THE AGES DIGITAL LIBRARY

REFERENCE

CYCLOPEDIA of BIBLICAL, THEOLOGICAL and ECCLESIASTICAL LITERATURE

C - Canthcras

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

C

Cab

(bqi *kab, a hollow* vessel; Sept. κάβος), a measure for things dry, mentioned in 2 Kings 6:25. The rabbins make it the sixth part of a *seah* (q.v.) or *satum*, and the eighteenth part of an ephah. This would be nearly *two quarts* English measure. *SEE MEASURE*.

Cábala,

Picture for Cabala

the title of the celebrated system of religious philosophy, or more properly theosophy, which has played so important a part in the theological and exegetical literature of both Jews and Christians ever since the Middle Ages. *SEE PHILOSOPHY*. The following account of it is partly compiled from Herzog's *Real-Encylclopadie*.

I. *The Name.* — KABBALA (from the Hebrews hlBqi Kabbala' the *received*), properly denotes *reception*, then *a doctrine received by oral tradition*. The term is thus in itself nearly equivalent to ""transmission," like the Latin *traditio-Massora*, for which last, indeed, the Talmud makes it interchangeable in the statement, "Moses received (lBq) the Law of Mount Sinai, and transmitted (rsm) it to Joshua." The difference between it, however, and the word hrSmi (from rsm; to deliver) is, that the former expresses *the act of receiving*, while the latter denotes *the act of giving over, surrendering, transmitting*. The Cabala is also called by some hrTsjhabmkj; *secret wisdom*, because it pretends to be a very ancient and secret tradition, and ^"j, *grace*, from the initials of these two words.

The term *Kabbalah* is employed in the Jewish writings to denote several traditional doctrines; as, for example, that which constituted the creed of the patriarchal age before the giving of the law; that unwritten ritual interpretation which the Jews believe was revealed by God to Moses on the mount, and which was at length committed to writing and formed the Mishna. Besides being applied to these and other similar traditions, it has

also been used in, comparatively speaking, modern times, to denote a singular mystic mode of interpreting the Old Testament.

We are reminded by this indefinite title that among the Jews, as throughout the greater part of the East, human knowledge, whether historical or scientific, rested principally on a sort of *succession*, and the best claim for its reception was an unbroken chain of traditionary evidence. Hence the care with which Judaism established the regular consecution of the sacred custodians of truth, from Moses through Joshua and the so-called greater prophets, thence through Ezra and "the Great Synagogue" to the teachers of later times, subdividing at length into the various schools or period of particular rabbis and their hereditary adherents. While, therefore, the truth was gradually exhibited in the writings of the Law, the Prophets, and the Talmud, the Cabala indicates the verbal exposition of these, orally transmitted along with them, and not generally known to the people, but containing a deeper or more thoroughly initiated style of instruction. It thus came ultimately to designate a particular theologico-philosophical system, that arose and established itself in the bosom of Judaism, yet in a measure independent of, or rather supplementary to it.

II. *Original Documents*. — Instruction in Judaism being principally verbal and founded on memory, its phases of development could necessarily leave but little mark on history; and as such a philosophy would thus naturally, in process of time, become a mystery, at least in the view of posterity, the origin and progress of the Cabala are yet largely matters of conjecture, and it is even a subject of scientific controversy whether in its speculative form it can be distinctly traced earlier than the Middle Ages, although its leading principles appear to have been derived from ancient documents, the nature of which is still very imperfectly understood, such as the so-called revelations of Adam, Abraham, Moses, Ezra, etc. *SEE APOCRYPHA*. The Talmud, indeed (both in the Mishna and Gemara of the tract *Chagiga*, passim), makes mention of a doctrine imparted only to a few carefully selected persons, and even applies to it certain fanciful names (drawn from the phraseology of Genesis 1:1, and Ezekiel 1:1), significant respectively of a speculative *cosmology* and a speculative *theology*; but it is uncertain whether these designate definite treatises, or, if so, whether these have in any identifiable form descended to modern times. The only works which can with any propriety claim to embody these earliest views are the following two, that became the acknowledged texts of the Cabala in the

latter part of the Middle Ages; a third cabalistic treatise (called the ryjB; rps; *Sepher Bachir*, or *Choice Book*), which is found in an edition of Amst. 1651, and attributed to a rabbi, Nechoniah Ben-Hakana, of the first century, has long ago been generally acknowledged to be fictitious, although a cabalistic work of the same title is mentioned as early as the fourteenth century.

The first of these is the *Book of Creation* (rps;hryxy; *Sepher Yetsirah*, often reprinted, as ed. Steph. Rittangel, Amst.1642, with a Latin translation and commentary; and the ed. of J.F. van Meyer, with a German translation and commentary, Leipz.1830,4to), ascribed to the renowned rabbi Akiba (A.D.120). It is a rather short treatise, in oracular sentences, the language of which, more obscure in import than in form, does not resemble the Hebrew of the Mishna. As a book of the same title appears to be already mentioned in the Gemara, where wonderful power is ascribed to it, and as R. Saadias is said to have commented upon it as early as the tenth century, it is certain that we can ascend to a considerable antiquity in tracing its authority. *SEE JEZIRAH.*

