Demetrius III, Eucerus, his brother, likewise associated with Philip till their rupture, when he was taken prisoner by the Parthians, 94 - 88.
- 24.** Antiochus XII, Dionysius II, his brother, whose cause he took up against Philip, till slain by the Arabians, cir. 88 - 86.
- 25.** Tigranes, king of Armenia, invited to the throne by the Syrians over all the rival claimants, and held it till his overthrow by the Roman general Lucullus, 83 - 69.

**26.** Antiochus XIII, Asiaticus, son of Antiochus Eusebes, allowed by Lucullus to hold the throne of the Seleucidae till its entire abolition by Pompey, 69 - 65.

The following (Nos. 3; 6, 8, 9, 12, 14, 17, 18, 20, 22, 24, of the above) are the only ones of the name of Antiochus that are important in sacred literature. (See Frohlich, *Annales Syric*; Vaillant, *Seleucidar. Imp.*)

**1.** ANTIOCHUS (II) THEOS (Θεός, god, so surnamed “in the first instance by the Milesians, because he overthrew their tyrant Timarchus,” Appian, *Syr.* 65), the son and successor of Antiochus (I) Soter as king of Syria, B.C. 261. He carried on for several years the war inherited from his father with the Egyptian king, Ptolemy (II) Philadelphus, who subdued most of the districts of Asia Minor, but at length (B.C. 250), in order to secure peace, he married Ptolemy’s daughter (Berenice) in place of his wife Laodice, and appointed the succession in the line of his issue by her (Polyb. *ep.* Athen. 2, 45); yet, on the death of Ptolemy two years afterward, Antiochus recalled his former wife Laodice, and Berenice and her son were soon after put to death at Daphne. Antiochus himself died, B.C. 246, in the 40th year of his age (Porphyry, in Euseb. *Chronicles Ann.* 1, 345), of poison administered by his wife, who could not forget her former divorce (Justin, 27:1; Appian, *Syr.* 65; Val. Max. 9, 14,1).

The above alliance of Antiochus with Ptolemy, by the marriage of Berenice to the former, is prophetically referred to in <sup>(27106)</sup>Daniel 11:6, as “the joining of themselves together” by “the king of the south and the king of the north,” through “the king’s daughter;” and its failure is there distinctly characterized, through the triumph of Laodice over “him that strengthened her,” i.e. her husband Antiochus (see Jerome, *Comment.* in loc.). After the death of Antiochus, Ptolemy Evergetes, the brother of Berenice (“out of a branch of her root”), who succeeded his father Ptol. Philadelphus, exacted vengeance for his sister’s death by an invasion of Syria, in which Laodice was killed, her son Seleucus Callinicus driven for a time from the throne, and the whole country plundered (<sup>(27107)</sup>Daniel 11:7-9; hence his surname “*the benefactor*”). The hostilities thus renewed continued for many years; and on the death of Seleucus, B.C. 226, after his “return into his own land” (<sup>(27109)</sup>Daniel 11:9), his sons Alexander (Seleucus) Ceraunos and Antiochus “assembled a great multitude of forces” against Ptol. Philopator, the son of Evergetes, and “one of them” (Antiochus) threatened to overthrow the power of Egypt (<sup>(27110)</sup>Daniel 11:10).

## Picture for Anti'ochus 2

**2. ANTIOCHUS (III) THE GREAT**, Seleucid king of Syria, son of Seleucus Callinicus, brother and successor of Seleucus (II) Ceraunus, B.C. 223 (Polyb. 4:40; comp. Euseb. *Chronicles Arm.* 1, 347; 2, 235; see Goschen, in the *Theol. Stud. u. Krit.* 1831, 4:713). In a war with the weak king of Egypt, Ptolemy Philopator, in order to regain Coele-Syria and Phoenicia, he twice (comp. Polyb. 5,49) penetrated as far as Dura (two miles north of Caesarea), but on the second occasion he concluded a four-months' truce with his adversary, and led his army back to the Orontes (Polyb. 5,60; Justin, 30:1, 2; Athen. 13:577; comp. <sup>27110</sup>Daniel 11:10). On the breaking out of hostilities again, he drove the Egyptian land-force as far as Zidon, desolated Gilead and Samaria, and took up his winterquarters at Ptolemais (Polyb. 5,63-71). In the beginning of the following year (B.C. 217) however, he was defeated by the Egyptians (Polyb. 5,79, 80. 8286; Strabo, 16:759; comp. <sup>27111</sup>Daniel 11:11) at Raphia (near Gaza), with an immense loss, and compelled to retreat to Antioch, leaving Coele-Syria, Phoenicia, and Palestine to the Egyptians. Thirteen [14] years afterward, Antiochus (in connection with Philip III of Macedon, Liv. 31:34) opened another campaign against Egypt, then ruled over by a child. Ptolemy (V) Epiphanes. He had already conquered the three above-named countries, when a war between him and Attalus, king of Pergamus, diverted him to Asia Minor, and in his absence Ptolemy, aided by Scopas, obtained possession of Jerusalem; but, as soon as he had secured peace there, he returned through Coele-Syria, defeated the Egyptian army at Paneas, and obtained the mastery of all Palestine, B.C. 198 (Polyb. 15:20; Appian, *Syr.* 1; Liv. 30, 19; Joseph. *Ant.* 12, 3, 3; comp. <sup>27113</sup>Daniel 11:13-16). Ptolemy now formed an alliance with Antiochus, and married his daughter Cleopatra (Polyb. 28:17, 11), who received as a dowry (comp. <sup>27113</sup>Daniel 11:13-16) Coele-Syria, Phoenicia, and Palestine (Joseph. *Ant.* 12, 4, 1). Antiochus undertook in the following year a naval as well as land expedition against Asia Minor, in which he subdued the greater part of it, and even crossed the Hellespont into Europe. By this means he became (B.C. 192) involved in a war with the Romans (Liv. 35, 13; Justin, 31, 1), in which, after many reverses, he was finally compelled, by an unfortunate battle at Magnesia, in Lycia (B.C. 190), to conclude a disgraceful treaty, B.C. 189 (Appian, *Syr.* 33-39; Polyb. 21, 14; Liv. 37, 40, 43, 45, 55; Justin, 21:8; comp. <sup>27118</sup>Daniel 11:18; 1 Maccabees 8:6 sq.). *SEE EUMENES*. He lost his life soon afterward (B.C. 187, in the 36th year of

his reign, according to Euseb. *Chronicles* 2, 35, 235, but after 34 full years, according to Porphy. *Excerpt.* 1, 347) in a popular insurrection excited by his attempt to plunder the temple at Elymais, in order to obtain means for paying the tribute imposed upon him by the Romans (Strabo, 16:744; Justin, 32:2; Diod. Sic. *Exc.* 2, 573; Porphy. in Euseb. *Chronicles Arm.* 1, 348; comp. <sup>27119</sup>Daniel 11:19). During the war of Antiochus with Egypt, the Jews and inhabitants of Coele-Syria suffered severely, and the suspense in which they were for a long time kept as to their ultimate civil relations operated injuriously for their interests (Joseph. *Ant.* 12, 3, 3); but, as the Jews quickly adopted the Syrian party after the battle at Paneas, he granted them not only full liberty and important concessions for their worship and religious institutions (Josephus, *Ant.* 12, 3, 3, 4), but he also planted Jewish colonies' in Lydia and Phrygia, in order to secure the doubtful fidelity of his subjects there. Two sons of Antiochus occupied the throne after him, Seleucus Pllilopator, his immediate successor, and Antiochus IV, who gained the kingdom upon the assassination of his brother. (See, generally, Fluthe, *Gesch. Macedon.* 2, 226 sq.)

### Picture for Anti'ochus 3

**3.** ANTIOCHUS (IV) EPIPHANES (Ἐπιφάνης, *illustrious*; comp. Michaelis on 1 Maccabees 1:10, and Eckhel, *Doctr. num.* I, 3, 223; nicknamed *Epimanes*, Ἐπιμανής, *madman*, Athen. 10:438 sq.; on coins *Theos*, Θεός, *god*, see Frohlich, *Annal.* tab. 6, 7), a Seleucid king of Syria, second son of Antiochus the Great (Appian, *Syr.* 45; 1 Maccabees 1:11), ascended the throne on the death of his brother, Seleucus Philopator (on his enumeration, the 11th of the Seleucidae, <sup>2708</sup>Daniel 7:8, 24; see Lengerke, *Daniel*, p. 318 sq.), B.C. 175 (see Wernsdorf, *De fide libr. Macc.* p. 28 sq.), and attained an evil notoriety for his tyrannical treatment of the Jews (comp. <sup>2708</sup>Daniel 7:8 sq.), who have described him (in the second Book of the Maccabees) as barbarous in the extreme (see Eichhorn, *Apokr.* p. 265). He had been given as a hostage to the Romans (B.C. 188) after his father's defeat at Magnesia. In B.C. 175 he was released by the intervention of his brother Seleucus, who substituted his own son Demetrius in his place. Antiochus was at Athens when Seleucus was assassinated by Heliodorus. He took advantage of his position, and, by the assistance of Eumenes and Attalus, easily expelled Heliodorus, who had usurped the crown, and himself "obtained the kingdom by flatteries" (<sup>27125</sup>Daniel 11:21; comp. Liv. 41:20), to the exclusion of his nephew Demetrius (<sup>2708</sup>Daniel 7:8). The accession of Antiochus was immediately followed by desperate efforts of



the Hellenizinma party at Jerusalem to assert their supremacy. Jason (Jesus; Joseph. *Ant.* 12, 5, 1; **SEE JASON**), the brother of Onias III, the high priest, persuaded the king to transfer the high-priesthood to him, and at the same time bought permission (2 Maccabees 4:9) to carry out his design of habituating the Jews to Greek customs (2 Maccabees 4:7, 20). Three years afterward, Menelaus, of the tribe of Benjamin, **SEE SIMON**, who was commissioned by Jason to carry to Antiochus the price of his office, supplanted Jason by offering the king a larger bribe, and was himself appointed high-priest, while Jason was obliged to take refuge among the Ammonites (2 Maccabees 4:23-26). From these circumstances, and from the marked honor with which Antiochus was received at Jerusalem very early in his reign (B.C. cir. 173; 2 Maccabees 4:22), it appears that he found no difficulty in regaining the border provinces which had been given as the dower of his sister Cleopatra to Ptol. Epiphanes. He undertook four campaigns against Egypt, in order to possess himself of Coele-Syria and Phoenicia, which he had claimed since Cleopatra's death (see the ANTIOCHUS preceding); the first B.C. 171, the second B.C. 170 (2 Maccabees 5:1; 1 Maccabees 1:17 sq.), the third B.C. 169, the fourth B.C. 168. On his return from the second of these campaigns, in the prosecution of which he had overrun the greater part of Egypt, and taken prisoner the Egyptian king, Ptolemy Philometor (comp. <sup>2713</sup>Daniel 11:26), he indulged in the harshest manner of proceedings in Jerusalem, on occasion of the above shameful quarrel among the priests, **SEE MENELAUS**, which had been carried on by open force of arms (comp. Joseph. *Ant.* 12, 5, 1), and vented his rage especially on the temple, which he plundered and desecrated with great bloodshed (1 Maccabees 1:20-42; 2 Maccabees 5:1-23). Being checked by the Romans in his fourth campaign against Egypt, and compelled in a very peremptory manner to retire (Liv. 45:12; Polyb. 29:11; Appian, *Syr.* 66; Diod. *Sic. Exc. Vatic.* 31:2; comp. <sup>2713</sup>Daniel 11:29 sq.), he detached (B.C. 167) a body of troops to Jerusalem, who took the city by assault, slaughtered a large part of the inhabitants, and gave up the city to a general sack (1 Maccabees 1:30 sq.; 2 Maccabees 5:24 sq.; comp. <sup>2713</sup>Daniel 11:31 sq.). The Jewish worship in the Temple was utterly broken up and abolished (1 Maccabees 1:43 sq.). At this time he availed himself of the assistance of the ancestral enemies of the Jews (1 Maccabees 4:61; 5:3 sq.; <sup>2714</sup>Daniel 11:41). The decrees then followed which have rendered his name infamous. The Greek religion was forcibly imposed upon the Jews, and there was set up, for the purpose of desecrating (Diod. *Sic. Eclog.* 34, 1) and defiling the Temple, on the 15th of Kisleu, the "abomination of

desolation” [q.v.] (<sup>27133</sup>Daniel 11:31; 12:11; 1 Maccabees 1:57), i.e. probably a little idolatrous shrine (Joseph. *Ant.* 12, 5, 4) on the altar of burnt-offerings; the first victim was sacrificed to Jupiter Olympius, on the 25th of the same month. Many timidly submitted to the royal mandate (1 Maccabees 1:43), being already inclined to Gentilism (1 Maccabees 1:12), and sacrificed to the pagan gods (1 Maccabees 1:45); but a band of bold patriots united (comp. <sup>27134</sup>Daniel 11:34) under the Asmonnean Mattathias (q.v.), and, after his death, which occurred shortly afterward, under his heroic son, Judas Maccabeus (q.v.), and, after acting for a long time on the defensive, at length took the open field (1 Maccabees 4), and gained their freedom (comp. <sup>27025</sup>Daniel 9:25 sq.). Meanwhile Antiochus turned his arms to the East, toward Parthia (Tac. *Hist.* 5,8) and Armenia (Appian, *Syr.* 45; Diod. ap. Miller, *Fragm.* 2, 10; comp. <sup>27140</sup>Daniel 11:40). Hearing not long afterward of the riches of a temple of Nanaea (“the desire of women,” <sup>27135</sup>Daniel 11:37) in Elymais (1 Maccabees 6:1 sq.; see Wernsdorf, *Defide Maccab.* p. 58 sq.), hung with the gifts of Alexander, he resolved to plunder it. The attempt was defeated; and, though he did not fall like his father in the act of sacrilege, the event hastened his death. He retired to Babylon, and thence to Tabae in Persia (not in the vicinity of Ecbatana, as in 2 Maccabees 9:3, the traditionary burialplace of this king, see Wernsdorf, *ut sup.* p. 104 sq.), where he died in the year B.C. 164 (see Hofmann, *Weissag.* 1, 310), in the twelfth year of his reign (Appian, *Syr.* 66; Polyb. 21:11; see Wernsdorf, p. 26 sq., 61 sq.; comp. <sup>27103</sup>Daniel 11:8; 8:25), the victim of superstition, terror, and remorse (Polyb. 31:2; Josephus, *Ant.* 12, 8, 1 sq.), having first heard of the successes of the Maccabees in restoring the temple worship at Jerusalem (1 Maccabees 6:1-16; comp. 2 Maccabees 1:7-17?). “He came to his end, and there was none to help him” (<sup>27145</sup>Daniel 11:45). Comp. Liv. 41:24-25; 42:6; 44:19; 45:11-13; Josephus, *Ant.* 12, 5, 8. See Jacob ben-Naphtali, [sk/yf\\$ai](#) t Ljææ (Mantua, 1557). **SEE MACCABEE.**

## Picture for Anti’ochus 4

The prominence given to the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes in the Book of Daniel accords with its representative character (<sup>27018</sup>Daniel 7:8, 25; 8:11 sq.). The conquest of Alexander had introduced the forces of Greek thought and life into the Jewish nation, which was already prepared for their operation. **SEE ALEXANDER THE GREAT.** For more than a century and a half these forces had acted powerfully both upon the faith and upon

the habits of the people; and the time was come when an outward struggle alone could decide whether Judaism was to be merged into a rationalized paganism, or to rise not only victorious from the conflict, but more vigorous and more pure. There were many symptoms which betokened the approaching struggle. The position which Judaea occupied on the borders of the conflicting empires of Syria and Egypt, exposed equally to the open miseries of war and the treacherous favors of rival sovereigns, rendered its national condition precarious from the first, though these very circumstances were favorable to the growth of freedom. The terrible crimes by which the wars of “the North and South” were stained, must have alienated the mind of every faithful Jew from his Grecian lords, even if persecution had not been superadded from Egypt first and then from Syria. Politically nothing was left for the people in the reign of Antiochus but independence or the abandonment of every prophetic hope. Nor was their social position less perilous. The influence of Greek literature, of foreign travel, of extended commerce, had made itself felt in daily life. At Jerusalem the mass of the inhabitants seem to have desired to imitate the exercises of the Greeks, and a Jewish embassy attended the games of Hercules at Tyre (2 Maccabees 4:9-20). Even their religious feelings were yielding; and before the rising of the Maccabees no opposition was offered to the execution of the king’s decrees. Upon the first attempt of Jason the “priests had no courage to serve at the altar” (2 Maccabees 4:14; comp. 1 Maccabees 1:43); and this not so much from wilful apostasy as from a disregard to the vital principles involved in the conflict. Thus it was necessary that the final issues of a false Hellenism should be openly seen that it might be discarded forever by those who cherished the ancient faith of Israel. The conduct of Antiochus was in every way suited to accomplish this end; and yet it seems to have been the result of passionate impulse rather than of any deep-laid scheme to extirpate a strange creed. At first he imitated the liberal policy of his predecessors, and the occasion for his attacks was furnished by the Jews themselves. Even the motives by which he was finally actuated were personal, or, at most, only political. Able, energetic (Polyb. 27:17), and liberal to profusion, Antiochus was reckless and unscrupulous in the execution of his plans. He had learned at Rome to court power and to dread it. He gained an empire, and he remembered that he had been a hostage. Regardless himself of the gods of his fathers (<sup>-271137</sup> Daniel 11:37), he was incapable of appreciating the power of religion in others; and, like Nero in later times, he became a type of the enemy of God, not as the Roman emperor, by the perpetration of unnatural crimes,

but by the disregard of every higher feeling. "He magnified himself above all." The real deity whom he recognised was the Roman war-god, and fortresses were his most sacred temples (<sup>271138</sup>Daniel 11:38 sq.; Ewald, *Gesch. des Volkes Isr.* 4, 340). Confronted with such a persecutor, the Jew realized the spiritual power of his faith. The evils of heathendom were seen concentrated in a personal shape. The outward forms of worship became invested with something of a sacramental dignity. Common life was purified and ennobled by heroic devotion. An independent nation asserted the integrity of its hopes in the face of Egypt, Syria, and Rome. Antiochus himself left behind him among the Jews the memory of a detestable tyrant (<sup>hzbijæ</sup>contemptible, <sup>271212</sup>Daniel 11:21; ἵζα ἀμαρτωλός, 1 Maccabees 1:10), although Diodorus Siculus (*Eclog.* 34) gives him the character of a magnanimous prince (βασιλεὺς μεγαλόψυχος καὶ τὸ ηθος ἡμερος). It cannot, indeed, be denied that the portraitures of the Jewish writers are likely to have been exaggerated, but they could not well have fabricated the facts in the case, while the nature of the reaction (in the times of the Maccabees) shows an intolerable civil pressure preceding; accordingly Antiochus is depicted even in Diodorus (ii. 582 sq.) and other historians as a violently eccentric (almost atrocious) monarch, whose character is composed of contradictory elements (comp. Athen. 10:433). His attempt to extirpate the Jewish religion could certainly hardly have arisen from despotic bigotry, but he probably sought by this means to render the Jews somewhat more tractable, and to conform them to other nations—a purpose to which the predilection for foreign customs, already predominant among the prominent Jews (1 Maccabees 1:12; 2 Maccabees 4:10 sq.), doubtless contributed. The Jews, no doubt, by reason of their position between Syria and Egypt, were subject to many hardships unintentional on the part of Antiochus, and his generals may often have increased the severity of the measures enjoined upon them by him, on account of the usual rigid policy of his government toward foreigners; yet in the whole conduct of Antiochus toward the Jews an utter contempt for the people themselves, as well as a relentless hastiness of disposition, is quite evident. See HORN (*Little*).

## Picture for Anti'ochus 5

**4.** ANTIOCHUS (V) EUPATOR (Εὐπάτωρ, having a *noble* father) succeeded. in B.C. 164. while yet a child (of nine years, Appian, *Syr.* 66; or twelve years, according to Porphyry. in Euseb. *Chronicles Arm.* 1, 348), his father

Antiochus Epiphanes, under the guardianship of Lysias (Appian, *Syr.* 46; 1 Maccabees 3:32 sq.), although Antiochus Epiph. on his deathbed had designated Philip as regent and guardian (1 Maccabees 6:14 sq., 55; 2 Maccabees 9:29). Soon after his accession (B.C. 161) he set out with a large army for Judaea (1 Maccabees 6:20), where Lysias already was, but hard pressed by the Jews (1 Maccabees 3:39 sq.; 6:21 sq.). Respecting the route that he took and the issue of the engagement which he fought with Judas Maccabaeus, the accounts do not agree (1 Maccabees 6, and 2 Maccabees 13; comp. Wernsdorf, *De fide Maccab.* p. 117; Eichhorn, *Apokr.* p. 265 sq.); that victory, however, was not on the side of Judas, as one of these states (2 Maccabees 13:29, 30), appears evident from all the circumstances. The statement (1 Maccabees 6:47) that the Jews were compelled to retreat on account of the superiority of their enemies, is very probable, and corroborated by Josephus (*War.* 1, 1, 5; comp. *Ant.* 12, 9, 5). Antiochus repulsed Judas at Bethzacharia, and took Bethsura (Bethzur) after a vigorous resistance (1 Maccabees 6:31-50). But when the Jewish force in the temple was on the point of yielding, Lysias persuaded the king to conclude a hasty peace that he might advance to meet Philip, who had returned from Persia and made himself master of Antioch (1 Maccabees 6:51 sq.; Joseph. *Ant.* 12, 9, 5 sq.). Philip was speedily overpowered (Joseph. 1. c.); but in the next year (B.C. 162) Antiochus and Lysias fell into the hands of Demetrius Soter, the son of Seleucus Philopator, who now appeared in Syria and laid claim to the throne. Antiochus was immediately put to death by him (together with Lysias) in revenge for the wrongs which he had himself suffered from Antiochus Epiphanes (1 Maccabees 7:1 sq.; 2 Maccabees 14:1 sq.; Appian, *Syr.* 46; Justin, 34:3), after a reign (according to Eusebius) of two (full) years (Polyb. 31:19; Joseph. *Ant.* 12, 10, 1).

## Picture for Anti'ochus 6

**5.** ANTIOCHUS (VI), surnamed EPIPHANES DIONYSUS (Ἐπιφανῆς Διόνυσος, *illustrious Bacchus*, on coins, see Eckhel, I, 3, 231 sq.; but THEOS, Θεός, *god*, by Josephus, *Ant.* 13, 7, 1), son of Alexander (Balas) king of Syria (Ἀλέξανδρος Ἀλεξάνδρου τοῦ νόθου, App. *Syr.* 68). After his father's death (B.C. 146) he remained in Arabia; but, though still a child (παιδίον, App. 1. c.; παιδάριον νεώτερον, 1 Maccabees 11:54), he was soon afterward brought forward by Diodotus or Trypho (Strabo, 16:752), who had been one of his father's chief ministers at Antioch, as a claimant of the throne against Demetrius Nicator, and (through his

generals) quickly obtained the succession by force of arms (1 Maccabees 11:39, 54), B.C. 145-144 (comp. Eckhel, *Doctr. Num.* I, 3, 231; Justin, 36:1; Appian, *Syr.* 68). Jonathan Maccabees, who joined his cause, was laden with rich presents and instated in the high-priesthood, and his brother Simon was appointed commander of the royal troops in Palestine (1 Maccabees 11:57 sq.). Jonathan now reduced the whole land to subjection from Damascus to Antioch (1 Maccabees 11:62), defeated the troops of Demetrius (1 Maccabees 11:63 sq.), and even successfully repelled a fresh incursion of Demetrius into Palestine (1 Maccabees 12:24 sq.); but hardly was Antiochus established on the throne when Trypho began to put into execution his long-cherished plan of seizing the royal power for himself (1 Maccabees 12:39). In order to this, Trypho first of all advised the young prince to get the powerful Jonathan out of the way, and having succeeded by stratagem in confining him in prison, he soon after (B.C. 143) put him to death (1 Maccabees 12:40 sq.). He then returned to Syria, caused Antiochus to be murdered, and seized upon the crown (1 Maccabees 13:31 sq.; Joseph. *Ant.* 13, 5, 6; App. *Syr.* 68; Livy, *Epit.* 55 [where the *decem annos admodum habens* is incorrect]; Diod. ap. Miller, *Fragm.* 2, 19; Just. 36:1).