The other and more important cabalistic text is the celebrated *Book of Light* (rhiWzhi rps; *Sepherhaz-Zohar*, from), first printed at Cremona and Mantua in 1560, and since often reprinted, ‘as at Sulzbach in 1684, fol., with various additions. Tradition ascribes this work to a contemporary of R. Akiba, namely, R. Simeon Ben Jochai, a teacher much praised in the Talmud for his great wisdom and legal knowledge, although nothing is there said directly of his writings. Incredulous criticism considers it as a production of the thirteenth century, the time of its first appearance in the history of literature, and ascribes it to a Spanish Jew, Moses of Leon. It appears, however, to be older than this, having probably originally appeared piecemeal in the East at intervals, the whole being completed in its present form about the eighth century. It includes certain special tracts or treatises, in which the author seems especially to develop his own sentiments, and which form, so to speak, the kernel of the science sought to be imparted. Three of these are designated by particular names *(The Book of Confidence*, and the *Greater* and *Less Collections);* the popular distinction made by the Jews, however, between a great and a small Zohar sometimes refers to the varying fullness of the editions merely. *SEE ZOHAR.*

III. *Fundamental Doctrines.* — These are somewhat differently expounded in the above-named books (to the separate articles on which the reader is therefore referred for full particulars), and most at large in the latter. The following, however, is a summary of the cabalistic views as expressed in the general writings of later authors of that school:

1. *Nature of the Deity.*— God is above everything, even above being and thinking. It cannot, therefore, be said of him that he has either a will, intention, desire, thought, language, or action, since these properties, which adorn man, have limits, whereas God is in every way boundless, because he is perfect. Owing to this boundlessness of his nature, which necessarily implies absolute unity and immutability, and that there is nothing without him, i:e. that the τὸ πλαν is in him, he is called EN-SOPH *=without end, boundless,* and can neither be comprehended by the intellect nor described with words, for there is nothing which can grasp and depict him to us. In this incomprehensibility or boundlessness, God, or the *En-Soph* (ã/s ˆyae); is in a certain sense not existent (ˆyae); since, as far as our mind is concerned, that which is incomprehensible does not exist. Hence, without making himself comprehensible, his existence could never have been known. He had, therefore, to become active and creative in order that his existence might become perceptible.

2. *Development of the Deity.* — But since, on the one hand, the will to create, which implies limit, and the circumscribed and imperfect nature of this world, preclude the idea of taking it as the direct creation of him who can have no will, nor produce anything but what is like himself, boundless and perfect; and since, on the other hand, the beautiful design and order displayed in the world, which plainly indicate an intelligent and active will, forbid us to regard it as the offspring of chance, the *En-Soph* must be viewed as the Creator of the world in *an indirect manner,* through the medium of ten "*Sephiroth*" or *intelligences,* which emanated from the *En-Soph.* The etymology and exact meaning of the word are obscure. It is the plur. t/rypis] *sephiroth',* of , hrypse] which R. Asariel, the first Cabalist, derives from rpis; *saphar',* to *number;* while later Cabalists derive it from ryPse; *sappir',* the *sapphire,* from the word syrPesim] "declare," in <191901>Psalm 19:1, or even from the Greek σφαῖραι, *spheres.*

From his infinite fullness of light the *En-Soph* sent forth at first one spiritual substance or intelligence; this intelligence, which existed in the *En-*

Soph from all eternity, and which became a reality by a mere act, contained the nine other intelligences or *Sephiroth.* Great stress is laid upon the fact that the first *Sephirah* was not created, but was simply an emanation (hlyxa); and the difference between creation and emanation is thus defined, that in the former a diminution of strength takes place, while in the latter this is not the case. From the first *Sephirah* emanated the second, from the second the third, from the third the fourth, and so on, one proceeding from the other, till the number ten. These ten *Sephiroth* form among themselves, and with the *En-Soph,* a strict unity, ani simply represent different aspects of one and the same Being, just as the flame and sparks which proceed from the fire, and which appear different things to the eye, form only different manifestations of the same fire. Differing thus from each other simply as different colors of the same light, all the ten emanations alike partake of the *En-Soph.* They are boundless, and yet constitute the first finite things; so that they are both infinite and finite. They are infinite and perfect, like the *En-Soph,* when he imparts his fullness to them, and finite and imperfect when that fullness is withdrawn from them. The finite side of the emanation of the *Sephiroth* is absolutely necessary, for thereby the incomprehensible *En-Soph* makes his existence known to the human intellect, which can only grasp that which has measure, limit, and relation. From their finite side the *Sephiroth* may even be called bodily, and this renders it possible for the *En-Soph,* who is immanent in them, to assume a bodily form.

3. *Forms of this Development.* — The ten *Sephiroth,* every one of which has its own name, are divided into three groups of three *Sephiroth* each, respectively operating upon the three worlds, viz, the world of intellect (lkC,hiµl/[), the world of souls (vpN,hiµl/[), and the world of matter ([bæhiµl/[). 1. The first group operates upon the intellectual world, and consists of *Sephiroth* 1, denominated rtK, or hlx}hiµWr, the *crown,* or the *inscrutable height;* 2, called hmk]j; the creative *wisdom;* and 3, called hnyB, the conceiving *intellect.* The result of the combination of the latter two (as “father” and “mother”) is likewise represented as t[i— D, or *knowledge,* i.e. concrete thought, the universe of mind, the effect of λόγος. 2. The second group exercises its power upon the moral world, and consists of *Sephiroth* 4, called dsj, infinite *grace* (also jlWdG] *greatness);* 5, called ˆyD, or hrWbG] divine *justice,* or judicial *power;* and

6, which is called תפארת, *beauty*, and is the connecting link between the opposite *Sephiroth* 4 and 5. 3. The third group exercises its power upon the material world, and consists of *Sephiroth* 7, called נצח, *firmness;* 8, called הוד, *splendor;* and 9, which is called יסוד, the primary *foundation,* and is the connecting link between the two opposite *Sephiroth,* 7 and 8. *Sephirah* 10 is called מלכות, *kingdom,* and denotes Providence or the revealed Deity (שכינה, Shekinah) which dwells in the midst of the Jewish people, goes with them and protects them in all their wanderings and captivities. The first triad is placed above, and the second and third triads, with the unit, are put below, in such a manner that the four *Sephiroth* called *crown, beauty, foundation,* and *kingdom,* form a central perpendicular line denominated *the middle pillar* (עמוד האמצעי). This division yields three different forms in which the ten *Sephiroth* are represented by the Cabalists, and which we subjoin in order to make the description more intelligible. The first represents an inverted tree, called עץ חיים, *the tree of life,* while the second and third are human figures, called אדם קדמון; *the primeval man.* Yet, notwithstanding the different appearance of these three forms, the *Sephiroth* are so arranged that the three triads and the middle pillar are to be distinguished in each one of them.

4. *Processes of the Divine Development.* — These *Sephiroth,* or God through them, created the lower and visible world, of which everything has its prototype in the upper world. "The whole world is like a gigantic tree full of branches and leaves, the root of which is the spiritual world of *thephroth;* or it is like a firmly united chain, the last link of which is attached to the upper world; or like an immense sea, which is being constantly filled by a spring everlastingly gushing forth its streams." The *Sephiroth,* through the divine power immanent in them, uphold the world which they have created, and transmit to it the divine mercies by means of twelve channels (תרעין). This transmission of the divine mercies can be accelerated by prayer, sacrifices, and religious observances; and the Jewish people, by virtue of the revelation, and the 613 commandments given to them, *SEE SCHOOLS*, have especially been ordained to obtain these blessings (פיוט) for the whole world. Hence the great mysteries of the Jewish ritual (הלכות); hence the profound secrets contained in every word and syllable of the formulary of prayers; and hence the

declaration that “the pious constitute the foundation of the world” (µl/[d/sy]qyDix). Not only does the *EnSoph* reveal himself through the *Sephiroth*, but he also becomes incarnate in them, which accounts for the anthropomorphisms of Scripture and the Hagada. Thus, when it is said that “God spake, descended upon earth, ascended into heaven, smelled the sweet smell of sacrifices; repented in his heart, was angry,” etc., or when the Hagadic works describe the body and the mansions of God, etc., all this does not refer to the *En-Soph*, but to these intermediate beings. These *Sephiroth* again became incarnate in the patriarchs, e.g. *Sephira 4, love* was incarnate in Abraham; 5, *power* in Isaac; 6, *beauty* in Jacob; 7, *firmness* in Moses; 8, *splendor* in Aaron; *9, foundation* in Joseph; 10, *kingdom* in David; and they constitute the chariot throne (hbKrm).

5. The *psychology* of the Cabala is one of its most important features. All human souls are pre-existent in the world of the *Sephiroth*, and are, without an exception, destined to inhabit human bodies, and pursue their course upon earth for a certain period of probation. If, notwithstanding its union with the body, the soul resists all earthly trammels, and remains pure, it ascends after death into the spiritual kingdom, and has a share in the world of *Sephiroth.* But if, on the, contrary, it becomes contaminated by that which is earthly, the soul must inhabit the body again and again (rWby[i lWgl]yGi) till it is able to ascend in a purified state, through repeated trial (restricted by Nachmanides and the later cabalists to *three* transmigrations). The apparently undeserved sufferings which the pious have sometimes to endure here below are simply designed to purify their souls. Hence God’s justice is not to be impugned when the righteous are afflicted and the wicked prosper. This doctrine of the transmigration of souls is supported by an appeal to the injunction in the Bible, that a man must marry the widow of his brother if he died without issue, inasmuch as by this is designed, say the cabalists, that the soul of the departed one might be born again, and finish its earthly course. Very few new souls enter into the world, because many of the old souls which have already inhabited bodies have to re-enter those who are born, in consequence of their having polluted themselves in their previous bodily existence. This retards the great redemption of Israel, which cannot take place till all the pre-existent souls have been born upon earth, because the soul of the Messiah, which, like all other souls, has its pre-existence in the world of the spirits of the *Sephiroth*, is to be the last born one *at the end of days*, which is supported by an appeal to the Talmud *(Yebamoth*, 63, a). Then the great jubilee year

will commence, when the whole pleroma of souls (tmvnhirxa), cleansed and purified, and released from earth, shall ascend, in glorious company, into heaven. *SEE METEAMPSYCHOSIS.*

IV. *Origin, Date, Design, and Relations of the Cabala.* — The rise of Cabalism is involved in great obscurity. The Jews ascribe it to Adam, or to Abraham, or to Moses, or to Ezra, the last being apparently countenanced by 2 Esdr. 14:20-48. The opinions of Christian writers are as variously divided; and the Cabala is such a complex whole, and has been aggregated together at such distant periods, that no general judgment can apply to it. In its crude form it is undoubtedly to be attributed to the authors of the books Jezirah and Zohar above named, and therefore cannot be assigned an earlier date than these writings. Its fuller and more mature doctrines, however, as above delineated, are due to the speculations of later masters of this school. The account of this theosophy has been greatly obscured by modern writers, who, in their description of the Cabala, confound its doctrines with *the Jewish mysticism* propounded in the works called *the Alphabet of R. Akiba* (abyq[8rd atyb apla, or abyq[8rd twytwa), *the Description of the Body of God* (hmwq rw[yç), *and the Delineation of the heavenly Temples* (twlbyh). Even the book *Jezirah* does not contain the doctrines of the Cabala as above expounded. All these productions, and others of a similar nature so frequently quoted by writers who give an analysis of the Cabala, know little or nothing of the *Sephiroth,* and of the speculations about the *EnSoph,* or the being of God, which constitute the essence of the Cabala. Nevertheless, these works are unquestionably to be regarded *as having induced the more refined speculations of the Cabala,* by the difficulty in which they placed the Jews in the south of France, and in Catalonia, who believed in them almost as much as in the Bible, and who were driven to contrive this system whereby they could explain to themselves, as well as to their assailants, the gross descriptions of the Deity, and of the plains of heaven, given in these Hagadic productions. Being unable to go to the extreme of the rigid literalists of the north of France and Germany, who, without looking for any higher import, implicitly accepted the difficulties and anthropomorphisms of the Bible and Hagada in their most literal sense; or to adopt the other extreme of the followers of Maimonides, who rejected altogether the Hagadic and mystical writings, and rationalized the Scriptures, it may be conjectured that Isaac the blind contrived, and his two