## Picture for Anti'ochus 7

**6.** ANTIOCHUS (VII) SIDETES (Σιδήτης, from Sida in Pamphylia, where he was born, Euseb. *Cheron. Arm.* 1, 349, and not from his great love of hunting, Plutarch, *Apophth.* p. 34, ed. Lips., comp. **dyx**), called also EUSEBES (Εὐσεβής, *pious*, Josephus, *Ant.* 13, 8, 2); on coins EVERGETES (Εὐεργέτης, *benefactor*, see Eckhel, *Doctr. Num.* 3, 235), second son of Demetrius I. After his brother Demetrius (II) Nicator had been taken prisoner (B.C. cir. 141) by Mithridates I (Arsaces VI, 1 Maccabees 14:1), kin, of Parthia, he married Demetrius's sister (wife) Cleopatra, B.C. 140 (Justin. 36:1), recovered the dominion of Syria (B.C. 137, comp. Niebuhr, *Kl. Schr.* 1, 251) from the atrocious Trypho (Strabo, 14:668), and ruled over it for nine years (1 Maccabees 15:1 sq.). At first he made a very advantageous treaty with Simon, who was now "high-priest and prince of the Jews," but when he grew independent of his help, he withdrew the concessions which he had made, and demanded the surrender of the fortresses which the Jews held, or an equivalent in money (1 Maccabees 15:26 sq.; Josephus, *Ant.* 13, 7, 3). As Simon was unwilling to yield to his demands, he sent a force under Cendebaeus against him, who occupied a

fortified position at Cedron (? 1 Maccabees 15:41), near Azotus, and harassed the surrounding country. After the defeat of Cendebaeus by the sons of Simon and the destruction of his works (1 Maccabees 16:1-10), Antiochus, who had returned from the pursuit of Trypho, undertook an expedition against Judaea in person. In the fourth year of his reign he besieged Jerusalem, and came near taking it by storm, but at length, probably through fear of the Romans, made peace on tolerable terms with John Hyrcanus (Josephus, *Ant.* 13, 8, 3, 4; comp. Euseb, *Chronicles Arm.* 1, 349). Antiochus next turned his arms against the Parthians, and Hyrcanus accompanied him in the campaign; but, after some successes, he was entirely defeated by Phraortes II (Arsaces VII), and fell in the battle (Josephus, *Ant.* 13, 8, 4; Justin. 38:10; Diod. Sic. *Exc. Vat.* p. 117 sq.), B.C. cir. 127-126 (App. *Syr.* 68; comp. Niebuhr, *Kl. Schrift.* 1, 251 sq.; Clinton, *F. H.* 2, 332 sq.). According to Athenseus (5, 210; 10, 439; 12:540), this king, like most of his predecessors, was inordinately given to the pleasures of the table (comp. Justin. 38:10). See CLEOPATRA 3.

## Picture for Anti'ochus 8

7. ANTIOCHUS (VIII) GRYPUS (Γρυπός, from his *aquiline* nose), and on coins *Epiphanes*, was the second son of Demetrius Nicator and Cleopatra. After the murder of his brother Seleucus by his mother, she placed him on the throne, as being likely to submit to her dictation, B.C. 125; but with the assistance of Ptolemy Physcon, his father-in-law, he not only succeeded in ejecting the usurper Alexander Zebina from Syria (Josephus, *Ant.* 13, 9, 3), but eventually compelled his mother to drink the poison that in her jealousy she prepared for him, B.C. 120. Eight years afterward a quarrel arose between him and his halfbrother Antiochus Cyzicenus about the succession (Josephus, *Ant.* 13, 10, 1), causing a protracted civil war that resulted in the partition of the kingdom of Syria between them and their descendants till the Roman conquest. He was assassinated, B.C. 96, in Heracleon, after a reign of 29 years (Josephus, *Ant.* 13, 13, 4), leaving four sons. (See Justin. 39:1-3; Livy, *Epit.* 60; Appian, *Syr.* p. 69; Athen. 12:540.) Most of his coins have his mother's bust together with his own (Eckhel, *Doctr. Num.* 3, 238). He appears to be the Antiochus *Philometor* (Φιλομήτωρ, *lover of his mother*) referred to by Josephus (*Ant.* 13, 12, 2).

## Picture for Anti'ochus 9

**8.** ANTIOCHUS (IX) CYZICENUS (Κυζικηνός, from Cyzicus, where he was brought up), and on coins (Eckhel, 3, 241) *Philopator* (Φιλοπάτωρ, *lover of his father*), acquired possession of Cole-Syria and Phoenicia (B.C. 111-96) from his half-brother Antiochus Grypus (q.v.), on whose death he attempted to seize the whole of Syria, but was resisted by Seleucus, eldest son of the latter, by whom he was killed in battle, B.C. 95 (Josephus, *Ant.* 13, 13, 4). He made an unsuccessful campaign at Samaria, as related by Josephus (*ib.* 10, 2; *War*, 1, 2, 7), under the following circumstances: John Hyrcanus, prince and highpriest of the Jews, having besieged the city, the Samaritans invited Antiochus to their assistance. He advanced speedily to help them, but was overcome by Antigonus and Aristobulus, sons of Hyrcanus, who commanded the siege, and who pursued him to Scythopolis; after which they resumed the siege of Samaria, and blocked up the city so closely that the inhabitants again solicited Antiochus. Having received 6000 men from Ptolemy Lathyrus; son of Cleopatra, queen of Egypt, he wasted the lands belonging to the Jews, designing thereby to oblige Hyrcanus to raise the siege of Samaria, but his troops were at last dispersed, and Samaria was taken by storm, and razed by Hyrcanus.

## Picture for Anti'ochus 10

**9.** ANTIOCHUS (X) EUSEBES (Εὐσεβής, pious), and on coins *Philopator*, the son of the preceding, whom he succeeded, B.C. 95, and defeated Seleucus of the rival portion of Syria, as well as the two brothers of the latter; but the Syrians, worn out with the continuation of the civil broil, at length offered the crown of all Syria to Tigranes, before whose full accession Antiochus perished in battle with the Parthians (Josephus, *Ant.* 13, 13, 4).

## Picture for Anti'ochus 11

**10.** ANTIOCHUS (XI), who also assumed the title of *Epiphanes* (II), was one of the above-named sons of Antiochus Grypus and brothers of Seleucus, who contended with Antiochus Cyzicenus; he was defeated:and lost his life, B.C. cir. 94 (Josephus, *Ant.* 13, 13, 4), leaving the contest to his surviving brother Philip, assisted by another brother, Demetrius, till the dispute was finally terminated by Tigranes (q.v.) assuming supreme power of all Syria, thus putting an end to the Seleucid dynasty.



## Picture for Anti'ochus 12

**11.** ANTIOCHUS (XII), the youngest son of Antiochus Grypus, surnamed likewise *Dionysus* (II), and on coins (Eckhel, 3, 246) *Philopator* CALLINICUS (*Καλλίνικος*, *finely victorious*), assumed the title of king after his brother Demetrius (see above) had been taken prisoner by the Parthians. He fell in battle against Aretas, king of the Arabians, after a brief exercise of power at Damascus, in opposition to his surviving brother Philip, B.C. cir. 90 (Josephus, *Ant.* 13, 15, 1).

### Antiochus

## Picture for Antiochus

was likewise the title of several kings of the petty province of Commagene, between the Euphrates and Mount Taurus, having the city of Samosata for its capital, and originally forming part of the Seleucid kingdom of Syria, from which it appears to have been independent during the contests between the later kings of that dynasty — a circumstance that probably explains the recurrence of the name Antiochus in this fresh dynasty. The only one of these mentioned even by Josephus is the FOURTH of the name, surnamed *Epiphanes*, apparently a son of Antiochus II of the same line. He was on intimate terms with Caligula, who gave him his paternal kingdom, A.D. 38, but afterward withheld it, so that he did not succeed to it till the accession of Claudius, A.D. 41. Nero added part of Armenia to his dominions in A.D. 61. He was one of the richest of the kings tributary to the Romans (see Smith's *Dict. of Class. Biog.* s.v.). His son, also called Antiochus Epiphanes, was betrothed, A.D. 43, to Drusilla, the daughter of Agrippa (Jo, sephus, *Ant.* 19, 9, 1). He assisted Titus in the final siege of Jerusalem (Josephus, *War*, 5,11, 3; Tacitus, *Hist.* 5,1). But in A.D. 72 he was accused by Paetus, governor of Syria, of conspiring with the Parthians against the Romans, and, being deposed from his kingdom, retired first to Lacedaemon and then to Rome, where he spent the remainder of his life in great respect (Josephus, *War*, 7, 7).

### Antiochus bishop of Ptolemais in Palestine,

a Syrian by birth. At the beginning of the fifth century he went to Constantinople, where his eloquent preaching gained him the reputation of another Chrysostom. He died not later than 408. Besides many sermons, he left a large work "against Avarice," which is lost. — Theodoret, *Dial.* 2;

Phot. *Cod.* 288; *Act. Concil. Ephes.* 3, 118; Labbe, *Catal. Codd. Vindobon.* pt. 1, p. 116, No. 58.

### Antiochus monk of St. Saba,

near Jerusalem, at the time of the capture of Jerusalem by the Persians (A.D. 614), and author of an “Epitome of Christian Faith” (Πανδέκτης τῆς Ἀγίας Γραφῆς), first published in Latin by Tilman (Paris, 1543, 8vo); reprinted in the *Bibliotheca Patrum* (Paris, 1579; Colon. 1618; Lugd. 1677); in the original Greek, first by Ducaeus, in the *Auctarii Bibl. Patr.* (Par. 1624), reprinted in Morell’s *Bibl. Patr.* (Par. 1644), and a considerable fragment in Fabricius’s *Bibl. Groec.* 10, 501.

### Antipaedobaptists

(from ἀντί, *against*, παῖς, *child*, and βάπτισμα, *to baptize*), persons who object to the baptism of infants, on the assumption that Christ’s commission to baptize appears to them to restrict this ordinance to such only as are taught, or made disciples; and that consequently infants, who cannot be thus taught, ought to be excluded. The Baptists, Campbellites, and Mennonites are Antipaedobaptists. See those titles.

### An’tipas

#### Picture for An’tipas

(Ἀντίπας, for Ἀντίπατρος, *Antipater*; comp. Josephus, *Ant.* 14, 1, 3), the name of three men.

**1.** A son of Herod the Great by Malthace, a Samaritan (Joseph. *Ant.* 17, 1, 3; *War.* 1, 28, 4). He inherited of his father’s dominions only Galilee and Peraea (B.C. 5), as tetrarch (q.v.), with a yearly income of 200 talents (Joseph. *Ant.* 17, 8, 1; 11, 4); Jesus was thus within his territorial jurisdiction (ⲉⲗⲁⲩⲏⲗⲏ Luke 23:7). He first married the daughter of the Arabian king Aretas, but afterward became enamored with Herodias, his half-brother Philip’s wife, and contracted a clandestine marriage with her, on which account the Arabian princess indignantly returned to her father (Joseph. *Ant.* 18, 5 1). Herodias inveigled her new husband into the execution of John the Baptist (ⲉⲙⲁⲩⲏⲗⲏ Matthew 14:4). His former father-in-law, Aretas, not long afterward (according to Josephus about one year before the death of Tiberius, i.e. A.D. 36) declared war against him, on pretense of a dispute about boundaries, but probably in reality to avenge the insult

to his daughter, and entirely routed his army (Joseph. *Ant.* 18, 5, 1), but was obliged to desist from farther steps by the intervention of the Romans. Antipas visited Rome on the accession of Caligula, although fond of ease, at the instance of his vain and ambitious wife, in order to secure the same royal title (which is derisively ascribed to him in ~~4064~~ Mark 6:14) that his nephew Herod Agrippa had just acquired (Joseph. *Ant.* 18, 7, 1); but upon the accusation of the latter he was dethroned by the emperor (A.D. 39; see Ideler, *Chronol.* 2, 309 sq.; comp. Joseph. *Ant.* 18, 6, 11; 7, 2), and, together with Herodias, who would not desert him in his misfortune, banished to Lyons in Gaul (Joseph. *Ant.* 18, 2), not to Vienna (Euseb. *Hist. Eccl.* 1, 11), but died in Spain (Joseph. *War.* 2, 9, 6), whither he eventually removed. (See Koch, *De anno natali J. C. per numnu et fata Antipoe demonstrato*, Helmst. 1721; comp. Zorn, *Biblioth. Antiq.* 1, 1021.) Although Josephus relates no great series of infamous acts on the part of Antipas, it is yet very evident that he was a frivolous prince (comp. ~~4085~~ Mark 8:15; ~~4132~~ Luke 13:32), abandoned to the pleasures of life (comp. Joseph. *Ant.* 18, 4, 5), destitute of firmness of character (comp. ~~4231~~ Luke 23:11), aware of his faults (~~4107~~ Luke 9:7 sq.), yet not disinclined to arbitrary acts (~~4238~~ Luke 13:38), whom Luke (3, 19) charges with many crimes (**πovηρά**); as likewise Jewish tradition. paints in the most disadvantageous light (Noble, *Hist. Idum.* p. 251 sq.). **SEE HEROD.**

**2.** A person “of royal lineage” in Jerusalem, and city treasurer, the first man seized by the assassins during the last war with the Romans; and soon after butchered in prison (Josephus, *War.* 4, 3, 4 and 5).

**3.** A “faithful martyr,” mentioned in Revelations 2:13. A.D. ante 100. He is said to have been one of our Savior’s first disciples, and a bishop of Pergamus, and to have been put to death in a tumult there by the priests of AEsculapius, who had a celebrated temple in that city (Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* 4, 5). Tradition relates that he was burned in a brazen bull under Domitian (*Acta Sanctorum*, 2, 3, 4). His day in the Greek calendar is April 11 (*Menol. Gr.* 3, 51).

### Antip’ater

(**Ἀντίπατρος**, *instead of his father*), the name of several men in the Apocrypha and Josephus.

1. The son of Jason, and one of the two ambassadors sent by the Jews in the time of the Maccabees to renew the league with the Romans and Lacedaemonians (1 Maccabees 12:16; 14:22).
2. The father of Herod the Great (q.v.) was, according to Josephus (*Ant.* 14, 1, 3; for other accounts of his parentage, see Nicolas of Damascus, *ap. Joseph.* in loc.; Africanus, *ap. Eusebius, Hist. Eccles.* 1, 6, 7; Photius, *Bibl.* 76 and 238), the son of a noble Idumaeon, to whom the government of that district had been given by Alexander Jannaeus (q.v.) and his queen Alexandra, and at their court the young Antipater was brought up. In B.C. 65 he persuaded Hyrcanus to take refuge from his brother Aristobulus II with Aretas, king of Arabia Petraa, by whom, accordingly, an unsuccessful attempt was made to replace Hyrcanus on the throne (*Joseph. Ant.* 14, 2; *War*, 1, 6, 2). In B.C. 64 Antipater again supported the cause of Hyrcanus before Pompey in Ccele-Syria (*Ant.* 14, 3, 2). In the ensuing year Jerusalem was taken by Pompey and Aristobulus deposed; and henceforth we find Antipater both zealously adhering to Hyrcanus and laboring to ingratiate himself with the Romans. His services to the latter, especially against Alexander, the son of Aristobulus, and in Egypt against Archelaus (B.C. 57 and 56), were favorably regarded by Scaurus and Gabinius, the lieutenants of Pompey; his active zeal against Mithridates of Pergamus in the Alexandrian war (B.C. 48) was rewarded by Julius Caesar with the gift of Roman citizenship; and, on Caesar's coming inmo Syria (B.C. 47), Hyrcanus was confirmed by him in the high-priesthood through Antipater's influence, notwithstanding the complaints of Antigonus, son of Aristobulus, while Antipater himself was appointed procurator of Judaea (*Josephus, Ant.* 14, 5, 1 and 2; 6, 2-4 and 8; *War*, 1, 8, 1 and 7; 9, 3-5). After Caesar had left Syria to go against Pharnaces, Antipater set about arranging the country under the existing government, and appointed his sons Phasaelus and Herod governors respectively of Jerusalem and Galilee (*Joseph. Ant.* 14, 9, 1 and 2; *War*, 1, 10, 4). In B.C. 46 he dissuaded Herod from attacking Hyrcanus, and in B.C. 43 (after Caesar's death) he regulated the tax imposed by Cassius upon Judaea for the support of the Roman troops (*Ant.* 14, 9, 5; 11, 2; *War*, 1, 10, 9; 11, 2). During the last-mentioned year he was carried off by poison which Malichus, whose life he had twice saved, bribed the cup-bearer of Hyrcanus to administer to him (*Ant.* 14, 11, 2-4; *War*, 1, 11, 2-4).
3. The eldest son of Herod the Great (q.v.) by his first wife, Doris (*Josephus, Ant.* 14, 12, 1). Josephus describes him as a monster of crafty

wickedness (**κακίας μυστήριον**, *War*, 1, 24, 1). Herod, having divorced Doris and married Mariamne, B.C. 38, banished Antipater from court (*War*, 1, 22, 1), but re. called him afterward, in the hope of checking the supposed resentment of Alexander and Aristobulus for their mother Mariamne's death. Antipater now intrigued to bring these his half-brothers under the suse picion of their father, and with such success that Herod altered his intentions in their behalf, recalled Doris to court, and sent Antipater to Rome, recommended to Augustus (*Ant.* 16, 3; *War*, 1, 23, 2), He still continued his machinations against his brothers, in concert with Salome and Pheroras, and aided by a certain Spartan Eurycles (comp. Plut. *Ant.* p. 9476), till he succeeded in accomplishing their death, B.C. 6 (Josephus, *Ant.* 16, 4, 11; *War*, 1, 23-27). **SEE ALEXANDER**. Having thus removed his rivals, and been declared successor to the throne, he entered into a plot with his uncle Pheroras against the life of his father; but this being discovered during his absence to Rome, whither he had gone to carry out a part of the scheme, he was remanded to Judaea by his father, and then tried before Varus, the Roman governor of Syria. The sentence against him being confirmed by Augustus, although with a recommendation of mercy, he was executed in prison by the order of his father, now himself in his last illness (Josephus, *Ant.* 17, 1-7; *War*, 1, 28-33; Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* 1, 8, 12).

**4.** The oldest of the three sons of Phasaelus by Salampsio, the daughter of Herod the Great (Josephus, *Ant.* 18, 5, 4). **SEE HEROD**.

**5.** The son of Salome, Herod's sister; he married his cousin Cypros, by whom he had a daughter Cypros (Joseph. *Ant.* 18:5, 4). He was an able orator, and in an extended speech opposed the confirmation of Archelaus (q.v.) in his royal legacy before the Emperor Augustus (*Ant.* 17, 9, 5). **See Herod**.

**6.** A Samaritan, steward of Antipater the son of Herod the Great, who tortured him in order to procure evidence against his master (Josephus, *War*, 1, 30, 5). See No. 3.

### Antip'atris

(**Ἀντιπατρίς**, from *Ant.pater*; in the Talmud **סרפריפנה**, see Lightfoot, *Hor. Illeb.* p. 109 sq.), a city built by Herod the Great, in honor of his father (Josephus, *Ant.* 16, 5, 2; *War*, 1, 21, 9), on the site of a former place called

*Caphar-saba* (Χαβαρζαβᾶ or Καφαρσαβᾶ, Josephus, *Ant.* 13, 15, 1; 16:5, 2). The spot (according to Ptolemy, lat. 32°, long. 66° 20') was well watered and fertile; a stream flowed round the city, and in its neighborhood were groves of large trees (Josephus, *Ant.* 16, 5, 2; *War.* 1, 21, 9). Caphar-saba was 120 stadia from Joppa; and between the two places Alexander Balas drew a trench, with a wall and wooden towers, as a defense against the approach of Antiochus (Josephus, *Ant.* 13, 15, 1; *War.* 1, 4, 7).

Antipatris also lay between Caesarea and Lydda (*Itin. Hieros.* p. 600). It was not exactly on the sea (Schleusner, *Lex. s.v.*), but full two miles inland (Josephus, *War.* 4, 8, 1) on the road leading to Galilee (Mishna, *Gattin.* 7, 7; comp. Reland, *Palest.* p. 409, 417, 444). These circumstances indicate that Antipatris was in the midst of a plain, and not at *A rsuf*, where the Crusaders supposed they had found it (Will. Tyr. 9:19; 14:16; Vitracus, c. 23; Brocard, c. 10; comp. Reland, *Palast.* p. 569, 570). On the road from Ramlah to Nazareth, north of Ras el-Ain, Prokesch (*Reise ins Heilige Land*, Wien, 1831) came to a place called *Kaffir Saba*; and the position which Berghaus assigns to this town in his map is almost in exact agreement with the position assigned to Antipatris in the *Itin. Hieros.*

Perceiving this, Raumer (*Palistina*, p. 144, 462) happily conjectured that this Kefr Saba was no other than the reproduced name of Caphar-saba, which, as in many other instances, has again supplanted the foreign, arbitrary, and later name of Antipatris (comp. the *Hall. Lit. — Zeit.* 1845, No. 230). This conjecture has been confirmed by Dr. Robinson, who gives Kefr Saba as the name of the village in question (*Researches*, 3, 46-48; see also later ed. of *Researches*, 3, 138, 139; and *Biblioth. Sac.* 1853, p. 528 sq.). Paul was brought from Jerusalem to Antipatris by night, on his route to Caesarea (<sup>4231</sup>Acts 23:31; comp. Thomson's *Land and Book*, 1, 258).

Dr. Robinson was of opinion, when he published his first edition, that the road which the soldiers took on this occasion led from Jerusalem to Caesarea by the pass of Beth-Horon, and by Lydda or Diospolis. This is the route which was followed by Cestius Gallus, as mentioned by Josephus (*War.* 2, 19, 1), and it appears to be identical with that given in the *Jerusalem Itinerary*, according to which Antipatris is 42 miles from Jerusalem, and 26 from Caesarea. Even on this supposition it would have been quite possible for troops leaving Jerusalem on the evening of one day to reach Caesarea on the next, and to start thence, after a rest, to return to (it is not said that they arrived at) their quarters at Jerusalem before nightfall. But the difficulty is entirely removed by Dr. Smith's discovery of a much shorter road, leading by Gophna direct to Antipatris. On this route

he met the Roman pavement again and again, and indeed says “he does not remember observing anywhere before so extensive remains of a Roman road” (*Biblioth. Sac.* 1843, p. 478-498). Van de Velde, however (*Memoir*, p. 285 sq.), contends that the position of *Mejdel Yaba* corresponds better to that of Antipatris. In the time of Jerome (*Epitaph. Paulce*, 108) it was a halfruined town. Antipatris, during the Roman era, appears to have been a place of considerable military importance (Josephus, *War*, 4, 8, 1). Vespasian, while engaged in prosecuting the Jewish war, halted at Antipatris two days before he resumed his career of desolation by burning, destroying, and laying waste the cities and villages in his way (see Conybeare and Howson, *Life and Epistles of St. Paul*, 2, 269). This city is supposed (by Calmet, s.v.) to have been the same with *Capharsaloma* (or *Capharsaroma*, perhaps also *Caparsemelia*; see Reland, *Palest.* p. 690, 691), where a battle was fought in the reign of Demeþtrius between Nicanor, a man who was an implacable enemy of the Jews, and Judas Maccabaeus, when five thousand of Nicanor’s army were slain, and the rest saved themselves by flight (1 Maccabees 7:26-32).