disciples, Ezra and Azariel of Zerona, developed the modern system of Cabalism (about 12001230), which steers between these two extremes. By means of *the Sephiroth* all the anthropomorphisms in the Bible, in the Hagada, and even in *the Shiur Koma*, are at once taken from the Deity, and yet literally explained; while the sacrificial institutions, the precepts, and the ritual of the Bible and Talmud, receive at the same time a profound spiritual inmport. The Cabala in its present state is therefore almermeneutical system, which, in part at least, was instituted to oppose the philosophical school of Maimonides (q.v.).

The relationship between the Cabala- and Neo-Platonism is apparent. The Cabala elevates God above being and thinking, and likewise denies all divine attributes; so does Neo-Platonism. The Cabala, like Neo-Platonism, places intelligent principles or substances between the Deity and the world. The Cabala teaches that the *Sephiroth*, which emanated from God, are not equal to God; Neo-Platonism teaches that the substances, thought, spirit, and nature (νοῦς, ψύχη, and φύσις), which proceeded from one being, are not equal to their origin (οὐκ ἴσον δὲ τὸ προ ὸν τῷ μείναντι); and the Cabala has adopted the very same classification of the *Sephiroth* into the three great spheres of intelligence, animation, and matter. The comparison between the emanation of the *Sephiroth* from the *EnSoph*, and the rays proceeding from light to describe immanency and perfect unity, is the same as the NeoPlatonic figure to illustrate the emanations from the one Being (οἵον ἐκ φωτὸς τὴν ἐξ αὐτοῦ περίλαμψιν). The doctrine of the Cabala, that most of the souls which enter the world have occupied bodies upon this earth before, is Neo-Platonic (comp. Zeller, *Geschder Philosophie*, III, 2:944). *SEE NEO-PLATONISM.*

V. *Later Processes of Cabalism.* — In the hands of the younger disciples of the cabalistic science, the secret knowledge was not only studied in its philosophical bearing, but also, and even rather, under two new aspects (which were not mentioned by their predecessors, and which carried it farther than it went at first, though by this we do not mean to say that it received any positively novel additions), namely, the *practical* application and the *hermeneutical* method. We find that in olden times secret philosophical science and magic went hand in hand. The sorcerer mentioned in Acts 13 was called by the Arab name of μlyŗ[e, *the secret*, *i*.e. learned; in Acts 19 we read of books of magic which were at Ephesus; the sporadic mentions made of the Cabala in the Talmud are accompanied by

descriptions of miracles. When R. Chahina and R. Oshia studied the book of Jezirah, we are told in the treatise *Sanhedrim* of the Gemara, they also made each time a three-year-old cow, and lived thereon. It is no wonder, then, if the Jewish cabalists of the latter part of the Middle Ages transmitted the conception of their science to their Christian adepts, not only as speculative (tynWY[), but also as practical (tyci[]m), i.e. in plain English, that they connected with it the idea that a true cabalist must at the same time be a sorcerer. It is self-evident, however, that we must here distinguish between theosophic overstraining and mere juggling, although in actual practice the difference may sometimes have been hard to perceive. The effects hoped for or believed in magic were accordingly transmitted outwardly through amulets, talismans, exorcisms, images, signs, and such things, consisting of certain writings, names of angels, or mysterious letters, whose connection, however, always leads back to the name of God. This last, unpronounceable to the unconsecrated, but known to the cabalist, whether it consist of four (hwhy), twelve, or forty-two letters (numbers which result from combinations from the Sephir system), was, as such, called µvevrpMh; *the declared name;* and he who knew how to use it was a µVeai l [B; or *master of the name.* The well-known implements of magic, such as Solomon's keys, the shield of David, etc., owe their origin to this line of ideas. Amateurs will find a very entertaining account of these things in Eisenmenger's *Entdecktes Judenthum,* in Schudt's *Jewish Curiosities,* and other works of the same character. *SEE AMULET.*

The exegetical ingenuity of the Cabala is interesting to, the theologian. The principle of the mystic interpretation of Scripture is universal, not particular to such or such schools, as every one will perceive in Church history, and even in the history of Greek literature. We find it in Philo, in the New Test., in the writings of the fathers, in the *Talmud,* and in the Zo*har;* and the more it departs from the spirit of the sacred text, the more had the latter to be brought to its support by distortions of its meaning. For such operation there are no known rules except the exigencies of the case and the subjective mass of the sense. *SEE MYSTICISM*. In the mean time, the Jews had already, by the arbitrary character of their alphabet, arrived at all manner of subtleties, of which we have already isolated examples in earlier writings, but which were especially established as a virtuosoship in post-Zoharic times. From this arose the following species of cabalistic transformation:

1st. aYrifGe *Gematria* (γεωμετρία), i.e. the art of discovering the hidden sense of the text by means of the numerical equivalents of the letters. For example, in the first and last verses of the Hebrew Bible are found six a's, which, according to this method, means that the world is to last 6000 years. The numerical equivalent of the first word of Genesis is 913, which is also the number given by the words rxy; hrf tB] *(by the law Heformed it,* i.e. the world), from whence it follows that the law existed before the creation, and that the latter was accomplished through the former. If the second word of Genesis (arB) be added to the first, the result is 1116, which is also the equivalent of arbihnVhiva/rB] *(in the beginning cf He year it was created),* by which is known that God created the world in the beginning of the year — that is, in the season of Autumn. The antiquity of this method is already shown in Revelation 13:18, where the solution must be ciphered out with the aid of the Hebrew — (or Greek) alphabet. It is also considered as Germatria when Biblical numbers — for instance, dimensions of buildings are expressed in letters, and words again made of them. Still later came speculations on the greater, smaller, inverted, and suspended letters found in the Masoretic text; for instance, Deuteronomy 6:4; Genesis 2:4; Numbers 10:35; Judges 18:30, in which some deep meaning is looked for, although they may perhaps have originally been but peculiar marks to aid memory.

2d. The particularly so-called "figurative" (tyYirWx) Cabala, ^WqyeGifYn, *Notarikon* (from Lat. *natzre,* to extract), consists in framing with each letter of a word several new ones, e.g. from the first, word of Genesis six can thus be framed: arB; *he made;* [yqir; *the firmament;* /ra, *the earth;* µyimv; *the heavens;* µy; *the sea;* µ/hT] *the abyss.* We thus learn the correct scientific nature of the universe, besides the proper meaning of the text. Again, it consists in taking the first letters of several words to form a new one: e.g. Deuteronomy 30:12, hmyGmVhiWnLAhl,[yiymi *who shall bring us to heaven?* Answer: hlymi *circusm cisioni.*

3d, hrWmT] *Temurah (permutation),* the anagram, of two kinds. The sifiple is a mere transposition of the letters of a word: e.g. we thus learn

that the angel in Exodus 23:23 (ybia;lmi, *my angel)* was the angel Michael (laeymi). The more ingenious kind is that by which, according to certain established rules, each letter of the alphabet acquires the signification of another: as Aleph that of Tan, both that of Ayin. Then, again, the letters may be read forward and backward (which constitute the alphabet of *Athbash,* v8Bitai), or the first letter that of the twelfth, the second of the thirteenth, and the reverse (making the alphabet called *Albam,* s8Blai). *SEE ATBACH.* The more multifarious these trifles, the easier it is to arrive in every given case at a result, and the less wit or thought is required. Thus the Christian theology of the 17th century, which itself inclined to literal belief, and which, by its strong polemical aspect against the Jews, was led to a diligent study of the cabalistic arts, through them found everywhere in the Old Test. evidences of the Christian dogmas (e.g. Genesis 1:1, tyvarB=hm;t;hdyjy]hv;lv]ba;jWr ^Be, i.e. *filius, spiritus, pater; tres unitasperfecta).*

In the 13th century we find evidence of a knowledge of the cabalistic ideas and methods in the works of the Spaniard Raymond Lullus; but with him, as well as among his direct and indirect followers, these elements of Judaic philosophy take the character of eccentricities and superstitions more than of grand speculative theory. Two centuries elapsed after this before the Cabala really entered the circle of Christian mental development. Its admission was prepared, on the one hand, by the overthrow of the worn-out scholasticism of Aristotle, and the consequent tendency toward Platonic ideas, although, of course, these latter were yet in their more elementary form, as they had been transmitted to Alexandria by Eastern influences; on the other hand, the same result was conduced by an awakening interest in the study of nature, which, it is true, was still in a poetic, dream-like infancy, but was the more inclined to entertain itself with mysteries, as it had discovered as yet but few natural laws. To these was, however, joined a third and more powerful influence, namely, the belief handed down by the fathers of the first centuries that all the wisdom of nations, and chiefly Platonic philosophy, actually took their origin in the Hebraic revelation; that, in a more extended sense than the popular religious histories admit, the Jewish people were the possessors and keepers of a treasury of wisdom and knowledge which time or zealous research could alone reveal. What wonder is it, then, if the assertion of the

Cabalists that they possessed such a treasure found credence and gained them followers? The progress of Christians toward the Cabala was greatly helped by the conversion of a large number of Jews to Christianity, in which they recognized a closer relation to their Gnostic views, and also by the Christians perceiving that Gnosticism could become a powerful instrument for the conversion of the Jews. Among the converted Jews we notice Paul Ricci, physician in ordinary to the Emperor Maximilian, and author of *Cdelestis Agricultura;* Judas Ben Isaac Abrabanel (Leon Hebraeus), son of the renowed Portuguese exegist, and author of the *Dlalogi de amore.* Among Christians we will only mention the two most important: John Pico della Mirandola and John Reuchlin; the former as a highly gifted and enthusiastic syncratist, author of *Conclusiones cabbalisticce secundum secretarm disciplinam sapientice Hebr.* (1486); the other a faithful disciple of the classics, in connection with mysticism, but opposed to scholasticism and monachal torpitude, author of *De verbo mirijco* (1494); *De arte cabbalistica* (1517). His, and some other writings of the same kind, are collected in the work *Artes CabbaEsticce h. e. reconditce theologice etphilosophicw Scriptorum,* tom. 1 (unicus), ex. bibl. J. Pistorii (Basle, 1587, fol.). The powerful preponderance of the religious and Church interests, as well as those of practical politics, which became perceptible in the first quarter of the 16th century, giving to the mind a positive impulse, and to studies a substantial foundation, arrested the further development of the Cabala; and when, in latter times, it was occasionally taken up again, it was rather with the view of giving a high-sounding, mystericus name to theories which had not strength enough to stand by themselves, than as a genuine resurrection If the old systems.