### Antiphilus

(*Ἀντίφιλος*, *instead of a friend*), a friend of Antipater, charged by the party of Pheroras with bringing from Egypt a poisonous draught for Herod (Josephus, *Ant.* 17, 4, 2; *War*, 1, 30, 5); a suspicion confirmed by a letter intercepted between Antiphilus and Antipater (*Ant.* 17, 5, 7). **SEE ANTIPATER.**

### Antiphon

(from *ἀντί*, *in turn*, and *φωνή*, *a sound*), the singing or chanting of one portion of a choir *in reply* to another when the psalms are sung or chanted. In the “responsorium” the verse is spoken only by one person on either side, or by one person on one side, though by many on the other; whereas, in antiphony, the verses are sung by the two parts of the choir alternately. Antiphonal singing is supposed to have been brought into use in the Western Church by Ambrose, who, about the year 374, is said to have introduced it into the Church of Milan, in imitation of the Eastern Church, where it appears to have been of greater antiquity, though as to the time of its institution authors are not agreed. The chanting of the psalms in this antiphonal manner was practiced by the Hebrews; and some of these were actually composed in alternate verses, with a view to their being used in a

responsive manner. In the English Church, where there is no choir, the reading of the Psalter is divided between the minister and the people; and in the cathedral service the psalms are chanted throughout, two full choirs being provided, stationed one on each side of the church. One of these, having chanted one of the verses, remains silent while the opposite choir replies in the verse succeeding; and at the end of the psalm the *Gloria Patri* is sung by the united choirs, accompanied by the organ. — Bingham, *Orig. Ecclesiastes* bk. 14, ch. 1, § 11. *SEE ANTHEM.*

### Antiphonarium or Antiphony

a Roman service-book containing all the anthems, responsories, collects, and whatever else was said or sung in the choir, except the lessons. It is sometimes called the *responsorium*, from the responses contained in it. The author of the Roman antiphonary was Gregory the Great. We read of nocturnal and diurnal antiphonaries, for the use of daily and nightly offices; of summer and winter antiphonaries; also antiphonaries for country churches. These and many other popish books were forbidden to be used by the 3 and 4 Edward VI. *SEE ANTIPHON*

### Antipope

(from *ἀντί*, *against*, i.e. a rival pope), a pontiff elected by the will of a sovereign, or the intrigues of a faction, in opposition to one canonically chosen. The emperors of Germany were the first to set up popes of their own nomination against those whom the Romans had elected without consulting them. Otho the Great displaced successively two bishops of Rome; and when Sylvester III had expelled from the capital of Christendom Benedict IX, whose profligacy had compromised in the eyes of all men the honor of the sovereign pontificate, Conrad II, king of Germany, brought back this worthless pastor, who hastened to sell his dignity to Gregory VI. As Benedict, however, soon repented of this transaction, there were now three popes at a time, and their number was increased to four by the election of Clement II in 1046. Shortly after, Alexander II found a rival in Honorius II; and in 1080 the same unseemly spectacle was witnessed, when Henry IV, emperor of Germany, elevated to the papal chair Guibert of Ravenna, under the title of Clement III, in opposition to his implacable adversary, Gregory VII. But after the death of Gregory Clement was himself opposed successively by Victor III and Urban II, and at last died at a distance from Rome, having just beheld the



exaltation of Pascal II as the successor of Urban. During the twelfth century several antipopes flourished, such as Gregory VIII and Honorius III. On the death of the latter, France began to intermeddle in these disgraceful strifes, and upheld the cause of Innocent II against Anaclet; while the kings of Sicily, on the other hand, frequently set up a pontiff of their own against the choice of the emperors. The thirteenth and fourteenth centuries swarm with antipopes; but what specially deserves notice is “the great schism of the West,” produced by these shameless rivalries in 1378 — a schism which divided the Church for fifty years. It broke out after the death of Gregory XI, at the election of Urban VI, whom the voice of the Roman people, demanding an Italian pope, and not one who should fix his pontificate, like several of his predecessors, at a distance from Rome, had elevated to the papal throne. The French cardinals objected, withdrew to Provence, and elected a new pope, under the name of Clement VII, who was recognised by France, Spain, Savoy, and Scotland; while Italy, Germany, England, and the whole north of Europe, supported Urban VI. These two popes excommunicated each other; nor did they even fear to compromise their sacred character by the most cruel outrages and the most odious insults. The schism continued after their death, when three popes made their appearance “in the field,” all of whom were deposed by the Council of Constance in 1415, and Cardinal Colonna elected in their room, under the title of Martin V. The last antipope was Clement VIII. With him the schism ceased; but the evil was done, and nothing could remedy it. The dogma of papal infallibility had received a mortal wound “in the house of its friends,” and the sceticism induced on this point rapidly extended to others. *SEE POPE*; *SEE PAPACY*.

### Antiquities, Sacred

a term that may be considered as embracing whatever relates to the religious, political, social, domestic, and individual life, not only of the Hebrew race, but also of those kingdoms, tribes, and persons that were connected with, or more or less influenced by the chosen people (with the exception of history and biography) in the several stages of its development prior to the capture of Jerusalem by the Romans, and to the usages of the Christian Church during the earlier ages.

**I. Biblical.** — The Scriptures themselves are the great source whence a knowledge of Hebrew and Christian antiquities may be drawn; and whoever wishes to have an accurate and thorough acquaintance with the

subject must, with this express purpose in view, make the holy record the object of a careful, sustained, and systematic study. Much of the Old Testament is, in the best sense of the term, picture writing; and the history of the Savior carries us into the very bosom of domestic life. The knowledge which is acquired from these sources is peculiarly valuable, from the stamp of truth which every part of it bears. Few, however, have the disposition, the leisure, or the ability for the requisite study; and therefore the aid of the scholar and divine is desirable, if not indispensable. But besides what may be learned from the Scriptures themselves, much remains to be known which they do not and cannot teach; for, like all other books relating to ages long by-gone, they contain allusions, phraseology, modes of thought and speech, which can be understood either not at all, or but imperfectly, without light derived from extraneous sources; and that the rather because the Hebrews were not a literary people, and the aim of the sacred penmen was far higher than to achieve intellectual reputation. The heathen writers afford very scanty materials for illustrating biblical antiquities, so ignorant or prejudiced were they on topics of that kind. Indirect information and undesigned testimonies may be here and there extracted from their writings, but in general they communicate no useful information except on geographical and kindred subjects. The least barren of them is the earliest prose writer extant, Herodotus, who, in his second book and part of the third, furnishes snatches of information which may be of service, especially in conjunction with the light which recent discoveries in Egyptian antiquities have so happily thrown on the biblical records (*The Egypt of Herodotus*, by John Kenrick, M.A. 1841; *Manners and Customs of the Ancient Egyptians*, by Sir J. G. Wilkinson, 1837, 1841).

The study of biblical antiquities, viewed as an aid in the interpretation of the books of the Old Testament, began probably on the return from the Babylonish exile, when a lengthened past already stretched out to the Israelitish nation as they looked back toward their origin; and, from the new circumstances in which they were placed, and the new modes of thought and action to which they had become habituated, they must have found many things in their sacred books which were as difficult to be understood as they were interesting to their feelings. The ideas, views, and observations which thence resulted were held, taught, transmitted, and from age to age augmented by Jewish doctors, whose professed duty was the expounding of the law of the fathers; and after having passed through many generations by oral communication, were at length, in the second and

some subsequent centuries of the Christian era, committed to writing. *SEE TALMUD*. This source of information, as being traditionary in its origin, and disfigured by ignorance, prejudice, and superstition, must, to be of any service, be used with the greatest care and discrimination. It seems, however, to have fallen into somewhat undue depreciation, but has been successfully employed by recent writers in delineating a picture of the age in which our Lord appeared (*Das Jahrhundert des Heils*, by Gfrorer, Stuttgart, 1838). In the first century Josephus wrote two works of unequal merit, on *The Jewish War* and *The Antiquities of the Jews*, which, notwithstanding some credulity and bad faith on the part of the author, afford valuable information, particularly in relation to the manners, customs, and opinions of his own times. Had another work of which the writer speaks (preface to the *Antiquities*) come down to these days, which appears to have been a sort of philosophical treatise on the Mosaic laws and institutions, giving probably, after the manner of Michaelis in his *Mosaisches Recht*, the *rationale* of the several observances enjoined, some considerable light might have been thrown on the antiquities of the nation, though the known propensity of Josephus to the allegorical method of interpretation diminishes the regret experienced at its loss. The works of Philo, the celebrated Alexandrian teacher, which were also produced in the first century, have their value too much abated by his love of the same allegorical method; which he was led to pursue mainly by his desire to bring the mind of the Hebrew nation into harmony with Oriental, and especially Grecian systems of philosophy, of which Philo was a diligent student and a great admirer. Little advantage is to be gained by the study of writers among the modern Jews; for, till a very recent period, no sound intellectual activity was found among this singular and most interesting race. Inspired, however, by the spirit of the eighteenth century, Mendelssohn opened to his fellow-believers a new era, and introduced a manner of thinking and writing which prepared the way for many valuable Jewish productions, and gave an impulse to the mind of "the nation," the best outward results of which are only beginning to be seen.

The study of classical antiquity, which commenced at the revival of letters, was not without an influence on biblical archaeology; but this branch of knowledge is chiefly indebted for its most valuable results to the systematic study of the Bible, and the cultivation of the long-neglected Hebrew language, which the interests of the Reformation both needed and called forth. It was not, however, till within the last century that the intelligent

spirit which had been applied to the examination of classical antiquity in Germany so directed the attention of Oriental scholars to the true way of prosecuting and developing a knowledge of Hebrew and Christian antiquities as to bring forth treatises on the subject which can be regarded as satisfactory in the present advanced state of general scholarship. In no one thing has the mental activity of recent times contributed more to the science of biblical antiquities than by leading well-informed travelers to penetrate into eastern countries, especially Syria, since, by communicating to the world the fruits of their enterprise, they have been enabled to present to no small extent a picture of what these lands and their inhabitants must have been of old, permanence being one of the chief characteristics of the Oriental mind. From Shaw (*Travels in Barbary and the Levant*) and Harmer (*Observations on various Passages of Scripture*) down to the valuable work by Prof. Robinson (*Biblical Researches in Palestine*, 1841, 1856), a numerous series of publications have been put forth, which have contributed to throw very great light on Jewish and Christian antiquity.

The earliest treatise in the English language expressly on the subject of Jewish antiquities was written by Th. Godwyn, B.D. (*Moses and Aaron, Civil and Ecclesiastical Rites used by the Ancient Hebrews observed*, etc. 4to, 1614). This work passed through many editions in England; was translated into Latin by J. H. Reiz (1679); furnished with a preface and two dissertations by Witsius (1690); was illustrated, amended, and enlarged by Hottinger (1710); and further annotated on by Carpzovius (1748). In 1724 - 5, Thomas Lewis gave to the public his *Origines Hebroeoe, or Antiquities of the Hebrew Republic*, 4 vols. 8vo, which is a very elaborate and carefully compiled treatise, composed of materials drawn from the best authorities, both Jewish and Christian. A work of much value, as affording fuller views on some topics, and written in an easy style, is a posthumous publication by Dr. Jennings, entitled *Jewish Antiquities, or a Course of Lectures on the three First Books of Godwyn's Moses and Aaron*, London, 1766; edited, with a preface of some value, by Philip Furneaux. Fleury's work (Dr. Adam Clarke's edition) on *The Manners of the Ancient Israelites, containing an Account of the peculiar Customs, Laws, Policy, and Religion of the Israelites*, offers a pleasing and useful introduction to the study of the Old Testament Scriptures. A valuable and (for ordinary purposes) complete treatise may be found by the English student in *Biblical Antiquities*, by John Jahn, D.D., translated by T. C. Upham (Andover, 1827, etc.; N.Y. 1858). Those who wish to enter more fully into

the subject may consult the original, of which the foregoing is an abridgment (*Biblische Archaologie*). A carefully compiled and well-written work may be found in *The Antiquities of the Jews from authentic Sources, and their Customs illustrated by Modern Travels*, by W. Brown, D.D. (2 vols. 8vo, Lond. 1820). Much important matter is presented in *Academical Lectures on the Jewish Scriptures and Antiquities*, by J. G. Palfrey, D.D., LL.D. (2 vols. 8vo, Boston, 1840). German scholars have produced numerous works on the subject, of which we may mention as worthy of special attention, G. L. Bauer's *Kurzgefasstes Lehrbuch der Hebr. Alterthumer des A. u. N.T.* (second edition, by E. F. K. Rosenmuller, Leipsic, 1835); J. Matthew A. Scholz's *Handbuch der Bibl. Archaologie* (Bonn u. Wien, 1834); De Wette (*Lehrbuch der Hebr. — Judisch. Archaologie*, Leips. 1830), translated by Rev. Theodore Parker, Bost. *Helon's Pilgrimage to Jerusalem* may serve as a connecting link between Jewish and Christian antiquities, being almost equally useful for both, as it presents a picture of Judaism in the century which preceded the advent of our Savior. The English translation (by the Rev. John Kenrick, M.A.) from the German original is accompanied by valuable notes and a preface, in which may be found a brief outline of the sources of biblical archaeology. The work is conceived and executed in the form of a story or novel, and possesses no ordinary interest, independently of its high theological value, as affording a living picture of the customs, opinions, and laws of the Jewish people. In French there is a somewhat similar work by M. de Montbron, under the unsuitable title of *Essais sur la Litterature des Hebreux* (4 tomes, 12mo, Paris, 1819), in which a number of short tales illustrative of ancient Hebrew usages and opinions are prefaced by a large and elaborate Introduction, and followed by a great number of learned and curious notes.

**II. Ecclesiastical Antiquities.** — Among the fathers of the Christian Church, Jerome, who was long resident in Palestine, has left in various works very important information respecting the geography, natural history, and customs of the country. Most of the fathers, indeed, furnish, directly or indirectly, valuable notices respecting Christian antiquity, and in a body constitute the source whence for the most part writers and scholars of later ages have drawn their materials. The reader may with advantage consult *Some Account of the Writings and Opinions of Clement of Alexandria*, by John, bishop of Lincoln (1835); also, *Some Account of the Writings and Opinions of Justin Martyr*, by the same (Cambridge, 1829).

A useful compendium, as giving specimens of the writings, and therein views of the opinions, manners, rites, and observances of the early Christian Church, may be found in *Bibliothèque Choisie des Peres de l'Eglise Grecque et Latine*, by M. N. S. Guillon (Paris, 1828).

For a long period after the revival of learning the subject of Christian antiquities received no specific attention, but was treated more or less summarily in general histories of the Church of Christ; as, for instance, in the great Protestant work, *Ecclesiast. Historia per aliquot viros in urbe Magdeburg* (1559-74); and on the part of the Catholics, by Baronius, *Annales Ecclesiast. a Christo nato ad annum 1198* (Romans 1558). If any exception is to be made to this general statement, it is on behalf of Roman Catholic writers, whose works, however, are too inaccurate and prejudiced to be of any great value in these times. The first general treatise on Christian antiquity proceeded from the pen of an English divine, Jos. Bingham, *Origines Ecclesiasticæ, or the Antiquities of the Christian Church* (London, 1708-22, 10 vols. 8vo); which was translated into Latin by Grischow (1738), and into German (1778). The work corresponds in no slight degree to the learning, care, and time bestowed upon it; but, besides being somewhat in the rear of the learning of the day, it has its value diminished by the High-Church notions of the writer, as well as by the strength of his prejudices against the Roman Catholics. A useful compendium, written in a liberal spirit; and compiled chiefly from German sources, has lately been published in English (*A Manual of Christian Antiquities*, by Rev. J. E. Riddle, M.A. London, 1839), in which (Preface, § 2, and Appendix H) may be found a concise but detailed account of the literature of Christian antiquities. A more complete catalogue of works, embracing each particular branch, is given in Winer's *Handbuch der Theologischen Literatur*. Among the best Continental treatises on the general subject of Christian antiquities may be mentioned those of Augusti, *Handbuch d. Christl. Archæol.* (Leipzig, 1836-7, 3 vols. 8vo); Bohmer, *Die christl.-kirchl. Alterthums Wissenschaft* (Bresl. 1836, 8vo); Siegel, *Handbuch der christl.-kirchl. Alterthümer* (Leipzig, 1836-7, 3 vols. 8vo).  
**SEE ARCHAEOLOGY.**

**III.** Other treatises on Biblical archaeology in general: Muller (Giess. 1830); Ugolini (Venet. 1744-69); Bellermann (Erf. 1787 and 1812); Ackermann (Wien, 1826); Schmidt (Neust. 1834). On Hebrew antiquities: Iken (Brem. 1732, etc.); Wahner (Gott. 1743); Warnekros (Weim. 1782, etc.); Faber (Halle, 1773); Babor (Weim. 1794, Lpz. 1805); Pareau (Ultraj.

1823); Wait (Cambr. 1825); Hullmann (Lpz. 1834); Kalthoff (Munst. 1840). On Christian antiquities: Fabricius (Hamb. 1760); Palaeotinus (Ven. 1766)1; Blackmore (Lond. 1760); Baumgarten (Hal. 1768); Simonis (Hal. 1769); Chrysander (Lpz. 1775); Selvaggi (Neap. 1772); Pellica (Neap. 1777-81); Haag (Tub. 1785); Volborth (Gott. 1789); Binterim (Mainz, 1825-32); Rheinwald. (Berl. 1830); Locherer (Frkf. 1832); Miinter (Kopenh. 1828); Borsius (Lugd. B. 1825). For the *sources* of biblical antiquities, *SEE ARCHAEOLOGY*, where also will be given a more detailed view of the Christian department of the subject.

### Anti-Sabbatarians

those who reject the Sabbath, both Jewish and Christian. *SEE SABBATH*.

### Antitactae

(q. d. ἀντιτακταί, from ἀντιτάσσω, to *resist*), the Antinomian branch of the Gnostics. Gnosticism regarded matter as absolutely evil, and the body as the seat and source of evil. Gnostic morality, therefore, consisted in the mortification of the body. One class of Gnostic sects tried to attain this end by means of rigorous asceticism, *SEE ENCRATITES*, the other by wilfully abusing it for debauchery. The latter class bore the collective name Antitactae, as they considered the law as not obligatory for them, and intended to show their contempt of the law, and of the Demiurgos, the author of matter, and, consequently, of evil, by purposely transgressing the commandments of the law. To this class belong the Carpocratians, Basilidians, and others. Whether any particular sect ever bore the name Antitactae is still controverted. Neander, *Ch. Hist.* 1, 451. See GNOSTICISM.

### Antitrinitarians

a general name either applied to all who oppose the doctrine of the Trinity (q.v.), or, in a more restricted sense, to the opponents of the Trinity in the first three centuries of the Christian Church and to those of the 16th century.

**I.** The Antitrinitarians of the ancient church, before the Council of Nice, were generally called Monarchians (q.v.). They may be divided into two classes: the rationalistic or dynamic, who denied the divinity of Christ, regarding him merely as a man filled with divine power, and the

Patripassians (q.v.), who identified the Son with the Father, or admitted at most only a modal Trinity. The first class had its representatives even in the Apostolical Church, for Cerinthus (q.v.) taught that the origin of Jesus was merely human; and the Ebionites, though differing on some doctrinal points, agreed in denying the divinity of Christ, one class regarding him as the son of Mary and Joseph, while the others, although looking upon him as born of the Virgin through the Holy Ghost, and acknowledging him to be a superhuman being, yet denied his divinity. The Magi (about 170) rejected the doctrine of the Logos and the Gospel of John. Theodotus the Elder, or the Tanner, was excommunicated about 200 by Bishop Victor, of Rome, for teaching that Christ was begotten in a miraculous way, but otherwise a man, without any superiority to others except that of righteousness. From the sect founded by him proceeded Theodotus the Younger, or the Money-broker, who advocated, but at the same time modified the views of the elder Theodotus. He maintained that the “Logos” dwelt in Melchizedek to a higher degree than in Christ, and thus became the founder of the Melchizedecians. Of greater influence than the heretics thus far named was Artemon (q.v.), who was also excluded from the Church of Rome for maintaining that the established doctrine of the church had always been that Christ was only a man, until Bishop Zephyrinus, of Rome, had introduced the newer doctrine of his divinity. Artemon also admitted the superhuman origin of Christ, but denied that he was superior to the prophets except by virtue. The most important of the representatives of this class of early Antitrinitarians is Paul of Samosata, bishop of Antioch, who was deposed for heresy in 269. He maintained that Christ, as a man, was begotten by the Holy Ghost; that the “Logos” which then began personally to exist dwelt in Christ as a divine power, by the use of which he rose above all other men, and became participant of divinity, which, therefore, was for him a moral, not a natural dignity.

The first representatives of the second class of the early Antitrinitarians was Praxeas (q.v.), a confessor in the time of Marcus Aurelius, and a prominent opponent of the Montanists. He taught that the Father himself descended into the Virgin, that he was born from her, and suffered, and that he (the Father) himself was Christ; that only in so far as he assumed flesh in Jesus he was called Son; that he was not, personally or otherwise, different from the Son, “but made himself the Son” (*ipse se sibi filium fecit*), and that he suffered in the Son (*pater compassus est filio*). His adherents, therefore, were called “*Patripassians*.” Noetus (q.v.) of



Smyrna, and probably a presbyter of Ephesus, was excluded about 230 from his church as a Patripassian. He denied this charge, and we are not fully informed about the peculiar kind of Monarchianism to which he was attached. Callistus, bishop of Rome, is also said to have belonged to this class. Beryllus of Bostra (q.v.) denied that Christ had any personal existence before his incarnation, or that there was in Christ a divine nature distinct from that of his Father, but he conceded that the Godhead of the Father dwelt in the person of Jesus. Under the instruction of Origen, he repudiated his views at the Synod of Bostra in 244. The views of Beryllus were further developed by Sabellius (q.v.), a presbyter of Ptolemais (250-260). According to him, God is an absolute, undivided unity (*μοναξ*), and the “Logos” is the self-revelation of God in the world. The Father reveals himself as God when he gives the law, as Son when he becomes man in Christ, and as Holy Spirit when he inspires the hearts of the believers.

**II.** *The Middle Ages.* — There are few traces of Antitrinitarian doctrines in the church history of the Middle Ages. Amalric of Bena, and his disciple, David of Dinanto, regarded the names of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost as expressions for three different ages of the world. The Paulicians, the Catharists, and some other sects, revived, with other Gnostic and Manichæan heresies, also those concerning the Trinity.

**III.** *The Time of the Reformation.* — The rationalistic element, concealed and suppressed by the Church of Rome, came to the surface naturally at the period of the Reformation. The Anabaptist attack on practical points coincided in time, and partly in the men themselves, with the theoretical attack on the orthodox doctrine of the Trinity. To the first Antitrinitarians of this period belongs Johannes Denk (died 1528), who regarded the “Logos” as the totality of all human souls, which received its highest development in Jesus. He denied consistently the pre-existence of the Logos, the divinity of Christ, and the Trinity. Hetzer, who was executed at Basel in 1529, seems to have been a disciple of Denk. Campanus, who died in prison at Cleves, was more attached to Arian views. He regarded the relation of the Father to the “Logos” as a kind of marital relation, and the Holy Ghost as an impersonal emanation from both. The views of David Georgs or Joris, of Delft, in Holland, were intermediate between Sabellianism and the Pantheism of Amalric of Bena. He regarded God as an undivided unity and as impersonal, but as having become man in three persons, Moses, Elias, Christ or Moses, Christ, David (himself),

corresponding to three ages of the world. Servetus, who was burned in 1529, sought to unite Sabellianism with the teachings of Paul of Samosata. God, as undivided unity, is the Father; as descending upon the man Jesus, he is the "Logos;" Jesus, pervaded by the "Logos," is the Son; God, as the power which penetrates all creatures, and especially the human soul, is called the Holy Ghost. Later he modified his views, and represented God as the essence of all things; the Logos as the self-revelation of God, and including within himself the ideas of all other things; and the Holy Ghost as the self-communication of God to the creatures, and as identical with the world-soul. All the Antitrinitarians of this period thus far mentioned were more or less addicted to a pantheistic mysticism, and in their views concerning the Trinity agreed more with Sabellius than with Arius. One of the first prominent representatives of a rationalistic Antitrinitarianism was Gribaldo, a learned Italian jurist, who maintained that the Son was another God of the same nature, but derived from the Father. This doctrine of three gods of unequal rank was completed by Gentilis, a Calabrian. The adherents of Antitrinitarian views in the Reformed Church of Poland were expelled in 1565, and have since been known as Unitarians (q.v.). They honored Jesus simply as a man, but one who was richly endowed by God, and exalted for dominion over the whole world. Most of them paid adoration to him. The Unitarians were organized as a community, and received a complete system of doctrine from Faustus Socinus (q.v.), who carried out the views first set forth by his uncle, Lselius Socinus, an Italian nobleman. The principal article of his system was an attempt at an accommodation between different parties by the doctrine that, although Jesus was born a mere man, he was nevertheless without any earthly father, and was wonderfully endowed by God; was taken up into heaven, and the reward of his life was deified, that he might be a mediator to bring man, alienated from God by sin, to the knowledge and grace of God, and that he might reign as the king of his people in all periods of time. The Freethinkers, Deists, and Rationalists were, of course, all Antitrinitarians. In Germany, Seebach and Dippel were prominent by their opposition to the doctrine of the Trinity; in England, Whiston, Clarke, Lindsey, and Priestly. Owing especially to this influence, Unitarian congregations were organized in England at the close of the 18th century. In the United States the spreading of Rationalism, especially among the Congregationalists, led, in 1815, to a formal separation, and the organization of a Unitarian denomination. With them another religious denomination, who simply call themselves Christians, as well as the Universalists, and a seceding portion

of the Society of Friends (the “Hicksites”), agree in the distinctive article of their faith. Swedenborg substituted for the doctrine of the Trinity a threefold revelation of the one God, who was obliged to become man that he might give a human character to the doctrines of faith, and drive back the powers of hell. Several denominations, as the Disciples, Mennonites, Quakers, and others, without rejecting the divinity of Christ, or explaining his relation to the Father, are opposed to the expression Trinity, as not being used by the Bible.

In Germany, Sabellianism has found many admirers in the school of speculative theology. Schleiermacher, in particular, was of opinion that Sabellianism both avoided the difficulties of the church doctrine, which he regarded as insoluble, and yet satisfied the natural desire of the Christian to attribute to Christ the highest predicate without endangering Monotheism (*Chriistische Glaubenslehre*, 2d ed. 2:532). Many new attempts were made to advocate a Trinitarian idea of God in a sense entirely different from that of the church doctrine. We refer to them more fully in the article TRINITY *SEE TRINITY*. See Lange, *Geschwichte der Unitarier vor der nic. Synode* (Leipz. 1831, 8vo); Bock, *Historia Antitrinitariorum* (Koenigsberg, 1774-84, 2 vols. 8vo); Trechsel, *Die Protestant. Antitrin. vor F. Socin* (Heidelb. 1839, 1844, 2 vols. 8vo); Hagenbach, *Hist. of Doctrines*, 1, 131; 2:210, 328, 478; Wallace, *Antitrin. Biog.* (Lond. 1850, 3 vols. 8vo); Shedd, *Hist. of Doctrines*, 1, 254 sq.; Schaff, *Ch. Hist.* 1, 287 sq. *SEE CHRISTOLOGY*.

## Antitype

that which answers to a type or figure. The corresponding Greek word, *ἀντίτυπος*, occurs twice in the New Testament (~~802~~ Hebrews 9:24; ~~402~~ 1 Peter 3:21), where it is rendered “figure” (q.v.). A type, in its primary and literal meaning, simply denotes a rough draught, or less accurate model, from which a more perfect image is made; but in the sacred and theological sense of the term, a type may be defined to be a symbol of something future and distant, or an example prepared and evidently designed by God to prefigure that future thing. What is thus prefigured is called the antitype. *SEE TYPE*.

## Antoine, Nicole

an apostate from Christianity to Judaism, was born at St. Brieu in 1600, and joined early the Reformed Church. A few years later he applied for admission among the Jews, but in vain. Having returned to Geneva, he

became a teacher, and afterward Reformed pastor, at Divonne, where he preached only on texts from the Old Testament, rarely mentioning the name of Jesus, and professing strange opinions about him. He fell for some time into insanity, and, having recovered, acknowledged again his faith in Judaism. He was accused at Geneva of blasphemy, and burned in 1632. — Pierer, *Univ.* — *Lexikon*, s.v.

## Antonia

### Picture for Antonia

(a frequent Roman name, fem. of ANTONIUS), the name of two females mentioned by Josephus.

**1.** The mother of Germanicus and Claudius (afterward emperor); she loaned Herod Agrippa money to retrieve his credit with Tiberius (Josephus, *Ant.* 18, 6, 4). She was a woman of eminent virtue (*ib.* 6). She was born about B.C. 36, and lived to see the accession of her grandson Caligula (see Smith's *Dict. of Class. Ant.* s.v.).

**2.** A daughter of the Emperor Claudius by Petina (Josephus, *War*, 2, 12, 7). Nero had her put to death on a charge of treason, after her refusal to marry him (Suet. *Claud.* 27; *Ner.* 35; Tacit. *Ann.* 12, 2; 13:23; 15:53; Dio Cass. 9:5).

## Antonia

(*Ἀντωνία*, from *Antony*), a fortress in Jerusalem, on the north side of the area of the Temple, often mentioned by Josephus in his account of the later wars of the Jews. It was originally built by the Maccabees, under the name of *Baris*, and was afterward rebuilt with great strength and splendor by the first Herod (Josephus, *Ant.* 15, 11). In a more particular description Josephus states (*War*, 5,5, 8) that the fortress stood upon a rock or hill fifty cubits high, at the north-west corner of the temple area, above which its wall rose to the height of forty cubits. Within it had the extent and appearance of a palace, being divided into apartments of every kind, with galleries and baths, and broad halls or barracks for soldiers; so that, as having every thing necessary within itself, it seemed a city, while in magnificence it resembled a palace. At each of the four corners was a tower. Three of these were fifty cubits high; but the fourth, at the south-east corner, was seventy cubits high, and overlooked the whole temple,

with its courts. The fortress communicated with the northern and western porticoes of the temple area, and had flights of stairs descending into both, by which the garrison could at any time enter the courts of the Temple and prevent tumults. On the north it was separated from the hill Bezetha by a deep trench, lest it should be approachable from that quarter, and the depth of the trench added much to the apparent elevation of the towers (*War*, 5,4, 2).

This fortress is called ἡ παρεμβολή in the New Testament (<sup><4213></sup>Acts 21:34, 37), and is the “castle” into which Paul was carried from the Temple by the soldiers, from the stairs of which he addressed the people collected in the adjacent court (<sup><4213></sup>Acts 21:31-40). Dr. Robinson (*Researches*, 1, 422) conceives that the deep and otherwise inexplicable excavation called “the pool of Bethesda” was part of the trench below the north wall of this fortress; in which case, as he remarks, its extent must have been much more considerable than has usually been supposed. *SEE JERUSALEM.*

### Antonians

**1.** A sect of Antinomians in Switzerland, followers of Anton Unternahrer, born a Roman Catholic at Entlebuch, 1761, whose mind seems to have been unsettled. In 1799 he began to hold meetings, and soon after announced himself as the Son of Man.

This he tried to demonstrate in the most singular manner from a number of scriptural passages, from his name, and from circumstances of his body and life. On Good Friday, 1802, he appeared, with a number of adherents, before the minster of Berne, proclaiming an impending crisis. He also summoned the government of the canton to appear before him. This led to his arrest and to an investigation, in consequence of which he was sentenced to two years imprisonment. As soon as dismissed from the prison, he again held assemblies in the neighborhood of Thun, was again arrested, and sentenced (April 4. 1805) to life-long banishment from the canton. He then went to Schlipfhelm in the canton of Lucerne, where he was visited by many of his adherents. The government was first inclined to treat him as a monomaniac, but subsequently arrested him, and kept him in prison until his death in 1824. Unternahrer published fifteen small volumes, several of which were printed secretly. All are written in the tone and language of the Bible. He combined the passages of the Bible without any regard to sense and connection, and justified this arbitrariness by saying

that the Scriptures were only “fragments,” and that he, as the Man of God, had the mission to put these fragments together in the proper way. Of God he speaks as a personal being, having all the attributes given to him in the Scriptures. Still, his conception is unconsciously pantheistic, inasmuch as he regards him merely as a natural being, without the idea of concrete holiness. He also accepted the doctrine of the Trinity, but thought himself to be the God who became man the second time. Every thing created by God, inclusive of man, with all his natural instincts, was regarded by him as good; the making of any distinction, as between good and evil, he declared to be the work of the devil. According to him, the man who recognises all such distinctions as opposed to the will of God, is redeemed. The redemption of mankind was begun by Christ, and completed by himself (Unternahrer). All institutions of church and state, marriage, property, religious service, sacraments, he denounced and cursed as distinctions taught by the devil. The only religious service he taught consisted in the cultivation of love — in particular, sexual love, without any restraint or distinction whatever. He found adherents in several places, and many continued to believe in him even after his death, expecting that his spirit would appear again in another form. In Amsoldingen, his former place of residence, the sect was suppressed in 1805. In Wohlen, near Berne, and several adjoining communities, a certain Bendicht Schori —became the center of the sect. They were summoned before the courts in 1830, but dismissed with a moderate fine, and still exist. Another branch of the sect existed in the community of Gsteig, near Interlachen, under the leadership of Christ. Michel. The courts several times proceeded a-ainst this branch (1821, 1830, and 1840), and in 1841 Michel and others were sentenced to five years’ imprisonment. Traces and branches of this sect, it is said, may also still be found in the cantons of Lucerne, Aargau, and Zurich. (See *Zyro, Chr. Michel und seine Anhanger*, in Trechsel’s *Beitrdge zur Geschichte der Schweiz. reform. Kirche*). Herzog, 1, 410.

2. The name of several orders. *SEE ANTHONY, ORDERS OF.*

### Antoniewicz, Charles Bolaz

a Polish poet and pulpit orator, born at Lemberg, Nov. 6, 1807, died at Obra, Nov. 14, 1852. He early distinguished himself as a poet, and took an active part in the Polish revolution of 1830. After the death of his wife he entered, in 1839, the order of Jesuits,; and at once obtained the reputation of being the most distinguished among the living Polish pulpit orators. His

countrymen compared him with Lacordaire (q.v.) and Ventura (q.v.). He had, in particular, great success as an apostle of temperance. Antoniewicz contributed many poetical and theological articles to Polish journals, and also published a number of books, as *Sonettes* (1828), *Bielang* (1829), *Reminiscences of Polish Convents*, etc. A biographical sketch of Antoniewicz, in Polish (“*Reminiscences of the Life and the Writings of Antoniewicz*”), was published by the priest Ignaz Polkowski (Warsaw, 1861). — *Unsere Zeit*, 8, 717 sq.

### Antoninus Titus Aurelius Fulvius Bojonius Pius,

a Roman emperor, Born Sept. 19, A.D. 86, at a villa near Lanuvium (now Civita-Lavinia), and died at Lorium (now Castel di-Guido), March 7, 161. He was first one of the four administrators of Italy, afterward proconsul of Asia. Adrian having adopted him, he became his successor as Roman emperor, and governor from 138 to 161. He showed himself in every respect one of the greatest and noblest emperors pagan Rome ever had. He was just, mild, liberal, a supporter of science and art, and averse to carrying on war. Under Adrian he saved the lives of many senators whose execution had been ordered, and he prevailed on Adrian himself to desist from committing suicide. The Roman empire greatly prospered under his administration, and neighboring nations frequently chose him as an umpire of their feuds. From him are the celebrated sayings: “I prefer saving one citizen to slaying a thousand enemies,” and “A prince must have no property of his own, but devote every thing to the common weal.” He protected the Christians when the pagans ascribed several public calamities, as the inundation of the Tiber, the earthquake in Greece, conflagrations, etc., to the wrath of the gods, in consequence of the Christians being tolerated. Antoninus forbade all towns in Greece, and especially Larissa, Thessalonica, and Athens, to persecute the Christians. Eusebius (*Hist. Eccles.* 4, 13) gives a rescript of this emperor to the assembly of deputies of Asia Minor, ordering even the punishment of such as would accuse Christians; but it is doubtful whether this decree is genuine. — Capitolinus, *Vita Antonini*; Wenck, *Divus Pius, sive ad leges imp. Tit. Ael. Anton. Pii Commentarii* (Lips. 1804-1805); Gautier de Sibert, *Vie d'Antonin*; Eichstadt, *Exercitationes Antoninianas* (Jen. 1821 sq.); Hofner, *De edicto Ant. pro Chris.* (Argent. 1781); Hegelmaier, *In edictum Ant.* (Tub. 1776); Wolle, *De δεισιδαμονίᾳ Antonini* (Lips. 1730); Keuchen, *Anton. P.* (Arrst. 1667); Meermann, *id.* (Haag, 1807); Beykert, *De edicto Ant. P.* (Argent. 1781); Smith's *Dict. of Class. Biog.* s.v.

## Antoninus, Marcus Annii Verus Aurelius.

### SEE AURELIUS.

Antoninus, archbishop of Florence: his real name was *Antonius*, but he was called by the diminutive Antoninus on account of his small stature. Born at Florence in 1389, he entered at sixteen years of age the order of St. Dominic, and soon acquired such a reputation that, even when yet quite young, he was intrusted with the government of various houses of his order, at Cortona, Rome, Naples, Florence, etc., and contributed greatly to its reformation. In 1439 he took part in the Council of Florence. In 1446, Pope Eugenius IV appointed him to the archbishopric of Florence. He died in 1459, and Pius II granted a plenary indulgence of seven years to all persons who kissed his body before it was placed in the tomb! He was canonized in 1523. His works are:

1. *Summa Historialis, set, Chronicon Tripartitum*; from the creation to the year 1459 (Venice, 1481, Basle, 1491, 5 vols. fol., and elsewhere): —
2. *Summa Theologiae moralis, partibus 4 distincta* (Venice, 1477, 4 vols.; a new edition, with very copious notes by Father Mamachi, Venice, 1751, 4 vols. 4to): —
3. *Summa Confessionalis* (Argent. 1492, Venice, 1572): —
4. *Annotationes de Donatione Constantmni M.*: —
5. *Triologus de Discipulis Emmaunticis*; with his *Life*: —
6. *De Virtutibus liaer*. His life is given by Echard, *De Script. Ord. Prmdicat.* 1, 818, and in the *Acta Sanctorum*, vol. 1:— Cave, *Hist. Lit.* anno 1444 Landon, *Eccles. Dictionary*, s.v.; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 2, 859.

### Antoninus

a martyr, who is said to have suffered either in the fourth or in the seventh century. He has been commemorated at Pamiers, France, since the eighth century, on the 2d of September. — Landon, *Eccles. Dictionary*, 1, 431.

### Antoninus

a priest and martyr of Palestine, who is said to have been present at Caesarea with Zebinus and Germanus, and, together with them, reproached



the governor Firmilianus for sacrificing to idols, for which they were put to death. This happened under Galerius Maximilianus. They are commemorated as saints in the Roman Church on the 13th of November. — Ruinart, p. 327; Landon, *Eccles. Dictionary*, 1, 432.

### Antoninus Honoratus

bishop of Constantina or of Cirta, in Africa. He is chiefly known by a letter of his (A.D. 437) to a Spanish bishop named Arcadius, and three others, banished by Genseric, king of the Vandals, because they would not embrace Arianism. He exhorts them to suffer patiently for the sake of Jesus Christ. The letter is short, but written in vigorous and even elevated language. It is given in Baronius, *Annales*, A.D. 437, and in the *Bibl. Patrum*, 8, 665. — Cave, *Hist. Lit.* 1, 338; Dupin, *Hist. Eccl. Writers*, 1, 447; Hoefer, *Biog. Generale*, 2, 859.

### Antonio, Augustine

of Saragossa, in Aragon, son of the vice-chancellor of that kingdom; studied at Salamanca, whence he passed into Italy, and made himself master of law, ecclesiastical history, languages, etc. At twenty-five years of age he published *Emenditiones et Opiniones Juris Civilis*. Paul III made him auditor of the Rota; and Julius, his successor, sent him as legate into England when Philip of Spain went there to marry Queen Mary. He was made successively bishop of Alifa in 1556, and Lerida in 1561, and lastly, in 1576, archbishop of Tarragona, which dignity he held till his death in 1586. Baluze has given a list of his works at the end of his *Treatise on the Correction of Gratian*, which is the most considerable of his writings. — Dupin, *Hist. of Eccl. Writers*, 3, 743; Landon, *Eccles. Dict.* s.v.

### Antonio, Juan

a Franciscan of Salamanca, ex-definitor and ex-guardian of the Franciscan Discalceats of St. Paul, also censor of the supreme tribunal of the Inquisition, and general historian of the entire order of Franciscans. He wrote *Bibliotheca Minorum Discalceatorum* (Salaman. 1728, 4to): — (*Chronicas de Franciscanos della Provincia de S. Paulo en Castilla* (tom. 1, Salaman. 1727; tom. 2, Madrid, 1729, fol.): *Bibliotheca Universa Franciscana* (3 tom. Mad. 1732)). — Richard and Giraud, *Biblioth. Sacree*, cited by Landon, s.v.

## Antonio Of Cordova

an Observantine monk of the order of St. Francis, who was looked upon in his time as an oracle in theology. He refused the bishopric of Placenza, which was offered to him, and died at Guadalaxara, in New Castile, in 1578, aged ninety-three. Among his works are *De Potestate Papae* (Venice, 1579, fol.); — *Comm. in Regul. S. Francisci* (Paris, 1621, 8vo); *Quaestiones 4 de Detractione, etc.* (Alcala, 1553); *Quaestionarium Theologicum lib. v* (Venice, 1604, fol.); *Commentaria in 4 libros Magistri Sent.*; *De Indugentiis* (Alcala, 1554); *De Conceptione B. Virginis*. Landon, *Eccl. Dct. s.v.*

## Antonio of Santa Maria

a Franciscan monk and missionary, born at Placentia, Spain, about 1610. He went as missionary to the Philippine Islands, where he taught theology in the monastery of the Discalceats. In 1633 he went to China, and was made superior of the missionaries of his order in that country. For thirty-seven years he labored with great zeal, suffering chains and imprisonment. He preached first in the province of Fokien, then at Nankin, and lastly in Xantung, where. he founded a church. He died in 1670. Among the works which he has left may be mentioned *Relatio Sinensium Sectarum*; *De Controversia Primogenitorum Defunctorum*; *Confuci Cultus*; *An Apology for Christianity*, in Chinese; *A work in Spanish on the Chinese rites* (translated into French by the Board of Foreign Missions, and printed at Paris, 1701); *A Catechism*, in Chinese (Canton, 1660); *An Apology for the Dominican and Franciscan Missionaries in China*; *History of the Venerable Brother Gabriel, of Madelaina, and the Seven Discalceat Franciscans, martyred in Japan*; *De modo Evangelisandi regnum Dei it Sinico imperio*; *Tractatus de Sinarum Conversione*; *Relationes 5 de Conversatione, Progressibus, ac Fructibus Missionariorum discalceatorum in Sinensium imperio*; and many other works, chiefly relating to the Chinese missions. — Landon, *Eccl. Dict. s.v.*

## Antonio of the Holy Spirit

a Portuguese monk, of the order of Barefooted Carmelites, and a famous theologian and preacher, who died bishop of Angola, in Upper Ethiopia, in 1667. He left many treatises, printed at Lyons, in five vols. fol. — Richard and Giraud, *Biblioth. Sacree*, cited by Landon, *s.v.*

## Antonius

### Picture for Antonius

(a frequent Roman name), the name of several men in Josephus. *SEE ANTONY.*

**1.** LUCIUS, third son of Marcus Antonius Creticus, and younger brother of Marc Antony, became tribune in B.C. 44, and consul in B.C. 41. Upon the death of Julius Caesar, he actively supported his brother's cause as triumvir (Dion Cass. 48:5); but in the issue he was besieged in Perusia, and forced to surrender, B.C. 40. He was shortly afterward appointed to the command of Iberia, after which we hear no more of him (Smith, *Dict. of Class. Biog.* s.v. Antonius, 14). Cicero describes him as infamous (<sup><SUB2></sup>Philippians 3:12; 5:7, 11; 12:8, etc.), but with exaggeration (Drumann, *Gesch. Roms*, p. 527). His decree as "Roman vice-quaestor and vice-praetor" to the Sardians in favor of the Jews is recited by Josephus (*Ant.* 14, 10, 17).

**2.** MARCUS (surnamed PRIMUS) a native of Tolosa, in Gaul, received in his boyhood the epithet of *Beko*, i.e. in Gallic a cock's beak (Suetonius, *Vitell.* 18; Martial, 9:10). He afterward went to Rome, and rose to the dignity of senator; but, having been degraded for forgery, he was banished (Tacit. *Ann.* 14, 40). After the death of Nero (A.D. 68), he was restored to his former rank by Galba, and appointed to the command of the seventh legion in Pannonia. When the fortunes of Vitellius began to fail (A.D. 68), Antonius was one of the first generals of Europe to declare in favor of Vespasian, to whom he subsequently rendered the most important military services (Smith's *Dict. of Class. Biog.* s.v. Primus). His dispossession of the forces of Vitellius from Rome is related by Josephus (*War*, 4, 11, 2 and 3). His haughty behavior in consequence, however, appears thenceforth to have left him in comparative obscurity (Tacit. *Hist.* 2, 86; Dio Cass. 65:9-18).

**3.** A captain of the Roman garrison at Ascalon, attacked by the Jews in the beginning of the final struggle (Joseph. *War*, 3, 2, 1). It is uncertain whether he was the same with the centurion who lost his life during the siege of Jotapata by the treachery of one of the Jews who had fled into the neighboring caves (*ib.* 3, 7, 35).

Antonius, St.

*SEE ANTHONY.*

Antonius De Dominis.

*SEE DOMINIS.*

Antonius De Rosellis.

*SEE ANTHONY.*

Antonius of Padua.

*SEE ANTHONY.*

Antonius, Orders Of.

*SEE ANTHONY, ST., ORDERS OF.*

Antonius

a martyr of the 14th century, who, with his brother, abandoned Paganism for Christianity in Lithuania. The grand-duke Olgar made vain efforts to induce the brothers to abjure Christianity, and finally ordered them to be tortured and hung. They are celebrated as martyrs in the Roman Church April 14. — *Acta Sanctorum*, April 14; Hoefler, *Biog. Generale*, 2, 823.