VI. *Literature.* — As a sort of accessory subject of the so-called Orientalism, and even of Biblical erudition, the Cabala is mentioned by the ancient archaeologues and isagogics (as Cuneus, *Respubl. Hebr.;* Walton, *Prolegg.;* Hottinger, *Thesaurus Philol.;* Leusden, *Philologus Hebr.;* Pfeifer, *Critica Sacra,* and many others); but they contain nothing of importance respecting it. Much more copious, though not yet complete, is the information contained in the works of Buddeus, *Philosophia Ebrceorumr* (1702); Hackspan, *Miscellanea;* Braum, *Selecta Sacra,* v; Reimmann, *Jiidische Theologie.* The work of Sommer, *Specimen theologice Sohzrice* (Goth. 1734), is (like many others which Fabricius quotes in the *Bibliographia Antiq.* p. 246) only a polemico-apoiogetic attempt at tracing the Christian doctrine of the Trinity in the Cabala. Of a

higher philosophic character are the works of Wachter, *Spinozismus im Judenthum,* and *Elucidarius cabbalisticus s. reconditce Ebrceorum philosophica brevis recensio* (Amst. 1699), in which the polemic tone prevails. Next are Basnage, *Hist. des Juifs* (tom. 3), and Brucker, *Hist. Philosophice* (vol. 2), who, however, from insufficient study of the original sources, acknowledges himself unable to master its intricate history. Among later writers we find the well-known works of Tennemann, Tiedemann, and Buhle. The line of the more recent monographic researches begins with Kleuker (Riga, 1786). But Christian writers, whose early knowledge of rabbinic literature has been fast waning, generally forsake it. Tholuck's treatise, *De ortu Cabbale* (1837), treats only of a preliminary question. Lutterbeck, in the first volume of his *Neutest. Lehrbegriy,* has a very interesting chapter on the Jezirah and Zohar. Molitor's extensive work, *Philos. d. Geschichte d. Tradition* (1827, pt. 1-3), is chiefly theoretical. Reuchlin *(De arte Cabbalistica,* 1517) is still a valuable authority. One of the latest is Etheridge *(Jerusalem and Tiberias,* Lond. 1856, 12mo). Next to the extensive work of Ad. Franck, *La Kabbale ou la Philosophie religieuse des Hebreux* (Paris, 1842; tr. by Jellinek, Lpz. 1844), we name the *Philosophia Cabbalistica et pantheismus* (1832) of M. Freystadt. See the *Eclectic Review,* Feb. 1856; *Christian Remembrancer,* April, 1862.

The earliest cabalist was Asariel, whose *Commentary on the Doctrine of the Sephiroth* (t/rypis]rc,[,vWrPe), in questions and answers, has been published (Warsaw, 1798; Berl. 1850); also his *Commentary on the Song of Songs* (Altona, 1764), usually ascribed to his pupil Nachmanides or Ramban (q.v.).

Among the most important cabalists we find Rabbi Moses Ben Nachman, author of the *Books of Faith and Hope* (ˆ/jF;bW hn;WmE); R. Jose, of Castile, author of hr/a yre[}vi *(Doors of Light);* R. Moses, of Cordova, µyni/MrisDePi *(Garden of Pomegranates);* R. Isaac Loria, µylWGlGhi rp,se *(Book of the Wanderings* of Souls); R. Chayim Vital, µyYiji/[e *(Tree of Life);* R. Nastali Ben Jacob Elchanan, ËlM,hiqm,[e *(Valley cf the King);* R. Abraham Cohen, of Herrera (vulg. Iriva), µyim;V;hir[}vi *(Door of Heaven).* Some of these works (translated into Latin) are to be found whole or in their principal parts in the *Kabbala Denudata* of Chr. Knorrvon Rosenroth (Sulsh. 1677, 3 vols. 4to), with all kinds of exegetical apparatus, and some texts from the *Zohar.* The cabalistic literature is fully

noticed in Bartolocci's *Bibliotheca Magna Rabbinica* and in Wolff's *Bibliotheca Hebraia,* tom. ii and Iv, though not in the correct order and construction; see also P. Beer, *Geschchte der Lehren aller Secten der Juden, und der Cabbala,(Briinn,* 1822, 2 vols. 8vo); Senet, *De Cabbala Judceorum* (Rost. 1702); Sennert, *De Cabbala* (Wittenb. 1655); and especially the copious list of expositions upon the works of Simon ben-Jochai, the reputed founder of Cabalism, given by Furst, *Bibliotheca Judiica,* in, 329 sq. We may specify the following: Zunz, *Gottesd. Vortrige der Juden* (Berlin, 1832), p. 402 sq.; Landauer, in the *Literaturblatt des Orients,* vol. 7 (1845); 8:812 sq.; Joel, *Religionsphilosophie des Sohar* (Lpz. 1849); Jellinek, *Moses benSchem-Job de Leon* (Lpz. 1851); *Beitr ge zur Gesch. der Kabbala* (Lpz. 1852); *Auswahl Kabbalischer Mystik* (Lpz. 1853); and *Philosophie und Kabbalah* (Lpz. 1854); Steinschneider, *Jewish Literature* (Lond. 1857), p. 104115, 299-309; Munk, *Melanges de Philosophie Juive et Arabe* (Par. 1859), p. 190 sq.; and especially the masterly analysis of the *Zohar* by Ignaz Stern, *Ben-Chananja,* 1-5; the lucid treatise of Gratz, *Gesch. der Judzn,* 7:442-459; and the able review of it by Low, *Ben-Chananja,* v, p. 325 sq. (also Lpz. 1863, p. 73-85). Ginsburg has lately published a compendious but copious and clear work entitled *The Kabbalah,* etc. (Lond. 1865), in which, however, he controverts the traditional view of the authorship by rabbis Akiba and Ben-Jochai, and assigns it an origin prior to the Zohar, which he attributes to Moses of Leon; considering this rather as the offspring than the parent of Cabalism.

Cabasilas, Nicolas,

archbishop of Thessalonica in 1354, a firm supporter of the rights and independence of the Greeks against the Roman Church. In the Hesychastic controversy he took part with the monks of Mount Athos against Barlaam (q.v.). He wrote several works, among which are,

1. *Exposition of the Greek Liturgy* (Greek), translated into Latin by Hervet, and given in the *Bibliotheca Patrum* under the title *Compendiosa interpretatio in Divinum Officium:* and,

2. Περὶ τῆς ἐν Χριστῷ ζωῆς, etc., *Life of Jesus Christ* (Ingoldst. 1604; a bad Latin version). This book is of value as illustrating the mystical tendency among the Byzantine writers. See Cave, *Hist. Lit.* anno 1350;

Stud. u. Krit. 1843, p. 724; Gasz, *Die Mystik d. N. Kabasilas*, etc. (Greifsw. 1849); Walch, *Bibliotheca Theologica*, 1:640; 2:570.

Cabasilas, Nilus,

uncle of the preceding, a Greek theologian, and archbishop of Thessalonica in the first half of the 14th century. He wrote Περὶ τῶν αἰτιῶν τῆς ἐκκλησιαστικῆς διαστάσεως, first printed at London (n. d.), afterward, Greek and Latin, at Basel (1544); again at Frankfort (1555), and at Hainault (1608). In it he shows that the arbitrary claims of the papacy were the true cause of the schism between the East and West. He wrote also Περὶ τῆς ἀρχῆς τοῦ Πάπα (Francfort, 1555, 8vo; Hanover, 1608, with the works of Barlaam). Dupin says that these writings are "full of learning." The book on the papal supremacy was translated into English by Gressop (London, 1560, 8vo). Cabasilas died in 1350.-Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale, 8:*15; Cave, *Hist. Lit.*, Wharton's Appendix; Dupin, *Ecclesiastes Writers,* cent. 14.

Cabassut (Cabassutius), Jean

an eminent Roman canonist, was born at Aix, in Provence, 1604 or 1605, entered the congregation of the Oratory 1626, and died at Aix, aged eighty-one, Sept. 25, 1685. At Rome he was regarded as an oracle in every thing relating to the canon law and casuistry, and a good Oriental scholar. He wrote *Juris Canonici theoria et praxis* (4to, 1696, 1698, and by Gibert, with notes, etc., 1738); also *Historiarum, Conciliorum et Canonum invicem collatorum veterumque Ecclesice rituum, ab ipsis Ecclesice incunabulis ad nostra usque tempora, notitia ecclesiastica* (best ed. Lugd. 1685, fol.; again, Lyons, 1725; and in an abridged form, 1776, 8vo).

Cab'bon

(Hebrews *Kabbon',* ˆ/BKj in Syriac, *a cake;* Sept. Χαββών v. r. Χαβρά and Χαββά), a place in the "plain" of Judah, mentioned between Eglon and Lahmam (<0654>Joshua 15:40); possibly the same with MACHBENAH (<1302>1 Chronicles 2:49). It is perhaps the modern ruined site *el-Kufeir,* marked by Van de Velde *(Map)* at 10 miles south-east of Ashkelon.

Cabet.

SEE COMMUNISM.

Cabin

(tWnj; *chanuth';* Sept. merely Graecizes, ἡ χερέθ), properly a vault or *cell* (so the margin) within the dungeon, and under ground, for the separate confinement of prisoners (2476Jeremiah 37:16). Others (Scheid, in the *Diss. Lugdun.* p. 988) understand it to mean a curved post, i.e. *the stocks* (comlp. 2402Jeremiah 20:2, 3; 29:26). The idea conveyed in either case is that the prophet suffered the most severe and loathsome imprisonment. *SEE PRISON.*

Cabiz, Also Called Aimé,

a learned Mohammedan who became noted for maintaining the superiority of Jesus Christ to Mohammed. Being summoned before the Divan, he silenced the two "cadilaskers" of Roumelia and Anatolia. He was then set at liberty, but the sultan, having listened to the discussion, referred the matter to the mufti and cadi of Constantinople. This time Cabiz was found guilty, and sentenced to death. He was executed on September 19,1527. An edict published on occasion of his execution forbade all Mohammedans, under penalty of death, to prefer thenceforth the doctrine of Jesus Christ to that of Mohammed. — Hoefer, *Biographie Generale,* 8:27.

Cabral, Francios

a Jesuit missionary, was born in 1528 at Covilhaa, in Portugal, and entered the Society of Jesus at Goa. Appointed a missionary, he traversed great part of India and Asia. After spending several years as professor of theology at Goa, he was made vice-provincial in Japan. He baptized, in 1575, the king of Bungo, who several years before had received hospitably Francis Xavier, but was not converted until the arrival of Cabral. He passed over into China, where he labored abundantly, and thence returned to Goa, where he governed the house of the Professed thirty-eight years. He died at Goa, April 16, 1609.-Alegambe, *Script. Soc. Jesu;* Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale,* 8:36.