Antonius Margarita

*SEE MARGARITA.*

Antonius Melissa

a Greek monk toward the end of the eighth century (?). He made a collection (something after the manner of Stobaeus) of passages from the classics and from the church fathers, ranging the materials under seventy-six titles. It was first printed by Gesner (Zurich, 1546, fol.), and is given also at the end of Stobaeus (Francf. 1581), and also in the *Bibliotheca Patrum*, t. v. — Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 1, 823.

Antonius Nebrissensis

*SEE ANTHONY OF LEBRIJA.*

## Antonius or Anton, Paul

a German theologian, born at Hirschfeldt in 1661. He became professor at Halle, and was for many years the friend and colaborer of Francke (q.v.) in the revival of religion known as Pietism. He died at Halle in 1730. Among his writings are *De sacrisprocessionibus gentiium* (Leipzig, 1684, 4to): — *Concilii Tridentini doctrina publica* (Halle, 1697, 8vo, and often): — *Elementa Homiletica* (Halle, 1700, 8vo): — other writings of his are named in Walch, *Bibliotheca*, 2. — Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 2, 834.

## Antony, Marc

### Picture for Antony 1

(properly MARCUS ANTONIUS), the triumvir, son of M, Antonius Creticus and Julia, the sister of Julius Caesar, was born apparently B.C. 83, for he was chosen consul as early as B.C. 64. His father dying while he was yet young, and his mother marrying again, he was left in his youth to all sorts of dissipation, and early became distinguished for profligacy, which continually afterward involved him in want and danger. To escape from his creditors, he served in the army in Syria under Gabinius, where he acquired a reputation for intrepidity (Josephus, *Ant.* 14, 5, 3; *War*, 1, 8, 5). He took part in the campaigns against Aristobulus in Palestine (B.C. 57, 56), and also in the restoration of Ptolemy Auletes to Egypt (in B.C. 55). In the following year he followed J. Caesar into Gaul, through whose influence he was elected quaestor in B.C. 52, and whose legate he became during the contest with the party of Pompey (B.C. 49-47). On the murder of Caesar, Antony was left in supreme power, but a rival soon appeared in the young Octavianus, with whom, after a defeat in battle, he at length formed the first triumvirate, in connection with Lepidus, the chief in command of the consular troops, B.C. 43, the death of Cicero being one of the terms of the compact. — Antony now vigorously prosecuted the war against the opponents of the late dictator Caesar, and defeated Brutus and Cassius in a pitched battle at Pharsalia, B.C. 42.

### Picture for Antony 2

Then, after an interval spent in Rome, he passed over to Asia, in order to procure funds for paying his troops, and in Egypt he became enamored of the famous Cleopatra (q.v.), and, neglecting his affairs in dalliance with her, at last became involved in inextricable reverses, which terminated in

the disastrous battle of Actium, B.C. 31, by which Octavianus became master of Egypt. Antony fled to Alexandria, and when Octavianus appeared before the place, he committed suicide, B.C. 30 (Smith's *Dict. of Class. Ant.* s.v.). Several of the events in the later part of his career are referred to by Josephus (*Ant.* 14, 13,- 1; *War*, 1, 16, 4), who speaks in detail of his connection with Herod (*Ant.* 14, 13-15, 4), and recites his decrees to various countries in favor of the Jews (*Ant.* 14, 10, 9 and 10). **SEE HEROD THE GREAT.** Plutarch wrote a *Life of Antony*. See Liddell's *Hist. of Rome*, p. 674729.

### Antothi'jah

(*Heb.*, *Anthothiyah'*, **הַיְתָאֲוִי** i.v. r. **הַיְתָאֲוִי** j answers from *Jehovah*; Sept. **Ἀναθωθιά** v. r. **Ἀναθώθ**), a descendant of Shashak, a chief Benjaminite of Jerusalem (<sup><1324></sup>1 Chronicles 8:24). B.C. apparently ante 536.

### An'tothite

the rendering in the Auth. Vers. in two passages (<sup><1312></sup>1 Chronicles 11:28; 13:3) of the name more properly, or at least more analogically, Anglicized ANATHOTHITE, i.e. an inhabitant of Anathoth (q.v.). It is observable that while the city is invariably written *Anathoth'* (**ת/תנ[ח]**, <sup><16218></sup>Joshua 21:18; <sup><1361></sup>1 Chronicles 6:60 [45]; 7:8; <sup><15123></sup>Ezra 2:23; <sup><16172></sup>Nehemiah 7:27; 10:19 [20]; 11:32; <sup><2310></sup>Isaiah 10:30; <sup><2400></sup>Jeremiah 1:1; 11:21, 23; 22:8; with the art., **ת/תנ[ח]**; as a var. read. in <sup><2217></sup>Jeremiah 22:7; "defectively," **תת[ח]** in <sup><1026></sup>1 Kings 2:26, as a var. read. in <sup><2419></sup>Jeremiah 22:9; Sept. **Ἀναθώθ** [v. r. **Ναθώθ** in <sup><1378></sup>1 Chronicles 7:8]; Vulg. *Anathoth*, but *Anathot* in <sup><16172></sup>Nehemiah 7:27), the derivative is written very variously as follows: <sup><1127></sup>2 Samuel 23:27, *Heb.*, *Annethothi'*, **יְתָאֲוִי** j; Sept. **Ἀνωθίτης**, Vulg. *de Anathoth*, Auth. Vers. "Anethothite;" Chronicles 11:28, *Anthothi'*, **יְתָאֲוִי** j; **Ἀναθωθ** *Anathotites*, "Antothite;" <sup><1312></sup>1 Chronicles 12:3, *Anthothi'*, **יְתָאֲוִי** j; **Ἀναθωθί**, *Anatothites*, "Antothite;" <sup><1372></sup>1 Chronicles 27:12, *Anihothi'*, **יְתָאֲוִי** j [v. r. *Antothi'*, **יְתָאֲוִי** j], **ἐξ Ἀναθώθ**, *Anathothites*, "Anethothite;" <sup><2427></sup>Jeremiah 29:27, *Annethothi'*, **יְתָאֲוִי** j; **ἐξ Ἀναθώθ**, *Anathothites*, "of Anathoth."

## A'nub

(*Heb.*, *Anub'*, תנח[; *bound* together; Sept. Ἐννώβ v. r. Ἐνώβ), the first named of the two or three sons of Coz of the tribe of Judah (<sup><1308></sup>1 Chronicles 4:8). B.C. post 1618.

## Anubis

### Picture for Anubis

(<sup><1308></sup>Ἄνουβις, derivation unknown), the name of an Egyptian deity, who had a temple in Rome, where Mundus, by personating the god, through the contrivance of a freed-woman and the collusion of the priests, secured the gratification of his passion for Paulina, a chaste matron (Josephus, *Ant.* 18, 3, 3). His worship in Egypt is referred to by Herodotus (2, 66), and was widely disseminated during the Roman Empire (Appian, *Bell. Civ.* 4, 47; Apul. *Met.* 11, 262; Lamprid. *Commod.* 9; Spartian, *Pescenn. Nig.* 6; Anton. *Carac.* 9). He appears to have been adored under the figure of a dog-headed man, a myth of which the ancients give various interpretations (see Smith's *Dict. of Class. Antiq.* s.v.). In the temples of Egypt he is represented as the guard of other gods, particularly the attendant of Osiris and Isis, occupying, in accordance with the form under which he is symbolized, the space in front of the temple (Strabo, 17, p. 805; Stat. *Sylv.* 3, 2, 12). For his rites, see Jablonsky, *Panth. AEG.* 5,1, § 12 etc.; Champollion (Le Jeune), *Pantheon Egypt.* (Par. 1823); Pritchard, *Egyptian Mythology*. See NIBHAZ.

## A'nus

### Picture for A'nus

(Ἄννιούθ v. r. Ἄννούς), one of the Levites who expounded the law read by Ezra (1 Esdras 9:48); evidently the BANI *SEE BANI* of the genuine text (<sup><1307></sup>Nehemiah 8:7).

## Anvil

(μ[Pi] *pa'am*, so called from being *beaten*, <sup><2407></sup>Isaiah 41:7; elsewhere a "step," "corner," "time," etc.; ἄκμων, Ecclus. 38:28), the utensil employed apparently among the Hebrews, as with other nations, by blacksmiths for hammering upon. *SEE METAL; SEE SMITH; SEE IRON.*

## Αρα΄me

(*Ἀράμη*, \_ appar. from *ἀπαμάω*, to *cut off*), the name given in the Apocrypha (1 Esdras 4:29) and by Josephus (*Ant.* 11, 3, 5) as that of a concubine of Darius (Hystaspis), of whom he was very fond, being the daughter of one of his nobles (Rabsases [? Rab-saris] Themasius, or “the admirable Bartacus”). Apama was the name of the wives of several of the Seleucid kings (see Smith’s *Dict. of Class. Biog.* s.v.), but none of this name are assigned in history to Darius.

## Apamea

### Picture for Apamea

(*Ἀπάμεια*, so called from *Apame*, q.v.), the name of several cities of antiquity (see Smith’s *Dict. of Class. Geog.* s.v.), none of which are mentioned in Scripture, though two of them are of interest in sacred literature.

**1.** APAMEA OF SYRIA, a large city in the valley of the Orontes, and capital of the province of Apamene (Steph. Byz. s.v.; Ptol. 5, 15, § 19; Festus Avienus, 5, 1083; *Anton. Itin.*). It was fortified and enlarged by Seleucus Nicator, who named it after his wife Apama (not his mother, see Strabo, 16, p. 752), although it also bore the Greek name *Pella*. The fortress was placed on a hill, the windings of the Orontes giving it a peninsular form; hence its other name, the *Chersonese* (*Χερρόνησος*). Seleucus had a large commissariat there for his cavalry, and the pretender Trypho made it the basis of his operations. Josephus relates (*Ant.* 14, 3, 2) that Pompey, in marching south from his winter quarters, probably at or near Antioch, razed Apamea. In the revolt of Syria under Bassus it held out for three years, until the arrival of Cassius, B.C. 46 (Dio Cass. 47:26-28; Joseph. *War.* 1, 10, 10). During the Crusades it was a flourishing and important place under the Arabic name of *Famieh*, and was occupied by Tancred (Wilken, *Gesch. d. Kreuzz.* 2, 474; Abulfeda, *Tab. Syr.* p. 114, 157). Niebuhr heard that the site was now called *Kulat ed-Mudik* (*Reise*, 3, 97), and Burckhardt found a castle of this name not far from the lake El-Takah, which he fixes as the location of Apamea (*Trav.* p. 138). The enormous and highly ornamental ruins still standing are probably remains of the temples of which Sozomen speaks (7, 15); besides the castle on the hill, a part of the town is found in the plain. The adjacent lake is full of the celebrated black fish.



2. APAMEA CIBOTUS (ἡ Κιβωτός), a town of Phrygia, built near Celsenae by Antiochus Soter, and named after his mother Apama. Strabo says it lay at the head of the Marsyas, which ran through the town to join the Maeander (Groskurd, *Strabo*, 2, 531), forming the Catarrhacteg described by Herodotus (7, 26). The site has been fixed at the modern *Denair* (Arundell, *Discoveries*, 1, 201), corresponding to the ancient descriptions (Hamilton, *Researches*, 2, 499), which have been collected by Leake (*Asia Minor*, p. 156 sq.). Notwithstanding its frequent earthquakes, Apamea continued to flourish during the Roman Empire, and its bishops are recorded in the early Christian councils, the Gospel having probably been introduced there by Paul during his visits through Phrygia (q.v.).

The epithet *Cibotus* has been conjectured to have been derived from the fact that the city was the emporium of the region (see Pliny, 5,29), **κιβωτός** signifies a *chest* or coffer; but, according to others, it is connected with the position of Noah's ark after the Flood, a hypothesis which, however untenable on general grounds, is supported by some singular coincidences. The Sibylline verses place the mountains of Ararat, where the ark rested, on the confines of Phrygia, at the sources of the Marsyas. On a medal struck in honor of Hadrian is the figure of a man, representing the river Marsyas, with this inscription, **ΑΠΑΜΕΩΝ ΚΙΒΩΤΟΣ ΜΑΡΣΣΙΑ** — *a medal of the Apameans — the ark and the river Marsyas*. That this was one of the commemorative notices of the ark and of the Deluge there is little doubt; but only in the sense that traditionary memorials of the ark were here very ancient. There are several other medals of Apamea extant, on which are represented an ark, with a man in it receiving the dove, which is flying to him; and part of their inscription is the word NOE; but either this should be read NEO, an abridgment of "Neokoron," or it is the end of a word, **ΑΠΑΜΕΩΝ**, or (some of) the medals are spurious, which has been suspected. Still, as they are from different dies, yet all referring to Apamea, it seems that their authors had a knowledge of the tradition of commemoration respecting the ark preserved in this city. *SEE ARK*. Many more such commemorations of an event so greatly affecting mankind were no doubt maintained for many ages, though we are now under great difficulties in tracing them. In fact, many cities boasted of these memorials, and referred to them as proofs of their antiquity. *SEE ARARAT*.

## Apathy

(ἀπάθεια, *want of feeling*) or *affectuum vacuitas*, a term formerly used to denote the entire extinction of the vicious passions, so that not the smallest movement of them is felt. It implies the utter rooting out of concupiscence, and the annihilation of all sin within. This was a favorite doctrine with the Stoics; and some of the fathers, as St. Clement of Alexandria, St. Macarius, and others, have used expressions which, at first sight, seem to imply that they had themselves attained to this state; but, in fact, they mean only that a perfect Christian keeps all his passions and desires in perfect subjection, so that they have not in any degree the mastery over him. The doctrine of apathy, in its strictest sense; is at variance with Holy Scripture and experience. The term apathy is also used in a limited sense, to signify a contempt for worldly things. — Landon, *Eccl. Dict. s.v.*

## Ape

### Picture for Ape 1

ā/q, *koph*), an animal of the monkey tribe mentioned in <sup><1112></sup>1 Kings 10:22, and in the parallel passage in <sup><4421></sup>2 Chronicles 9:21, among the merchandise brought by the fleets of Solomon and Hiram once in every three years. The Sept. renders the word by πίθηκος, which is equivalent to the Latin *simia*. The Greeks have the word κῆβος or κῆπος, for a longtailed species of monkey (Aristot. *Hist. Anim.* 2, 8, 9), and Pliny (8, 19, 28) uses *cephus*. Both Greeks and Hebrews received the word, with the animal, from India, for the ape, both in Sansc. and Malabar, is called *kapi*=swift, active. Hence also the German *Affe*, the Anglo-Saxon *apa*, and the English *ape*. The name, under these modifications, designates the Simiadae, including, no doubt, species of Cercopithecus, Macacus, and Cynocephalus, or Guenons, apes and baboons; that is, all the animals of the quadrumanous order known to the Hebrews, Arabs, Egyptians, and the classical writers. Accordingly, we find Pliny and Solinus speaking of Ethiopian Cephis exhibited at Rome; and in the upper part of the celebrated Praenestine mosaic representing the inundation of the Nile (see Shaw's *Travels*, p. 423, 2d ed. 4to) figures of Simiads occur in the region which indicates Nubia; among others, one in a tree, with the name **KHITIEN** beside it, which may be taken for a Cercopithecus of the Guenon group. But in the triumphal procession of Thothmes III at Thebes nations from the interior of Africa, probably from

Nubia, bear curiosities and tributes, among which the camelopardalis or giraffe and six quadrumana may be observed. The Ceph of Ethiopia are described and figured in Ludolfi *Historia Ethiopica*, 1, 10, § 52-64. They are represented as tailless animals, climbing rocks, eating worms and ants, and protecting themselves from the attack of lions by casting sand into their eyes. Apes also occur in the lately discovered Assyrian sculptures, both in bas-reliefs on slabs (Layard, *Nineveh*, 1, 118), and of various species on an obelisk at Nimroud (*ib.* 2, 330). The Koph of Scripture, named only twice (~~1102~~-1 Kings 10:22; ~~1021~~-2 Chronicles 9:21), is in both cases, associated with μῦλαῖ, *tokiyim*, rendered “peacocks.” The fleet of Solomen is said to have brought these two kinds of animals from Ophir. Now neither peacocks nor pheasants are indigenous in Africa; they belong to India and the mountains of high Asia, and therefore the version. “peacocks,” if correct, would decide, without doubt, not only that *koph* denotes none of the Simiadae above noticed, but also that the fleet of Tarshish visited India or the Australasian islands. For these reasons we conclude that the Hebrew *koph*, and names of same root, were, by the nations in question, used generically in some instances and specifically in others, though the species were not thereby defined, nor on that account identical. For the natural history of the ape family, see the *Penny Cyclopaedia*, s.v. For some attempts to identify the various kinds of quadrumana which were known to the ancients, see Lichtenstein’s *Commentatio philologica de Simiarum quotquot veteribus innotuerunt formis* (Hamb. 1791), and Tyson’s *Homo sylvestris, or the Anatomy of a Pigmie* (Lond. 1699), to which he has added a philosophical essay concerning the Cynocephali, the Satyrs, and Sphinges of the ancients. Aristotle (*De Anim. Hist.* 2, 5, ed. Schneider) appears to divide the quadrumana order of mammalia into three tribes, which he characterizes by the names πίθηκοι, κῆβοι, and κυνοκέφαλοι. The ancients were acquainted with several kinds of tailed and tailless apes (Plin. *Hist. Nat.* 8, 80; 11:100; Elian, *Anim.* 17, 25), and obtained them from Ethiopia (Plin. *ut sup.*) and India (Ctes. in Phot. *Cod.* 72, p. 66; Arrian, *Ind.* 15; AElian-*Anim.* 17, 25, 39; Philostr. *Apoll.* 3, 4), but in Mauritania they were domesticated (Strabo, 17:827), as now in Arabia Felix (Niebuhr, *Bed.* p. 167).

## Picture for Ape 2

## Picture for Ape 3

Some species of baboon may be denoted by the term *μυδαῖshedim*, or daemons (“devils”) in <sup><16317></sup>Deuteronomy 32:17; <sup><19457></sup>Psalms 106:37; and perhaps by the *μυρῶναι seirim*, or *hairy ones* (goats, “satyrs” of the desert) (<sup><23121></sup>Isaiah 13:21; 34:14), since these animals (see Rich’s *Babylon*, p. 30) are still found in the ruins of the Mesopotamian plains, under the name *Seir Assad* (see generally Bochart, *Hieroz.* 2, 898 sq.). It is some confirmation of this last interpretation that the Egyptians are said to have worshipped apes, and they are still adored in many places in India. **SEE SATYR.**

### Apel, Johann

a German theologian, was born at Nuremberg in 1486. After having studied theology at the university of Wittenberg, he became canon at Wurzburg, where he married a nun in 1523, in consequence of which he was expelled. He was one of the most zealous adherents of Luther, and eagerly labored for the spreading of the Reformation. He died in 1536 at Nuremberg, where he had been, during the last years of his life, jurist of the republic and councillor of the elector of Brandenburg. He wrote, among other works, *Defensio po suo conjugia cum praefat. Lutheri* (Wittenb. 1523, 4to); *Brachylogus juris civilis, sive corpus legum*: a work long ascribed to the Emperor Justinian. — Hoefer, *Biog. Generale*, 2, 875.

### Apelleans

followers of APELLES **SEE APELLES** , q.v.

### Apel'les

(Ἀπελλῆς, from the Lat. *appello*, to call), a Christian at Rome, whom Paul salutes in his epistle to the church there (<sup><4510></sup>Romans 16:10), and calls “approved in Christ,” i.e. an approved Christian, A.D. 55. Origen doubts whether he may not have been the same person with Apollos; but this is far from likely. **SEE APOLLOS.** According to the old Church traditions, Apelles was one of the seventy disciples, and bishop either of Smyrna or Heracleia (Epiph. *Cont. Haeres.* p. — 20; Fabricii *Lux Evangelii*, p. 115, 116, etc.). The Greeks observe his festival on Oct. 31. The name itself is

notable from Horace's "Credat Judaeus Apella, non ego" (*Sat.* 1, 5), by which he less probably means a superstitious Jew in general, as many think, than a particular Jew of that name well known at Rome.

## Apelles

surnamed, from his length of life, *Senex*, a heretic, and disciple of Marcion, who, having been falsely charged with the seduction of a young girl of Alexandria named Philumene, set up a school of his own, and became a critic of his former master. He taught that the Lord, when descending from heaven, formed to himself a body of particles of air, which he allowed to resolve itself into air again as he ascended. He taught that there was one God, the Creator of all things, who, when he had created the bad angels, intrusted to one of them the formation of the world. He denied the resurrection of the flesh, and repudiated the law and the prophets. — Cave, *Hist. Lit.* anno 188; Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* 5, 13; Mosheim, *Comm.* 1, 487, 488; Lardner, *Works*, 8, 539 sq.

## Aphaca

(τὰ Ἐφάκα, according to the ancients, from the *Heb.*, אֶפְחָא; *aphaks*, to embrace, with reference to the loves of Venus and Adonis, *Etymol. Mag.* s.v.; see Movers, *Phnm.* 1, 192), a town of Coele-Syria, midway between Heliopolis and Lyblus (Zosim. *Hist.* 1, 58), a position, as Reland thinks (*Paloest.* p. 315), not inconsistent with the other notices of the place as being situated on Lebanon. It was notorious for its temple of Venus, where all the abominations of an impure idolatry were practiced to such a degree that Constantine destroyed it (Euseb. *Vit. Const.* 3, 55; Sozomen, *Hist. Eccl.* 1, 5). Near it was a lake celebrated for certain marvellous properties (Seneca, *Quest. Nat.* 3, 25). It has been regarded as identical with the APHEKI *SEE APHEKI* (q.v.) of <sup><0600></sup>Joshua 19:30, and the *Aphik* of <sup><00E1></sup>Judges 1:31. Seetzen first observed the probable coincidence of Aphaca with the present *A4fka*, a village of the region indicated, and containing ruins (*Reisen*, 1, 245), which have since been described by Thomson (in the *Bibliotheca Sacra*, 1838, p. 5). The lake has been identified with that now called *Limru*, three hours distant (Burckhardt, *Travels*, p. 25), but Robinson thinks it is rather the neighboring spring (new ed. of *Researches*, 3, 607).

## Aphaer'ema

(Ἀφαίρεμά in the Apocrypha) or

## Apherima

(Ἀφερειμά in Josephus), one of the three “governments” (νόμους) added to Judaea from Samaria (and Galilee, 1 Maccabees 10:30) by Demetrius Soter, and confirmed by Nicanor (1 Maccabees 11:34; comp. Joseph. *Ant.* 13, 4, 9; and see Reland, *Paloest.* p. 178). It is probably the same as the EPHRAIM *SEE EPHRAIM* of the New Test. (<sup><48154></sup>John 11:54) and the OPHRAH *SEE OPHRAH* (q.v.) of the Old.

## Aphar'sachites

(Chald. *Apharsekaye'*, **ayk&š̄r̄pā**}; Sept. Ἀφαρσαχάιοι, <sup><45816></sup>Ezra 5:6; 6:6) or Aphar'sathchites (Chald. *Apharsathkaye'*, **ayk&t̄š̄r̄pā**}; Sept. Ἀφαρσαθαχάιοι, <sup><45048></sup>Ezra 4:9), the name of the nation (or one of the nations) to which belonged one portion of the colonists whom the Assyrian king planted in Samaria, in place of the expatriated northern tribes, and who violently opposed the Jews in rebuilding Jerusalem. Schulthess (*Parad.* p. 362) identifies the “Apharsachites” with the Persian, or rather Median *Parataceni* of Greek geography (Strabo 11, 522; 15, 732; Herod. 1:101; Plin. 16:29), the A being prosthetic (as in Strabo, 15:764, Mardi and Amardi are interchanged). They, together with the *Apharsites* (q.v.), for whose name this would seem only another form, appear to have been some foreign tribe of Eastern Asia, conquered by the Assyrians, and removed (according to well-known usage, see <sup><4282></sup>2 Kings 18:32 sq.) to another region for security and political extension. Ewald (*Isr. Gesch.* 3, 375), following Gesenius, regards the name as only another for the Persians, themselves, adopted out of hostility to the Jews (*ib.* p. 120), and in a three-fold form to enhance their own importance.

## Aphar'sites

(Chald. *Apharsaye'*, **ayš̄r̄pā**}; Sept. Ἀφαρσαίιοι), the name of a tribe removed along with the Apharsachites (q.v.) to Samaria by the king of Assyria, and forming one of the opponents of the Jews after the captivity (<sup><45048></sup>Ezra 4:9). Hiller (*Onomnast.*) regards them as the *Parrhasii*, a tribe of Eastern Media, and Gesenius (*Thes. Heb.* p. 143) thinks they are the *Persians*, to whose name theirs certainly bears a much greater affinity,

especially in the prolonged form of the latter found in <sup><216D></sup>Daniel 6:29 (Chald. *Parsaya'*, **aysrPj**). The presence of the proper name of the Persians in <sup><150E></sup>Ezra 1:1; 4:3, must throw some doubt upon Gesenius' conjecture; but it is very possible that the *local* name of the tribe may have undergone alteration, while the official and general name was correctly given.

## A'phek

(*Heb.*, *Aphek'*, **qpa**) prob. *strength*; with **h** directive, <sup><6334></sup>Joshua 13:4; <sup><112E></sup>1 Kings 20:26; <sup><920E></sup>1 Samuel 29:1; hence not to be confounded with APHEKAH), the name of at least three cities (Schwarz, *Palest.* p. 90).

**1.** (Sept. **Ἀφακά** and **Ἀφηκά**.) A city of the tribe of Asher (<sup><68E></sup>Joshua 19:30), apparently near Phoenicia (<sup><6334></sup>Joshua 13:4), doubtless the same with APHIK *SEE APHIK* (q.v.), which the Israelites were unable to capture from the Canaanites (<sup><003E></sup>Judges 1:31). This has been thought (see J. D. Michaelis, *Supplem.* p. 114; Rosenmuller, *Altherth.* II, 2:96; Gesenius, *Thes. Heb.* 1, 140; Raumer, *Palest.* p. 120, and others) to be the same place with the *Aphaca* (**Ἀφακκα**) which Eusebius (*Constant.* 3, 55) and Sozomen (*Hist.* 2, 5) place in Lebanon, on the river Adonis (Zozim. 1:58), where there was a famous temple of Venus (Theophanes, *Chronicles* p. 18). A village called *Afka* is still found in Lebanon, situated at the bottom of a valley, and probably marks the site of this latter place (Burckhardt, p. 25; Richter, p. 107). It is situated in the south-east bank of the great basin of Akurah, where are the sources of the Nahr Ibrahim, the Adonis of the ancients, and in an amphitheatre of verdant beauty. Here a fine fountain bursts forth in cascades from a cavern; and directly in front of these are the shapeless ruins of a large temple — that of the Venus of Aphaca, still containing massive columns of syenite granite (*Bibliotheca Sacra*, 1853, p. 150). (For the history and description of this place, see Robinson's *Bibl. Res.* new ed. 3, 604 sq.) But Reland (*Palest.* p. 572) correctly observes that this place is situated too far north to have been included within the bounds of the twelve tribes (see Keil, *Comment. on Joshua* 19, 30). It is possible, nevertheless, that the Aphek of <sup><6334></sup>Joshua 13:4, is identical with this Aphaca in Lebanon (Schwarz, *Palest.* p. 63, 90), and this may, perhaps, be the Canaanitish royal city mentioned in <sup><612E></sup>Joshua 12:18; but even this is doubtful, and it cannot have been the city in the tribe of Asher near Rehob (<sup><68E></sup>Joshua 19:30; <sup><003E></sup>Judges 1:31). From this last circumstance Schwarz thinks (*Palest.* p. 194) that the Aphek in

question may be the *En-Fit* (which he says is also called *En-Fik*) three miles south-west of Banias (see Zimmermann's *Map*); but this is beyond the bounds of Asher, and the Rehob of that tribe is probably different from the Syrian city of the same name. See REHOB. Kiepert (in his last *Wsn/karte von Palistinr*, 1857) gives this Aphek a conjectural location south-east of Accho, apparently at *Tel Kison* (Robinson's *Researches*, new ed. 3, 103). **SEE APHACA.**

**2.** (Sept. Ἀφέκ.) A city in the tribe of Issachar, not far from Jezreel, where the Philistines twice encamped before battles with the Israelites (<sup><0901></sup>1 Samuel 4:1; 29:1; comp. 28:4). Either this or the preceding, but most probably this, was the *Aphek* (Sept. Ἀφακιά) mentioned in <sup><0628></sup>Joshua 12:18, as a royal city of the Canaanites. Reland (*Palest.* p. 572) and others (e.g. Schwarz, *Palest.* p. 136) assume that the Aphek of <sup><0901></sup>1 Samuel 4:1, must have been in the tribe of Judah, because presumed to be near Mizpeh (comp. <sup><0902></sup>1 Samuel 7:12); but this is unnecessary. **SEE APHEKAH.** Josephus calls it *Apheca* (Ἀφεκά, *Ant.* 5, 11, 1; 8:14, 4). Eusebius (*Onomast.* "Ἀφερ) places it in the vicinity of Endor. Schwarz (*Palest.* p. 168), confounding this Aphek with that of <sup><1226></sup>1 Kings 20:26, seeks it in the village of *Fuknah*, two miles east of En-Gannim; but this is beyond the territory of Issachar. Kiepert (*Wandkarte von Palast.* 1856) locates it between the river Kishon and Shunem, apparently at *El-Afuleh*, where the Crusaders placed it (Van de Velde, *Memoir*, p. 286), or, rather, at the neighboring *El-Fuleh*, a ruined village (Robinson's *Researches*, 3, 163, 176, 181).

**3.** (Sept. Ἀφεκά.) A town near which Benhadad was defeated by the Israelites (<sup><1226></sup>1 Kings 20:26), evidently on the military road between Damascus and Palestine. It was walled (<sup><1230></sup>1 Kings 20:30), and was apparently a common spot for engagements with Syria (<sup><1237></sup>2 Kings 13:17). The use of the word *r/vMhā* (Auth. Vers. "the plain") in <sup><1225></sup>1 Kings 20:25, fixes the situation of Aphek to have been in the level down-country east of the Jordan, **SEE MISHOR**, and it seems to correspond to the *Apheca* of Eusebius (*Onomast.* Ἀφεκά), a large castle situated near Hippo, east of the Sea of Galilee. Josephus also (*Ant.* 8, 14, 4) calls it *Apheca* (Ἀφεκά), and it appears to have been in the tower of this place (πύργος Ἀφεκοῦ) that some of the insurgent Galilaeans threw themselves during the war with Cestius Gallus (Joseph. *War*, 2, 19, 1). The same place is probably mentioned by Burckhardt, Seetzen, and others, under the name of *Fik* or



*Afik* (see Gesen. in Burckhardt, *Reise*, 1, 539). It is a village on the top of a mountain, containing about two hundred families, who dwell in huts built out of the ruins of the ancient city, which appears to have been peculiarly situated so as to cause the ruin of the Syrian army by an earthquake (Thomson's *Land and Book*, 2, 52, 53).

### Aphe'kah

(*Heb.*, *Aphekah'*, *הַפְּקָה*) fem. of *Apek*; Sept. *Ἀφακά* v. r. *Φακούκ*), a city in the mountain tract of Judah, mentioned between Bethtappuah and Humtah (<sup><1653></sup>Joshua 15:53). Raumer (*PalEst.* p. 170) and others confound this with the *Apek* of <sup><1628></sup>Joshua 12:18; but the Hebrews accentuation of the names is different. Schwarz (*Palest.* p. 106) finds it in the village *Abik*, 4 miles east of Jannuth; but this position is entirely out of region of the associated names, which require a locality near Hebron, perhaps between that place and Tappuah (Keil, *Comment.* in loc.), possibly at the ruined site *Sibta* (Van de Velde, *Map*).

### Apher'ema, Apherima

SEE APHUEREMA.

### Apher'ra

(*Ἀφεῖρῥά*), one of "the servants of Solomon" whose sons are said to have returned from Babylon (1 Esdras 5:34); but the genuine text (<sup><1525></sup>Ezra 2:51) has no such name.

### Aphi'ah

(*Heb.*, *Aphi'ach*, *יֵפְיָא*) blown upon; Sept. *Ἀφίχ* v. r. *Ἀφέκ*), the father of Bechorath, a Benjamite, ancestor of King Saul (<sup><1001></sup>1 Samuel 9:1). B.C. considerably ante 1093.

### A'phik

(*Heb.*, *Aphik'*, *אֶפְיָק*) strong; Sept. *Ἀφεκά*), one of the cities from which the Asherites were unable to expel the Canaanites (<sup><1013></sup>Judges 1:31); doubtless the same as the APHEK SEE APHEK (q.v.) of <sup><1634></sup>Joshua 13:4; 19:30.

## Aph'rah

(*Heb.*, *Aphrah'*, אֶפְרַיִם), another form of the name OPHRAH *SEE* OPHRAH (<300>Micah 1:10). *SEE BETH-LEAPHRAH*.

## Aph'ses

or, rather, PIZ'ZEZ (*Heb.*, *Pitstsets'*, אֶפְסֵס dispersion, with the art., אֶפְסֵס hap-Pitsets; Sept. Ἀφεσσή v. r. Ἀφεσή; Vulg. *Aphses*), the head of the eighteenth sacerdotal family of the twenty-four into which the priests were divided by David for the service of the Temple (<1345>1 Chronicles 24:15). B.C. 1014.

## Aphthartocetae

(from ἄφθαρτος, *incorruptible*, and δοκέω, *to think*), a sect of Monophysites, who affirmed that the body of our Lord was rendered incorruptible in consequence of the divine nature being united with it. These were again divided into parties, who debated whether the body of Christ was created or not. Others of them asserted that our Lord's body was indeed corruptible, but that the divine nature prevented its actual corruption. The heresy spread widely in the 6th century, and, in 563, Emperor Justinian issued a decree, which, by favoring this doctrine, sought to reconcile the Monophysites with the orthodox Church. — Hase, *Ch. Hist.* § 115. *SEE MONOPHYSITES*.

## Apion

(Ἀπίων, *lean*), a Greek grammarian, against whose attacks upon Jewish history Josephus wrote the treatise *Contra Apionem*. Some writers call him a son of Pleistonices, while others more correctly state that this was only his surname, and that he was the son of Poseidonius (Gell. 6:8; Seneca, *Epist.* 88; Euseb. *Prep. Evang.* 10, 10). He was a native of Oasis, but used to say that he was born at Alexandria, where he studied under Apollonius and Didymus (Suidas, s.v.; Josephus, *Apion*, 2, 3, etc.). He afterward settled at Rome, where he taught rhetoric during the reigns of Tiberius and Claudius. In the reign of Caligula he traveled in Greece. About A.D. 38, the inhabitants of Alexandria having sent complaints to the emperor against the Jews residing there, Apion headed the embassy that made the prosecution, the defense by the Jews being made by Philo. According to his enemy Josephus (*Ap.* 2, 13), he died of the effects of his dissolute mode of

life. He appears to have enjoyed an extraordinary reputation for his extensive knowledge and versatility as an orator, but the ancients are unanimous in censuring his ostentatious vanity (Gell. 5,14; Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* praef. and 30, 6; Josephus, *Ap.* 2, 12). Besides the treatise named above, of which we only know what Josephus relates, he wrote commentaries upon Homer, a history of Egypt, a eulogy of Alexander the Great, and several historical sketches, of all of which there remain only the fragmental stories about Androclus and the lion, and about the dolphin near Dicaearchia, preserved by Gellius.

## Apis

### Picture for Apis 1

(Ἄπις), the sacred bull of Memphis, worshipped by the ancient Egyptians, who regarded it as a symbol of Osiris, the god of the Nile, the husband of Isis, and the great divinity of Egypt (Pomp. Mela, 1:9; Aelian, *Hist. An.* 11, 10; Lucian, *De Sacrif.* 15).

### Picture for Apis 2

A sacred court or yard was set apart for the residence of Apis in the temple of Ptah at Memphis, where a numerous retinue of priests waited upon him, and sacrifices of red oxen were offered to him. His movements, choice of places, and changes of appetite, were religiously regarded as oracles. It was an understood law that Apis must not live longer than twenty-five years. When he attained this age he was secretly put to death, and buried by the priests in a sacred well, the popular belief being that he cast himself into the water. If, however, he died a natural death, his body was embalmed, and then solemnly interred in the temple of Serapis at Memphis. The burial-place of the Apis bulls has lately been discovered near Memphis (Wilkinson, *Ancient Egyptians*, abridgm. 1:292). As soon as a suitable animal was found for a new Apis, having the required marks — black color with a white square on the brow, the figure of an eagle on the back, and a knot in the shape of a cantharus under the tongue — he was led in triumphal procession to Nilopolis at the time of the new moon, where he remained forty days, waited upon by nude women, and was afterward conveyed in a splendid vessel to Memphis. His Theophany, or day of discovery, and his birth-day were celebrated as high festivals of seven days' duration during the rise of the Nile (Herod. 3, 28). The worship of the golden calf by the Israelites in the wilderness, and also the employment of

golden calves as symbols of the Deity by Jeroboam, have been very generally referred to the Egyptian worship of Apis. — Smith's *Dict. of Class. Mythol.* s.v. *SEE CALF (GOLDEN)*.

## Apoc' alypse

the Greek name of the Book of REVELATION *SEE REVELATION* (q.v.).

## Apocalypse Knights of the,

an association founded in 1692 at Rome by Agostino Gobrino, for the purpose of defending the Catholic Church against the pope, whom it considered to be the Antichrist. The members always went out armed, and their chief was called Monarch of the Most Holy Trinity. The Inquisition suppressed the association in 1697.

## Apocaritae

(q. d. *Ἀποκοιταί*, from *ἀποκρίνω*, to *separate*), a sect, in the third century, who asserted that the human soul is part of, God, a portion of His substance joined to man. They are ranked among the Manichaeans (q.v.).

## Apocatastasis

a term used in <sup><402></sup>Acts 3:21, in the combination *apocatastasis panton* (*ἀποκατάστασις πάντων*), i.e. the restoration of all things. Origen, and, after him, many theologians and sects of ancient and modern times, put upon this passage the construction that at one time, evil itself, sin, condemnation, and Satan, would be reconciled through Christ with God. *SEE RESTITUTION; SEE RESTORATIONISTS*.

## Apocrisarius

(*Ἀποκρισιάριος*; Lat. *Responsalis*), literally a *respondent*, the title of a legate to negotiate concerning matters ecclesiastical. Justinian (*Novell.* 6) calls the *Apocrisarii* those "who administer the affairs of the churches." At first they were bishops, but afterward priests or deacons were substituted, and the term seems to have been applied to any one acting as locum-tenens for a bishop (or even monastery) in ecclesiastical matters; but the name was principally applied to the pope's nuncio at Constantinople, who resided there to receive the pope's instructions and to report the answers of the emperor. This custom ended with the Iconoclast divisions. After

Charlemagne had been crowned emperor, the popes conferred the name and the office of *apocrisiarius* upon the imperial arch-chaplain. Later the name *apocrisiarius* became a mere title, which the arch-chaplains of the palace bore, without being any longer representatives of the pope. — Suicer, *Thes.* p. 456; Collier, *Hist. Dict.* vol. 3, *Suppl.*; Landon, *Eccl. Dict.* 1, 446.

## Ἀποκρυφα

(ἀπόκρυφα, sc. βιβλία, *hidden, mysterious*), a term in theology, applied in various senses to denote certain books claiming a sacred character. The word occurs in the N.T. in its ordinary sense (<sup><4042></sup>Mark 4:22). It is first found, as denoting a certain class of books, in Clemens Alexandrinus (*Stromata*, 13, c. 4, ἐκ τινὸς ἀποκρύφων).

**I. Definition and Application of the Term.** — The primary meaning of ἀποκρυφος, “hidden, secret” (in which sense it is used in Hellenistic as well as classical Greek, see *Ecclus.* 23:19; <sup><4087></sup>Luke 8:17; <sup><51213></sup>Colossians 2:13), seems, toward the close of the 2d century, to have been associated with the signification “spurious,” and ultimately to have settled down into the latter. Tertullian (*de Anim.* c. 2) and Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* 1, 19, 69; 3, 4, 29) apply it to the forged or spurious books which the heretics of their time circulated as authoritative. The first passage referred to from the *Stromata*, however, may be taken as an instance of the transition stage of the words. The followers of Prodicus, a Gnostic teacher, are said there to boast that they have βιβλους ἀποκρύφους of Zoroaster. In Athanasius (*Ep. Fest.* 2, 38; *Synopsis Sac. Scrip.* 2, 154, ed. Colon. 1686), Augustine (*Faust.* 11, 2; *Civ. Dei*, 15, 23), Jerome (*Ep. ad Latam*, and *Prol. Gal.*) the word is used uniformly with the bad meaning which had become attached to it. The writers of that period, however, do not seem to have seen clearly *how* the word had acquired this secondary sense; and hence we find conjectural explanations of its etymology. The remark of Athanasius (*Synops. S. Scr.* 1. c.) that such books are ἀποκρυφῆς μάλλον ἢ ἀναγνώσεως ἄξια is probably meant rather as a play upon the word than as giving its derivation. Later conjectures are (1), that given b; the translators of the English Bible (ed. 1539, Pref. to Apocr.), “because they were wont to be read not openly and in common, but as it were in secret and apart;” (2), one, resting on a misapprehension of the meaning of a passage in Epiphanes (*de Mens. ac Pond.* c. 4) that the books in question were so called because, not being in the Jewish canon, they were excluded

ἀπὸ τῆς κρυπτῆς from the ark in which the true Scriptures were preserved; (3), that the word ἀπόκρυφα answers to the Hebrews μυστῆρ] *libri absconditi*, by which the later Jews designated those books which, as of doubtful authority or not tending to edification, were not read publicly in the synagogues; (4), that it originates in the κρυπτά or secret books of the Greek mysteries. Of these it may be enough to say, that (1) is, as regards some of the books now bearing the name at variance with fact; that (2), as has been said, rests on a mistake; that (3) wants the support of direct evidence of the use of ἀπόκρυφα as the translation for the Hebrew word; and that (4), though it approximates to what is probably the true history; of the word, is so far only a conjecture.

In the early ages of the Christian Church this term was frequently used to denote books of an uncertain or anonymous author, or of one who had written under an assumed name. Its application, however, in this sense is far from being distinct, as, strictly speaking, it would include *canonical* books whose authors were unknown or uncertain, or even *pseudepigraphal*. Origen, on Matthew 22, had applied the term apocryphal in a similar way: “This passage is to be found in no canonical book” (*regulari*, for we have Origen’s work only in the Latin translation by Rufinus), “but in the *apocryphal* book of Elias” (*secretis Eliae*). And, “This is plain, that many examples have been adduced by the apostles and evangelists, and inserted in the New Testament, which we do not read in the canonical Scriptures which we possess, but which are found in the *Apocrypha*” (Origen, *Proef. in Cantic.*). So also Jerome, referring to the words (~~484~~ Ephesians 5:14) “Awake, thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead,” observes that “the apostle cited this from *hidden* (*reconditis*) prophets, and such as seem to be apocryphal, as he has done in several other instances.” Epiphanius thought that this term was applied to such books as were not placed in the Ark of the Covenant, but put away in some other place (see Suicer’s *Thesaurus* for the true reading of the passage in this father). Under the term *apocryphal* have been included books of a religious character, which were in circulation among private Christians, but were not allowed to be read in the public assemblies; such as 3 and 4 Esdras, and 3 and 4 Maccabees. (See Stare, *De apocryphor. appellatione*, Greifsw. 1766.)

In regard to the New Testament, the term has been usually applied to books invented by heretics to favor their views, or by Catholics under fictitious signatures. Of this description were many spurious or apocryphal

gospels (see below). It is probably in reference to such that Basil, Cyril of Jerusalem, and Jerome gave cautions against the reading of apocryphal books; although it is possible, from the context, that the last named father alludes to the books which were also called *ecclesiastical*, and afterward *deutero-canonical*. The following passage from his epistle to Lata, on the education of her daughter, will serve to illustrate this part of our subject: “All *apocryphal* books should be avoided; but if she ever wishes to read them, *not to establish the truth of doctrines, but with a reverential feeling for the truths they signify*, she should be told that they are not the works of the authors by whose names they are distinguished, that they contain much that is faulty, and that it is a task requiring great prudence to find gold in the midst of clay.” And to the same effect Philastrius: “Among whom are the Manichees, Gnostics [etc.], who, having some *apocryphal* books under the apostles’ names (i.e. some separate Acts), are accustomed to despise the canonical Scriptures; but these *secret* Scriptures — that is, *apocryphal* — though they ought to be read by the perfect for their morals, ought not to be read by all, as ignorant heretics have added and taken away what they wished.” He then proceeds to say that the books to which he refers are the *Acts of Andrew*, written by “the disciples who were his followers,” etc.

In the *Bibliothèque Sacree*, by the Dominicans Richard and Giraud (Paris, 1822), the term is defined to signify (1,) anonymous or pseudepigraphal books; (2,) those which are not publicly read, although they may be read with edification in private; (3,) those which do not pass for authentic and of divine authority, although they pass for being composed by a sacred author or an apostle, as the *Epistle of Barnabas*; and (4,) dangerous books composed by ancient heretics to favor their opinions. They also, apply the name “to books which, after having been contested, are put into the canon by consent of the churches, as Tobit, etc.” Jahn applies it, in its most strict sense, and that which it has borne since the fourth century, to books which, from their inscription, or the author’s name, or the subject, might easily be taken for inspired books, but are not so in reality. It has also been applied by Jerome to certain books not found in the Hebrew canon, but yet publicly read from time immemorial in the Christian Church for edification, although not considered of authority in controversies of faith. These were also termed ecclesiastical books, and have been denominated, for distinction’s sake, the deutero-canonical books, inasmuch as they were not in the original or Hebrew canon. In this sense they are called by some the

Antilegomena of the Old Testament. “The uncanonical. books,” says Athanasius, or the author of the *Synopsis*, “are divided into *antilegomena* and *apocrypha*.” *SEE ANTILEGOMENA*.

Eventually, in the history of the early Church, the great number of pseudonymous productions palmed off upon the unwary as at once sacred and secret, under the great names in Jewish or Christian history, brought this entire class of works into disrepute. Those whose faith rested on the teaching of the Christian Church, and who looked to the O.T. Scriptures either in the Hebrew or the Sept. collection, were not slow to perceive that these productions were destitute of all authority. They applied in scorn what had been used as a title of honor. The *secret* books (*libri secretiore*s, Orig. *Comm. in Matthew* ed. Lomm. 4:237) were rejected as *spurious*. The word apocryphal was soon degraded to the position from which it has never since risen. So far as books like the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs and the Assumption of Moses were concerned, the task of discrimination was comparatively easy, but it became more difficult when the question affected the books which were found in the Sept. translation of the Old Testament; and recognised by the Hellenistic Jews; but were not in the Hebrew text or in the canon acknowledged by the Jews of Palestine. The history of this difficulty, and of the manner in which it affected the reception of particular books, belong rather to the subject of CANON than to that of the present article, but the following facts may be stated as bearing on the application of the word:

**1.** The teachers of the Greek and Latin Churches, accustomed to the use of the Septuagint, or versions resting on the same basis, were naturally led to quote freely and reverently from all the books which were incorporated into it. In Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Athanasius, we find citations from the books of the present Apocrypha, as “Scripture,” “divine Scripture,” “prophecy.” They are very far from applying the term **ἀπόκρυφος** to these writings. If they are conscious of the difference between them and the other books of the O.T., it is only so far as to lead them (comp. Athan. *Synops. S. Scr.* 1. c.) to place the former in the list of **οὐ κανονιζόμενα ἀντιλεγόμενα**, books which were of more use for the ethical instruction of catechumens than for the edification of mature Christians. Augustine, in like manner, applies the word “Apocrypha” only to the spurious books with false titles which were in circulation among heretics, admitting the others, though with some qualifications, under the title of canonical (*de doct. Chr.* 2, 8).



**2.** Wherever, on the other hand, any teacher came into contact with the feelings that prevailed among the Christians of Palestine, there the influence of the rigorous limitation of the old Hebrew canon is at once conspicuous. This is seen in its bearing on the history of the canon in the list given by Melito, bishop of Sardis (Euseb. *H. E.* 4, 26), and obtained by him from Palestine. Of its effects on the application of the word, the writings of Cyril of Jerusalem and Jerome give abundant instances. The former (*Catech.* 4, 33) gives the canonical list of the 22 books of the O.T. Scriptures, and rejects the introduction of all “apocryphal” writings. The latter in his Epistle to Laeta warns the Christian mother in educating her daughter against “omnia apocrypha.” The Prologus Galeatus shows that he did not shrink from including under that title the books which formed part of the Septuagint, and were held in honor in the Alexandrian and Latin Churches. In dealing with the several books he discusses each on its own merits, admiring some, speaking unhesitatingly of the “dreams,” “fables” of others.

**3.** The teaching of Jerome influenced, though not decidedly, the language of the Western Church. The old spurious heretical writings, the “Apocrypha” of Tertullian and Clement, tell more and more into the background, and were almost utterly forgotten. The doubtful books of the Old Testament were used publicly in the service of the Church, quoted frequently: with reverence as Scripture, sometimes, however, with doubts or limitations as to the authority of individual books according to the knowledge or critical discernment of this or that writer (comp. Bp. Cosins’s *Scholastic History of the Canon*). During this period the term by which they were commonly described was not apocryphal but “ecclesiastical.” So they had been described by Rufinus (*Expos. in Symb. Apost.* p. 26), who practically recognised the distinction drawn by Jerome, though he would not apply the more opprobrious epithet to books which were held in honor.

**4.** It was reserved for the age of the Reformation to stamp the word Apocrypha with its present signification. The two views which had hitherto existed together, side by side, concerning which the Church had pronounced no authoritative decision, stood out in sharper contrast. The Council of Trent closed the question which had been left open, and deprived its theologians of the liberty they had hitherto enjoyed, by extending the Canon of Scripture so as to include all the hitherto doubtful or deuterocanonical books, with the exception of the two books of Esdras

and the Prayer of Manasseh, the evidence against which seemed too strong to be resisted (*Sess. IV de Can. Script.*). In accordance with this decree, the editions of the Vulgate published by authority contained the books which the Council had pronounced canonical, as standing on the same footing as those which had never been questioned, while the three which had been rejected were printed commonly in smaller type and stood after the New Testament. The Reformers of Germany and England, on the other hand, influenced in part by the revival of the study of Hebrew and the consequent recognition of the authority of the Hebrew Canon, and subsequently by the reaction against this stretch of authority, maintained the opinion of Jerome and pushed it to its legitimate results. The principle which had been asserted by Carlstadt dogmatically in his “*de Canonicis Scripturis libellus*” (1520) was acted on by Luther. He spoke of individual books among those in question with a freedom as great as that of Jerome, judging each on its own merits, praising Tobit as a “pleasant comedy,” and the Prayer of Manasseh as a “good model for penitents,” and rejecting the two books of Esdras as containing worthless fables. The example of collecting the doubtful books into a separate group had been set in the Strasburg edition of the Septuagint, 1526. In Luther’s complete edition of the German Bible, accordingly (1534), the books (Judith, Wisdom, Tobias, Sirach, 1 and 2 Maccabees, Additions to Esther and Daniel, and the Prayer of Manasseh) were grouped together under the general title of “Apocrypha, i.e. Books which are not of like worth with Holy Scripture, yet are good and useful to be read.” In the history of the English Church, Wicliff showed himself in this as in other points the forerunner of the Reformation, and applied the term Apocrypha to all but the “*twenty-five*” Canonical Books of the Old Testament. The judgment of Jerome was formally asserted in the sixth Article. The disputed books were collected and described in the same way in the printed English Bible of 1539 (Cranmer’s), and since then there has been no fluctuation as to the application of the word. *SEE DEUTERO-CANONICAL.*

**II. Biblical Apocrypha.** — The collection of books to which this term is popularly applied includes the following. The order given is that in which they stand in the English version.

1. 1 Esdras.
2. 2 Esdras.
3. Tobit.
4. Judith.

5. The rest of the chapters of the Book of Esther, which are found neither in the Hebrew nor in the Chaldee.
6. The Wisdom of Solomon.
7. The Wisdom of Jesus the Son of Sirach, or Ecclesiasticus.
8. Baruch.
9. The Song of the Three Holy Children.
10. The History of Susanna.
11. The History of the Destruction of Bel and the Dragon.
12. The Prayer of Manasseh, King of Judah.
13. 1 Maccabees.
14. 2 Maccabees.

The separate books of this collection are treated of in distinct articles. Their relation to the canonical books of the Old Testament is discussed under CANON *SEE CANON*. We propose here to consider only the history and character of the collection as a whole in its relation to Jewish literature.

Whatever questions may be at issue as to the authority of these books, they have in any case an interest, of which no controversy can deprive them, as connected with the literature, and therefore with the history, of the Jews. They represent the period of transition and decay which followed on the return from Babylon, when the prophets, who were then the teachers of the people, had passed away, and the age of scribes succeeded. Uncertain as may be the dates of individual books, few, if any, can be thrown farther back than the beginning of the third century B.C. The latest, the 2d Book of Esdras, is probably not later than 30 B.C., 2 Esdras 7:28 being a subsequent interpolation. The alterations of the Jewish character, the different phases which Judaism presented in Palestine and Alexandria, the good and the evil which were called forth by contact with idolatry in Egypt, and by the struggle against it in Syria, all these present themselves to the reader of the Apocrypha with greater or less distinctness. In the midst of the diversities which we might naturally expect to find in books written by different authors, in different countries, and at considerable intervals of time, it is possible to discern some characteristics which belong to the entire collection.

**1.** The absence of the prophetic element. From first to last the books bear testimony to the assertion of Josephus (*Ap.* 1, 8), that the ἀκριβῆς διαδοχή of prophets had been broken after the close of the O.T. canon.

No one speaks because the word of the Lord had come to him. Sometimes there is a direct confession that the gift of prophecy had departed (1 Maccabees 9:27), or the utterance of a hope that it might one day return (*ibid.* 4, 46; 14:41). Sometimes a teacher asserts in words the perpetuity of the gift (Wisd. 7:27), and shows in the act of asserting it how different the illumination which he had received was from that bestowed on the prophets of the canonical books. When a writer simulates the prophetic character, he repeats with slight modifications the language of the older prophets, as in Baruch, or makes a mere prediction the text of a dissertation, as in the Epistle of Jeremy, or plays arbitrarily with combinations of dreams and symbols, as in 2 Esdras. Strange and perplexing as the last-named book is, whatever there is in it of genuine feeling indicates a mind not at ease with itself, distracted with its own sufferings and with the problems of the universe, and it is accordingly very far removed from the utterance of a man who speaks as a messenger from God.

**2.** Connected with this is the almost total disappearance of the power which had shown itself in the poetry of the Old Testament. The Song of the Three Children lays claim to the character of a psalm, and is probably a translation from some liturgical hymn; but, with this exception, the form of poetry is altogether absent. So far as the writers have come under the influence of Greek cultivation, they catch the taste for rhetorical ornament which characterized the literature of Alexandria. Fictitious speeches become almost indispensable additions to the narrative of a historian, and the story of a martyr is not complete unless (as in the later *Acta Martyrum* of Christian traditions) the sufferer declaims in set terms against the persecutors (Song of the Three Child., 3-22; 2 Maccabees 6:7).

**3.** The appearance, as part of the current literature of the time, of works of fiction, resting or purporting to rest on a historical foundation. It is possible that this development of the national genius may have been, in part, the result of the Captivity. The Jewish exiles brought with them the reputation of excelling in minstrelsy, and were called on to sing the "songs of Zion" (~~Psalm~~ Psalm 137). The trial of skill between the three young men in 1 Esdras 3:4, implies a traditional belief that those who were promoted to places of honor under the Persian kings were conspicuous for gifts of a somewhat similar character. The transition from this to the practice of story-telling was, with the Jews, as afterward with the Arabs, easy and natural enough. The period of the Captivity, with its strange adventures,

and the remoteness of the scenes connected with it, offered a wide and attractive field to the imagination of such narrators. Sometimes, as in *Bel and the Dragon*, the motive of such stories would be the love of the marvellous mingling itself with the feeling of scorn with which the Jew looked on the idolater. In other cases, as in *Tobit* and *Susanna*, the story would gain popularity from its ethical tendencies. The singular variations in the text of the former book indicate at once the extent of its circulation and the liberties taken by successive editors. In the narrative of *Judith*, again, there is probably something more than the interest attaching to the history of the past. There is indeed too little evidence of the truth of the narrative for us to look on it as history at all, and it takes its place in the region of historical romance, written with a political motive, Under the guise of the old Assyrian enemies of Israel the writer is covertly attacking the Syrian invaders, against whom his countrymen were contending, stirring them up, by a story of imagined or traditional heroism, to follow the example of *Judith*, as she had followed that of *Jael* (*Ewald, Gesch. Israels*, 4, 541). The development of this form of literature is, of course, compatible with a high degree of excellence, but it is true of it at all times, and was especially true of the literature of the ancient world, that it belongs rather to its later and feebler period. It is a special sign of decay in honesty and discernment when such writings -are passed off and accepted as belonging to actual history.

**4.** The free exercise of the imagination within the domain of history led to the growth of a purely legendary literature. The full development of this was indeed reserved for a yet later period. The books of the Apocrypha occupy a middle place between those of the Old Testament in their simplicity and truthfulness and the wild extravagances of the Talmud. As it is, however, we find in them the germs of some of the fabulous traditions which were influencing the minds of the Jews at the time of our Lord's ministry, and have since in some instances incorporated themselves more or less with the popular belief of Christendom. So in *2 Maccabees* 1:2, we meet with the statements that at the time of the captivity the priests had concealed the sacred fire, and that it was miraculously renewed — that *Jeremiah* had gone, accompanied by the tabernacle and the ark, "to the mountain where *Moses* climbed up to see the heritage of God," and had there concealed them in a cave together with the altar of incense. The apparition of the prophet at the close of the same book (15:15), as giving to *Judas Maccabaeus* the sword with which, as a "gift from God," he was

to “wound the adversaries,” shows how prominent a place was occupied by Jeremiah in the traditions and hopes of the people, and prepares us to understand the rumors which followed on our Lord’s teaching and working that “Jeremias or one of the prophets” had appeared again (~~<DIG4>~~ Matthew 16:14). So again in 2 Esdras 13:40-47, we find the legend of the entire disappearance of the Ten Tribes, which, in spite of direct and indirect testimony on the other side, has given occasion even in our own time to so many wild conjectures. In chap. 14 of the same book we recognize (as has been pointed out already) the tendency to set a higher value on books of an esoteric knowledge than on those in the Hebrew canon; but it deserves notice that this is also another form of the tradition that Ezra dictated from a supernaturally-inspired memory the sacred books which, according to that tradition, had been lost, and that both fables are exaggerations of the part actually taken by him and by “the men of the Great Synagogue” in the work of collecting and arranging them. So also the rhetorical narrative of the Exodus in Wisd. 16 - 19 indicates the existence of a traditional, half-legendary history side by side with the canonical. It would seem, indeed, as if the life of Moses had appeared with many different embellishments. The form in which that life appears in Josephus, the facts mentioned in St. Stephen’s speech and not found in the Pentateuch, the allusions to Jannes and Jambres (~~<STR8>~~ 2 Timothy 3:8), to the disputes between Michael and the devil (Jude 9), to the “rock that followed” the Israelites (~~<600>~~ 1 Corinthians 10:4), all bear testimony to the wide-spread popularity of this semi-apocryphal history. *SEE ENOCH (BOOK OF).*

**5.** As the most marked characteristic of the collection as a whole and of the period to which it belongs, there is the tendency to pass off supposititious books under the cover of illustrious names. The books of Esdras, the additions to Daniel, the letters of Baruch and Jeremiah, and the Wisdom of Solomon, are obviously of this character. It is difficult, perhaps, for us to measure in each instance the degree in which the writers of such books were guilty of actual frauds. In a book like the Wisdom of Solomon, for example, the form may have been adopted as a means of gaining attention by which no one was likely to be deceived, and, as such, it does not go beyond the limits of legitimate personation. The fiction in this case need not diminish our admiration and reverence for the book any more than it would destroy the authority of Ecclesiastes were we to come to the conclusion, from internal or other evidence, that it belonged to a later age than that of Solomon. The habit, however, of writing books under fictitious

names is, as the later Jewish history shows, a very dangerous one. The practice becomes almost a trade. Each such work creates a new demand, to be met in its turn by a fresh supply, and thus the prevalence of an apocryphal literature becomes a sure sign of want of truthfulness on one side, and want of discernment on the other.

**6.** The absence of honesty, and of the power to distinguish truth from falsehood, shows itself in a yet more serious form in the insertion of formal documents purporting to be authentic, but in reality failing altogether to establish any claim to that title. This is obviously the case with the decree of Artaxerxes in Esther 16. The letters with which 2 Maccabees opens from the Jews at Jerusalem betray their true character by their historical inaccuracy. We can hardly accept as genuine the letter in which the king of the Lacedaemonians (1 Maccabees 12:20, 21) writes to Onias that “the Lacedaemonians and Jews are brethren, and that they are of the stock of Abraham.” The letters in 2 Maccabees 9 and 11, on the other hand, might be authentic so far as their contents go, but the recklessness with which such documents are inserted as embellishments and make-weights throws doubt in a greater or less degree on all of them.

**7.** The loss of the simplicity and accuracy which characterize the history of the Old Testament is shown also in the errors and anachronisms in which these books abound. Thus, to take a few of the most striking instances, Haman is made a Macedonian, and the purpose of his plot is to transfer the kingdom from the Persians to the Macedonians (Esther 16:10); two contradictory statements are given in the same book of the death of Antiochus Epiphanes (2 Maccabees 1:15-17; 9:5-29); Nabuchodonosor is made to dwell at Nineve as the king of the Assyrians (Judith 1:1).

**8.** In their relation to the religious and ethical development of Judaism during the period which these books embrace, we find

**(1.)** the influences of the struggle against idolatry under Antiochus, as shown partly in the revival of the old heroic spirit, and in the record of the deeds which it called forth, as in Maccabees, partly again in the tendency of a narrative like Judith, and the protests against idol-worship in Baruch and Wisdom.

**(2.)** The growing hostility of the Jews toward the Samaritans is shown by the confession of the Son of Sirach (Ecclus. 1, 25, 26).

**(3.)** The teaching of Tobit illustrates the prominence then and afterward assigned to alms-giving among the duties of a holy life (Tobit 4:7-11; 12:9). The classification of the three elements of such a life, prayer, fasting, alms, in 12:8, illustrates the traditional ethical teaching of the Scribes, which was at once recognised and purified from the errors that had been connected with it in the Sermon on the Mount (~~401~~ Matthew 6:1-18).

**(4.)** The same book indicates also the growing belief in the individual guardianship of angels and the germs of a grotesque daemonology, resting in part on the more mysterious phenomena of man's spiritual nature, like the cases of daemonic possession in the Gospels, but associating itself only too easily with all the frauds and superstitions of vagabond exorcists.

**(5.)** The great Alexandrian book of the collection, the Wisdom of Solomon, breathes, as we might expect, a strain of higher mood; and though there is absolutely no ground for the patristic tradition that it was written by Philo, the conjecture that it might have been was not without a plausibility which might well commend itself to men like Basil and Jerome. The personification of Wisdom as "the unspotted mirror of the power of God and the image of his goodness" (7, 26), as the universal teacher of all "holy souls" in "all ages" (7, 27), as guiding and ruling God's people, approaches the teaching of Philo, and foreshadows that of the Apostle John as to the manifestation of the unseen God through the medium of the Logos and the office of that divine Word as the light that lighteth every man. In relation again to the symbolic character of the Temple as "a resemblance of the holy tabernacle" which God "has prepared from the beginning" (~~402~~ John 9:8), the language of this book connects itself at once with that of Philo and with the teaching of the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews. But that which is the great characteristic of the book, as of the school from which it emanated, is the writer's apprehension of God's kingdom and the blessings connected with it as eternal, and so as independent of men's conceptions of time. Thus chapters 1, 2, contain the strong protest of a righteous man against the materialism which then, in the form of a sensual selfishness, as afterward in the developed system of the Sadducees, was corrupting the old faith of Israel. Against this he asserts that the "souls of the righteous are in the hands of God" (3:1); that the blessings which the popular belief connected with length of



days were not to be measured by the duration of years, seeing that “wisdom is the gray hair unto men, and an unspotted life is old age.”

(6.) In regard to another truth also this book was in advance of the popular belief of the Jews of Palestine. In the midst of its strong protests against idolatry, there is the fullest recognition of God’s universal love (11:23-26), of the truth that His power is but the instrument of His righteousness (12:16), of the difference between those who are the “less to be blamed” as “seeking God and desirous to find Him” (13:6), and the victims of a darker and more debasing idolatry. Here also the unknown writer of the *Wisdom of Solomon* seems to prepare the way for the higher and wider teaching of the New Testament. *SEE LOGOS.*

**III.** *Spurious and Pseudepigraphal Books, as distinct from Antilegomena or Ecclesiastical.* — Among this class are doubtless to be considered the 3d and 4th books of Esdras; and it is no doubt in reference to these that, in his letter to Vigilantius, Athanasius speaks of a work of Esdras which he says that he had never even read. Of the same character are also the book of Enoch, the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs, the Assumption of Moses, etc.; which, as well as 3 and 4 Esdras, being by many considered as the fictions of Christians of the second and third centuries, it is doubtful whether they ought to be classed in the Apocrypha of the Old or of the New Testament. Origen, however, believed the New Testament to have contained citations from books of this kind written before the times of the apostles, as is evident from his reference to such in his preface to the *Canticles*. Then, in his *Letter to Apianus*, he observes that there were many things kept from the knowledge of the public, but which were preserved in the hidden or *apocryphal* books, to which he refers the passage (<sup>313</sup>Hebrews 11:37), “They were sawn asunder.” Origen probably alludes here to that description of books which the Jews called *genuzim*, [גנזינים] a word of the same signification with *apocrypha*, and applied to books laid aside, or not permitted to be publicly read or considered, even when divinely inspired, not fit for indiscriminate circulation: among the latter were the first chapter of Genesis, the Song of Solomon, and our last eight chapters of the prophet Ezekiel. The books which we have here enumerated, such as the book of Enoch, etc., which were all known to the ancient fathers, have descended to our times; and, although incontestably spurious, are of considerable value from their antiquity, as throwing light

upon the religious and theological opinions of the first centuries. The most curious are the 3d and 4th books of Esdras, and the book of Enoch, which has been but recently discovered, and has acquired peculiar interest from its containing the passage cited by the apostle Jude. *SEE ENOCH*. Nor are the apocryphal books of the New Testament destitute of interest. Although the spurious Acts extant have no longer any defenders of their genuineness, they are not without their value to the Biblical student, and have been applied with success to illustrate the style and language of the genuine books, to which they bear a close analogy. The American translator of Mosheim's *Ecclesiastical History* terms them "harmless and ingenious fictions, intended either to gratify the fancy or to silence the enemies of Christianity."

Some of the apocryphal books have not been without their defenders in modern times. The *Apostolical Canons* and *Constitutions*, and the various *Liturgies* ascribed to St. Peter, St. Mark, etc., and published by Fabricius in his *Codex Apocryphus Novi Testamenti*, were considered by the learned and eccentric William Whiston, and the no less learned Grabe, to be of equal authority with any of the confessedly genuine apostolic compositions (see Whiston's *Primitive Christianity* and Grabe's *Spicilegium*). They are, however, regarded by most as originally not of an earlier date than the second century, and as containing interpolations which betray the fourth or fifth; they can, therefore, only be considered as evidence of the practice of the Church at the period when they were written. They have generally been appealed to by the learned as having preserved the traditions of the age immediately succeeding the apostolic; and, from the remarkable coincidence which is observable in the most essential parts of the so-called Apostolic Liturgies, it is by no means improbable that, notwithstanding their interpolations, they contain the leading portions of the most ancient Christian forms of worship. Most of the apocryphal Gospels and Acts noticed by the fathers, and condemned in the catalogue of Gelasius, which are generally thought to have been the fictions of heretics in the second century, have long since fallen into oblivion. Of those which remain, although some have been considered by learned men as genuine works of the apostolic age, yet the greater part are universally rejected as spurious, and as written in the second and third centuries. A few are, with great appearance of probability, assigned to Leucius Clarinus, supposed to be the same with Leontius and Seleucus, who was notorious for similar forgeries at the end of the third century. The authorship of the *Epistle of Barnabas*

(q.v.) is still a matter of dispute; and there appears but too much reason to believe that there existed grounds for the charge made by Celsus against the early Christians, that they had interpolated or forged the ancient Sibylline Oracles. In the letter of Pope Innocent I to St. Exupere, bishop of Toulouse, written about the year 405, after giving a catalogue of the books forming the canon of Scripture (which includes five books of Solomon, Tobit, and two books of Maccabees), he observes: "But the others, which are written under the name of Matthias, or of James the Less, or those which were written by one Leucius under the name of Peter and John, or those under the name of Andrew by Xenocheris and Leonidas the philosopher, or under the name of Thomas; or if there be any others, you must know that they are not only to be rejected, but condemned." These sentiments were afterward confirmed by the Roman Council of seventy bishops, held under Pope Gelasius in 494, in the acts of which there is a long list of apocryphal Gospels and Acts, the greater part of which are supposed to have perished. The acts of this council, however, are not generally considered to be genuine. But, whatever authority is to be ascribed to these documents, it cannot be denied that the early Church evinced a high degree of discrimination in the difficult task of distinguishing the genuine from the spurious books, as has been well observed by Jones (*New and Full Method*, 1, 15) and Baxter (*Saint's Rest*, p. 2). *SEE CANON.*

The following is a list of the genuine writings mentioned in the OLD TEST., but now *lost*, or generally thought so to be:

The "Prophecy of ENOCH" (~~614~~Jude 1:14). But *SEE ENOCH*

The "Book of the Wars of the Lord" (~~0214~~Numbers 21:14).

The "Book of the Just" (~~603~~Joshua 10:13; ~~0018~~2 Samuel 1:18). *SEE JASHER.*

The "Book of the Order of the Kingdom," or of the Royal Administration, written by Samuel (~~0025~~1 Samuel 10:25). See KING.

The "Books of NATHAN and GAD" concerning King David (~~1329~~1 Chronicles 29:29).

The "Books of NATHAN, AHIJAH, and IDDO" concerning King Solomon (~~4029~~2 Chronicles 9:29).

SOLOMON'S Parables, Songs, and Treatises on Natural History" (<sup><1069></sup>1 Kings 4:32 sq). But *SEE PROVERBS*; *SEE CANTICLES*; *SEE ECCLESIASTES*.

The "Book of the Acts of SOLOMON" (<sup><1114></sup>1 Kings 11:41).

The "Book of SERAIAH" concerning King Rehoboam (<sup><14215></sup>2 Chronicles 12:15).

The "Book of JEIU" concerning Jehoshaphat (<sup><14784></sup>2 Chronicles 20:34).

The "Book of ISAIAH" concerning King Uzziah (<sup><14872></sup>2 Chronicles 26:22)  
But *SEE ISAIAH*.

The "Words of the Seers" to King Manasseh (<sup><14872></sup>2 Chronicles 26:22).

The "Book of Lamentations" over King Josiah (<sup><14875></sup>2 Chronicles 35:25).  
But *SEE LAMENTATIONS*.

The "Volume of JEREMIAH" burned by Jehudi (<sup><28812></sup>Jeremiah 36:2, 6, 23).  
But *SEE JEREMIAH*.

The "Chronicle of the Kings of Judah" (<sup><11439></sup>1 Kings 14:29; 15:7). But *SEE CHRONICLES*.

The Chronicle 'of the Kings' of Israel" (<sup><11443></sup>1 Kings 14:29). But *SEE CHRONICLES*.

The following is a list of pseudepigraphal hooks relating to the Old Test., still *extant* (exclusive of those contained in the definitively so called "Apocrypha"), with the language in which ancient copies have been discovered. See each title, or professed author here cited, under its proper head in the body of this Cyclopaedia.

The "History of ANTIOCHUS" Epiphanes (Heb.). This appears to be a garbled Hebraic version of the accounts of that tyrant in the books of the Maccabees (see Fabricius, *Codex Pseudepigr.* 5, 1. 1, 1165 sq., where a Latin translation is given of it).

The "History of ARENATHI," Joseph's Wife (Lat. Given by Fabricius, *ib.* 1, p. 774 sq.).

The "Epistle of BARUCH" (Lat. In Fabricius, *ib.* 2, 147 sq.).

The "Book of ELIAS" the Prophet (see *ib.* 1, 1070).

The "Book of ENOCH" (Ethiopic).

The “THIRD [Engl. *First*] Book of ESDRAS” (Gr. and Lat.).  
 The “FOURTH [*Second*] Book of ESDRAS” (Lat., Arab., and Eth.).  
 The “Ascension of ISAIAH” (Ethiopic).  
 The “Book of JASHER” (Heb.).  
 The “Book of JEZIRAH” or Creation (Heb.).  
 The “Third Book of MACCABEES “ (Gr.).  
 The “Fourth Book of MACCABEES “ (Gr.).  
 The “Fifth Book of MACCABEES” (Ar. and Syr.)  
 The Assumption of MOSES” (see Fabricius, 1:825).  
 The “Preaching of NOAH” to the Antediluvians, according to the *Sibylline Oracle*. (Fabricius, 1:230).

The “Testament of the Twelve PATRIARCIS” (Gr. Given by Fabricius, with a Latin translation, *Coder Pseudepigr. A. T.* 1, 519 sq.).

The “Psalter of SOLOMON” (Gr. Given in like manner, *ib.* 1, 917 sq.).

The “Book of ZOHAR” or Light (Heb.).

The following is a list of all the apocryphal pieces relating to the NEW TEST., *not now extant*, mentioned by writers in the first four centuries after Christ, with the several writings in which they are (last) cited or noticed. See each name in its alphabetical place.

**(1.)** The “Acts of ANDREW” (Euseb. *Hist. Eccl.* 3, 25; Philastr. *Heres.* 87; Epiphan; *Heres.* 47, 1; 61:1; 63:2; Gelasius, in *Decret. ap. Concil. Sanct.* 4, 1260). But **SEE ANDREW**.

**(2.)** “Books” under the name of ANDREW (Augustine, *contr. Adversar. Leg. et Prophet.* 1, 20; Innocent I, *Epist.* 3, *ad Exuper. Thiol.* *Episc.* 7).

**(3)** The “Gospel of ANDREW” (Gelas. in *Decret.*).

A “Gospel” under the name of APELLES (Jerome, Praef. in *Conmmenn. in Matt.*).

The “Gospel according to the Twelve APOSTLES” (Origen, *Hom 1. in Luc.* 1, 1; Ambrose, *Comment. in Luc.* 1, 1; Jerome, Praef. in *Comment. in Matt.*).

The “Gospel of BARNABAS” (Gelas. in *Decret.*).

(1.) The “Gospel of BARTHOLOMEW” (Jerome, *Catal. Scrit. Eccles.* in Pantzen.; Prief. in *Comment. in Matt.*; Gelas. in *Decret.*).

(2.) The; “Writings of BARTHOLOMEW the Apostle” (Dionys. the Areopagite, *De Theol. Hist.* 1, 1).

The “Gospel of BASILIDES” (Origen, in *Luc.* 1, 1; Ambrose, in *Luc.* 1, 1; Jerome, Praef. in *Comm. in Matt.*).

(1.) The “Gospel of CERINTHUS” (Epiplan. *Haeres.* 51, 7).

(2.) The “Revelation of CERINTHUS” (Caius, Presb. Rom., *lib. Disput.* ap. Fuseb. *Hist. Eccl.* 2, 28).

(1.) Some “Books” under the name of CHRIST (Augustine, *De Consens. Evang.* 1, 3)

(2.) An “Epistle of CHRIST “ produced by the Manicheans (Augustine, *comltr. Faust.* 28, 4).

(3.) An “Epistle of CHRIST to Peter and Paul” (Augustine *de Consen. Evang.* 1, 9, 10).

(4.) A “Hymn of CHRIST” taught to his disciples (Episcop. *ad Ceret. Epist.*).

(1.) The “Acts of the Apostles” made use of by the EBIONITES (Epiphan. *Haeres.* 30, 16).

(2.) The “Gospel of the EBIONITES” (*ib.* 13).

The “Gospel according to the EGYPTIANS” (Clem. Alex. *Strom.* 3, 452, 465; Origen, in *Luc.* 2; Jerome, Praef. in *Comm. in Matt.*; Epiphan. *Haeres.* 62:2).

The “Gospel of the ENCRATITES” (Epiphan. *Haeres.* 46, 1).

The “Gospel of EVE” (*ib.* 26, 2).

The “Gospel according to the HEBREWS” (Heges’p. *lib. Comment.* sp Euseb. *Hist. Eccl.* 4, 22; Clem. Alex. *Strom.* 2, p. 380; Origen, *Tract.* 8 in ~~1019~~ *Matthew* 19:19; and in *Joan.* p. 58; Euseb. *Hist. Eccl.* 3, 25, 27, 39; Jerome, often).

The “Book of the HELKASAITES” (Euseb. *Hist. Eccl.* 6, 38).

The false “Gospels of HESYCHIUS” (Jerome, Praef. in *Evang. ad Darnas.*; Gelasius, in *Decret.*).

(1.) The “Book of JAMES” (Origen, *Comm. in ~~Luc.~~ Matthew 13:55, 56.*

(2.) “Books” forged and published under the name of JAMES (Epiphan. *Haeres.* 30, 23; Innocent I, *Epist. 3 ad Exuper. Tholos. Episc.* 7).

(1.) The “Acts of JOHN” (Euseb. *Hist. Eccl.* 3, 25; Athanas. in *Synopsis.* 76; Philastr. *Haeres.* 87; Epiphan. *Haeres.* 47, 1; Augustine. *contr. Advers. Leg.* 1, 20).

(2.) “Books” under the name of JOHN (Epiphan. *Haeres.* 38:1; Innocent 1, *I. c.*).

A “Gospel” under the name of JUDAS Iscariot (Iren. *adv. Haeres.* 1, 25).

A “Gospel” under the name of JUDE (Epiphan. *Haeres* 38:1).

The “Acts of the Apostles” by LEUCIUS (Augustine, *de Fide contr. Manich.* 38).

(1.) “The Acts of the Apostles” by LENTITIUS (Augustine, *de Act. cam., foelic. Manich.* 2, 6).

(2.) The “Books of LENTITIUS” (Gelas. in *Decret.*).

The “Acts” under the Apostles’ name, by LEONITUS (Augustine, *de Pide contr. Maanich.* 5).

The “Acts of the Apostles” by LEUTHON (Jerome, *Epist. ad Chromat. et Helionor.*).

The false “Gospels” published by LUCIANUS (Jerome, Praef. in *Evang. et Damas.*).

The “Acts of the Apostles” used by the MANICHEANS (Augustine, *contr. Adimant. Manich.* 17).

“Books” under the name of MATTHEW (Epiphan. *Haeres.* 30:23).

(1.) A “Book” under the name of MATTHIAS (Innocent I, *ut sup.*)

(2.) The “Gospel of MATTHIAS” Origen, *Comm. in Luc.* 1, 1; Euseb. *Hist. Eccl.* 3, 25; Ambrose, in *Luc.* 1, 1; Jerome, Praef. in *Comm. in Matt.*).

(3.) The “Traditions of MATTHIAS” (Clem. Al 10 *Strom.* 2, p. 38; 3, 436; 7:748).

The “Gospel of MERINTHUS” (Epiphan. *Haeres.* 2, 7).

The “Gospel according to the NAZARENES.” (See above, “Gospel according to the Hebrews.”)

(1.) The “Acts of PAUL” (Origen, *de Princip.* 1, 2; in *Joan.* 2, p. 298; Euseb. *Hist. Eccl.* 3, 3 and 25; Philastr. *Haeres.* 87.

(2.) A “Book” under the name of PAUL (Cyprian, *Epist.* 27).

(3.) The “Preaching of PAUL and PETER” (Lactantius, *De Ver. Sap.* 4, 21; *Script. anonym. ad calcem Opp. Cypr.*; and [according to some] Clem. Alex. *Strom.* 6, 636).

(4.) The “Revelation of PAUL” (Epiphan. *Haeres.* 38, 2; Augustine, *Tract* 98 in *Joan.* s. f.; Gelas. in *Decret.*).

The “Gospel of PERFECTION” (Epiphan. *Haeres.* 26, 2).

(1.) The “Acts of PETER” (Euseb. *Hist. Eccl.* 3, 3; Athanas. in *Synops.* S. S. 76; Philastr. *Haeres.* 87; Jerome, *Capit. Script. Eccl. in Petr.*; Epiphan. *Haeres.* 30, 15).

(2.) “Books” under the name of PETER (Innocent I, *Epist. 3 ad Exupa. Tholos Episc.* 7).

(3.) The “Doctrine of PETER” (Origen, Procem. in *lb. de Princip.*).

(4.) The “Gospel of PETER” (Serapion, *De Evang. Petri*, ap. Euseb. *Hist. Eccl.* 6, 16; Tertull. *adv. Macc.* 4, 5; Origen, *Comn. in Matt.* 13:55, 56; vol. 1, p. 223; Euseb. *Hist. Eccl.* 3, 3 and 25; Jerome, *Catal. Script. Eccl. in Petr.*).

(5.) The “Judgment of PETER” (Rufin. *Expos. in Symbol. Apost.* 36; Jerome, *Catal. Script. Eccles. in Peter.*).

(6.) The “Preaching of PETER” (Heracl. ap. Origen, *lib. 14 in Joan.*; Clem. Alex. *Strom.* 1, 357; 2:390; 6, 635, 636, 678; Theolot. Byzant. in *Excerpt.* p. 809, ad calc. *Opp.* Clem. Alex.; Lactant. *De Fer. Sap.* 4, 21; Euseb. *Hist. Eccl.* 3, 3; Jerome, *Catal. Scrip. Eccles. in Petr.*).



(7.) The “Revelation of PETER” (Clem. Alex. *lib. Hypntopos.* ap. Euseb. *Hist. Eccl.* 6, 14; Theodot. Byz. in *Excerpt.* p. 806, 807, ad calc. *Opp.* Clem. Alex.; Euseb. *Hist. Eccl.* 3, 3 and 25; Jerome, *Catal. Script. Eccl. in Petr.*).

(1.) The “Acts of PHILIP” (Gelas. in *Decret.*).

(2.) The “Gospel of PHILP” (Epiphan. *Haeres.* 26, 13).

The “Gospel of SCYTHIANUS” (Cyrill. *Catech.* 6, 22; Epiphan. *Haeres.* 66, 2).

The “Acts of the Apostles” by SELEUCUS (Jerome, *Epist. ad Chromat. et Heliodor.*).

The “Revelation of STEPHEN” (Gelas. in *Decret.*).

The “Gospel of THADDAEUS” (*ib.*).

The Catholic “Epistle of THEMISON” the Montanist (Apollon. *lib. contr. C taphya.* ap. Euseb. *Hist. Eccl.* 5,18).

(1.) “The Acts of THOMAS” (Epiphan. *Haeres.* 47, 1; 61:1; Athanas. in *Synops.* .S. .76; Gelas. in *Decret.*).

(2.) “Books” under the name of THOMAS (Innocent I, *up sup.*).

(3.) The “Revelation of THOMAS” (Gelas. in *Decret.*).

The Gospel of TITIAN” (Euseb. *Hist. Eccl.* 4, 29).

The “Gospel of TRUTH” made use of by the Valentinians (Iren. *adv. Haeres.* 3, 11).

The “Gospel of VALENTINUS” (Tertull. *de Proescript. adv. Haeres.* 49).

The following list comprises those pseudepigraphal works relating to the New Test. which still *exist*, with the language in which ancient copies have been preserved. See each title and professed author in its place.

A “History of the Contest between the Apostles” by ABDIAS (Lat.).

The “Letter of ABGARUS to Christ,” and the “Reply of Christ to Abgarus” (Gr.).

- The “General Epistle of BARNABAS” (Gr).
- The “First Epistle of CLEMENT to the Corinthians” (Gr.).
- The “Second Epistle (of CLEMENT to the Corinthians)” (Gr.).
- The “Descent of CHRIST into Hell” (*Gr.* and *Lat.*).
- The “Apostolical CONSTITUTIONS” (Gr., Eth., and Copt ).
- The First Book of HERMAS,” called his Visions (Gr. and Lat.).
- The “Second Book of HERMAS,” called his Commands (Gr. and Lat.).
- The “Third Book of HERMAS,” called his Similitudes (Gr. and Lat.).
- The “Epistle of IGNATIUS to the Ephesians” (Gr. and Lat.).
- The Epistle of IONATRUS to the Magnesians” (Gr. and Lat.).
- The Epistle of IGNATIUS to the Philadelphians” (Gr. and Lat.).
- The “Epistle of IGNATIUS to Polycarp” (Gr. and Lat.).
- The “Epistle of IGNATIUS to the Romans” (Gr. and Lat.).
- The “Epistle of IGNATIUS to the Smyrnaans” (Gr. and Lat.).
- The “Epistle of IGNATIUS to the Trallians” (Gr. and Lat.).
- The “Gospel of the INFANCY” of the Savior (Arab. and Lat.)
- The “Protevangeliium of JAMES” (Gr. and Lat.).
- The (mutilated and altered) “Gospel of St. JOHN” (Gr.).
- The (apocryphal) “Book of the Apostle JOHN” (Lat.).
- The “Narrative of JOSEPH of Arimathaea” (Gr.).
- The “Sacred Memorial Book of Joseph,” a Christian. (The Greek text, — entitled Ἰωσήπου Βιβλίον Ὑπομνηστικόν, is given in full by Fabricius, *Cod. Pseudepigr. V. T. 2*, ad fin., with a Latin translation). The “Epistle of Paul to the LAODICEANS” (Gr.).
- The (fragmentary) “Gospel of MARCION” (Gr.).
- The “Gospel of [Pseudo-] MATTHIAS” (Lat.).
- The “Gospel of the Nativity of St. MARY” (Lat.).
- The “Gospel of the Nativity of MARY, and of the Infancy of the Savior” (Lat.).
- The “Gospel of NICODEMUS” (Gr. and Lat.).
- The “Epistles of the Corinthians to PAUL, and of Paul to the CORINTHIANS” (Armen ).
- The “Acts of PILATE” (Gr. and Lat ).
- The “Apprehension of PILATE” (Gr.).
- The “Death of PILATE” (Gr. and Lat ).
- The “First Epistle of PILATE” (Gr. and Lat ).
- The “Second Epistle of PILATE” (Gr. and Lat.).

The “Epistle of POLYCARP to the Philippians” (Gr.).

The “Vindication of the SAVIOUR” (Lat.).

The “Epistles of Paul to SENECA,” and “of Seneca to PAUL” (Gr.).

The “SIBYLLINE Oracles” (Gr.).

The “Acts of Paul and THECLA” (Gr.).

The “Gospel of THOMAS” the Israelite (Gr. and Lat.).

**IV. Literature.** — The best accounts of these and other apocryphal documents will be found in Fabricii *Codex Pseudepigraphus V. T.* (Hamb. and Lpz. 1713 and 1741), and *Codex Apocryphus N.T.* (Hamb. 1713-1722); *Auctarium Codicis Apocryphi N.T. Fabriciani*, edidit And. Birch (Copenh. 1804); *A new and full Method of settling the Canon of the N.T.*, by the Rev. Jeremiah Jones (Oxf. 1726 — last edition, Oxf. 1827); Du Pin, *Prolegomena* (Amst. 1701); and *Canon of the Old and New Testaments* (London, 1700); Volkmar, *Einleit. in die Apocryphen* (vol. 1, Tib. 1860-63); and especially *Codex Apocryphus N.T.* etc., edit. with notes, prolegomena and translation, by T. C. Thilo (tom. 1, Lips. 1832, 8vo; the remaining two volumes have not been published) — containing:

(1.) The history of Joseph the Carpenter, Arab. and Lat.;

(2.) The Gospel of the Infancy;

(3.) The Protevangelion of James, and the Gospel of Thomas the Israelite, Greek and Latin;

(4.) The Gospel of the Nativity of Mary and the History of the Nativity of Mary and the Savior, Latin;

(5.) The Gospel of Marcion, collected by Dr. Hahn from ancient Greek MSS.;

(6.) The Gospel of Nicodemus, Gr. and Lat.;

(7.) Apprehension and Death of Pilate, Gr.;

(8.) The mutilated and altered Gospel of St. John, preserved in the archives of the Templars of St. John of Jerusalem in Paris, with Griesbach’s text;

(9.) An apocryphal book of the Apostle John, Lat

Consult the following by Dr. Tischendorf:

- (1.) *De Evangeliorum Apocryphorum origine et usu* (Hague, 1851);
- (2.) *Acta Apocrypha ex ant. codd.* (Lips. 1852);
- (3.) *Evangelia Apocrypha adhib. codd. Graec. et Latinis* (Lips. 1853);
- (4.) *Apocalypses Apocryphoe* (Lips. 1866).

Dr. Laurence, of Oxford, has published the following apocryphal works:

- (1.) *The Book of Enoch* (1838);
- (2.) *Ascensio Isaioe Vatis* (1819);
- (3.) *Primi Esroe Libri* (1820). Comp. Lardner, *Works*, 10, 31. **SEE ACTS, SEE GOSPELS, SEE EPISTLES, SEE REVELATIONS** (*spurious*).

The best commentary on the apocryphal books of the O.T. (i.e. those contained in the Sept. and Vulg. but not in the Heb.) is the *Exegetisches Handbuch zu den Apokryphen des 'A. T.* by Fritzsche and Grimm (Leipz. 1856 sq.); a convenient one for English readers is Rich. Arnald's *Crit. Comment. on the Apocrypha* (Lmond. 1744, aid often since). Annotations on each book are also contained in Calmet's *Commentary*, and the *Critici Sacri*, vol. 3; see likewise Parei *Opera*, 1; De Sacy's *Sainte Bible*; Cappel, *Commentarii*, p. 560 Others are by Van Hamelsveld (Amst. 1797); Heze, (Lemgo, 1800); Wilson (Edinb. 1801); Gaab (Tub. 1818-19); Plessner (Berlin, 1834); Gutmann (Alton. 1841); Bosberg (Stutt. 1840). Different editions: Fabricius (Frkft. and Lpz. 1691); Leusden (Frkft. ad M. 1694); Reineccius (Lips. 1732, 1757); Bendsten (Gott. 1790); Augusti (Lips. 1804); Apel (Lips. 1836). All the ancient versions of the texts extant may be found in the 4th vol. of Walton's *Polyglott*. Davidson has given a brief but critical Introduction to each book in Horne's *Introd.* new ed. vol. 2 of a more miscellaneous character: Suicer, *Thesaur. Eccl.* p. 438; Gieseler, *Was heisst Apokryphisch?* in the *Theol. Stud.* 2, 141; *Das Kriterium e. apker. Bucks*, in Augusti's *Theol. Bl.* 1, 540; Reynolds, *Censura apocryphorum V. et N.T.* (Oppenh. 1611); Hencke, *Prodromos ad apocr. V. T.* (Hal. 1711); Benzell, *De apocr. N.T.* in his *Syntag.* 1, 316 sq.; Eichhorn, *Einlkit. in d. Apokr. des A. T.* (Lpz. 1795); Frisch, *D. Apokr. d. A. T. u. d. Schr. d. v. N.T.*, in Eichhorn's *Bibl.* 4, 653; Bendsten, *Exerc. in V. T. Apocr.* (Gott. 1789); Bretschneider, *D. Apokr. d. A. T.* (Lpz. 1805); Cramar, *Moral d. Ap. d. A. T.* (Lpz. 1815); Jenichen, *De librorum . T. et*

*V. T. apocr. illustratione* (Viteb. 1786); Kuinol, *Obs. ad N.T. ex op3 cr. V. T.* (Lips. 1794); Beckhaus, *D. Apokr. d. A. T.* (Dortm. 1808); Frankel, *Apocrypha a Graec. in Heb. conversa* (Lips. 1830); *Appendices ad apocr. N.T.*, in J. Moller's *Theol. Bibl.* 9, 1 sq.; Brockmann, *De apocr. nonzine* (Gryph. 1766); Augusti, *D. Apokr. d. A. T.* (Bresl. 1816); Moultrie, *Les livres apocryphes de l'Ancient Test.* (Genf. 1828); Bergguist, *Jessia in apocr. V. T.* (Lond. 1826); Elbrard, *Zeugnisse gegen d. Apokryphen* (Basle, 1851); Kierl, *D. Apokryphen des A. T.* (Lpz. 1852); Kluge, *id.* (Freft. ad 5. 1852); Stier's Essays in the *Evang. Kirchengz.* 1828, 1853, 1855; Nitzsch, in the *Zeitschr. f. christl. Wissensch.* 1850; Bleek, *Stellung d. Ap. d. A. T.* (in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1853, p. 267 sq.). See each of the apocryphal books under its name.

The following works are on the apocryphal additions to the New Test.: Schmid, *Corpus apocr. extra Biblia* (Hadam. 1804); Beausobre, *De N.T. apocryphis* (Berol. 1734); Kleuker, *D. Apokr. d. N.T.* (Hamb. 1798); Lorsbach, *D. heiligen Bucher d. Johannis jiunger* (Marb. 1807); Bartholma, *Uebers. d. Apokr. d. N.T.* (Dinkelsbuhl, 1832); Beausobre, in Cramer's *Beit.* 1, 251-314; Reuss, *Dz N.T. apocr.* (Argent. 1829); Suckow's ed. of the *Protevangelium Jacobi* (Vratisl. 1841); Ellicott, *Cambridge Essays* for 1856; Toland, *Collection of Pieces*, 1, 350. Many of these spurious works are translated in Hone's *Apocryphal N.T.* (Lond. 1820; N. Y. 1849, 8vo), and Abp. Wake's *Apost. Fathers* (Lond. 1830; Hartf. 1834, 8vo).