Ca'bul

(Hebrews *Kabul',* lWbK; according to etymology, *bound,* but signification uncertain [see below]), the name of a town and a district.

1. (Sept. Χαβώλ, but other copies blend with the following words into Χωβαμασομέλ.) A city on the eastern border of the tribe of Asher, and apparently at the northern part, beyond Beth-Emek (Joshua 19:27). It seems to correspond to the village *Chabolo* (Χαβωλώ) mentioned by Josephus *(Lfe, §* 43, 45) as on the confines of Ptolemais, in Galilee, 40 stadia from Jotapata. A fortress by the name of *Kabul* is mentioned by Arabian geographers in the district of Safed (Rosenmiuller, *Analect. Arab.* in, 20). Dr. Robinson, during his last visit to Palestine, accordingly found a village called *Kabul* on his way to Accho, situated "on the left, among the lower hills" *(Biblioth. Sacra,* 1853, p. 121; *Later Bibl. Res.* p. 88; for Talmudical notices, see Schwarz, *Palest.* p. 192).

2. (Sept. translates Ὅριον, *boundary,* but in neglect of the context, ver. 12, which favors the derivation of Simonis *[Ononmast.* p. 417] and Hiller *[Onomast.* p. 435, 775], as i.q. "something exhaled, as nothing ;" Josephus *[Ant. 8:*5, 3] calls it Χαβαλών, and says [apparently from conjecture] that it is a Phoenician word indicative of *dissatisfaction.)* A district containing "twenty cities," given to Hiram, king of Tyre, by Solomon, in acknowledgment of the important services which he had rendered toward the building of the Temple (1 Kings 9:13). Hiram was by no means pleased with the gift, and the district received the name of Ca. bul (as if signifying *unpleasing)* from this circumstance. The situation of Cabul has been disputed; but we are content to accept the information of Josephus *(Ant.* 8:5, 3), who seems to place it in the north-west part of Galilee, adjacent to Tyre. The foregoing town, named Cabul (Joshua 19:27), being also in Galilee, it is possible that it was one of the twenty towns consigned to Hiram, who, to mark his dissatisfaction, applied the significant name of this one town to the whole district. The cause of Hiram's dislike to what Solomon doubtless considered a liberal gift is very uncertain. It has been conjectured (Kitto, *Pictorial Bible,* note on 1 Kings 9:13) that "probably, as the Phoenicians were a maritime and commercial people, Hiram wished rather for a part of the coast, which was now in the hands of Solomon, and was therefore not prepared to approve of a district which might have been of considerable value in the eyes of an agricultural people like the Hebrews. Perhaps the towns were in part payment of what Solomon owed Hiram for his -various services and contributions." *SEE HIRAM.*

Cad’dis

(Καδδίς, or rather Γαδδίς, as most texts read; so also Josephus, Γαδδίς or Γαδής, *Ant. 13:*1, 2; derivation uncertain, see Grimm, *Handb.* in loc.), the surname (διακαλούμενος) of JOANNAN *SEE JOANNAN* (q.v.), the’ eldest brother of Judas Maccabaeus (1 Macc. 2:2).

Cademann, Johann Georg.,

a German theologian of the 17th century, was born at Oschatz, in Saxony, and studied at Jena and Wittenberg, where he took his degree in 1654. In 1656 he became pastor at Dahlen, and in 1676 archdeacon at Wurzen, where he died, Dec. 28, 1687. Among his writings are *Disputatio de Causa Instrumentali JustiJfcationis* (Jena, 1650, *4to): — Disp. de principiis Immanarumn Actionum (Wit*tenb. 1654, *4to): — De Justitia Distributiva* (1654, 4to): — *D Mafjestate* (1654, 4to). — Hoefer, *Nfouv. Biog. Generale,* 8:63.

Ca’des

(Καδής v. r. Κῆδες and Κεδές), a Graecized form (1 Macc. 11:63, 73) of the name of KEDESH *SEE KEDESH* (q.v.) in Naphtali (Joshua 20:7).

Ca’dès-Bar’nè

(Κάδης Βαρνή), a Graecized form (Judith 5:14) of KADESH-BARNEA *SEE KADESH-BARNEA* (q.v.).

Cad’miel

(Καδμίηλος v. r. Καδόηλος), one of the Levites whose “sons” returned from the captivity, and who assisted at the musical performances at the restoration of the temple worship (1 Esdr.5:26, 58); evidently the KADMIEL *SEE KADMIEL* (q. v) of the Hebrews texts (Ezra 2:40; Nehemiah 7:43; 12:24).

Cadonici, Giovanni,

an Italian theologian, was born at Venice in 1705, and became a canon of the church of Cremona. He was a man of learning, and opposed the pretensions of the court of Rome and the doctrines of the Molinists. In a curious work, entitled “An Exposition of this passage of St. Augustine, The Church of Jesus Christ shall be in subjection to secularTprinces,” he

shows that as princes are subject to the Church in things spiritual, so the Church is bound to obey them in things temporal; and that in ancient liturgies, as the Ambrosian, Mozarabic, etc., prayer was made, specially and by name, even for persecuting princes. He wrote also *Sentimens de St. Augustin* (1763); *De Animabus Justorum* (Rome, 1766, 2 vols. 4to). He died Feb. 27, 1786. Landon, *Eccl. Dict. s.v.*; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Geerale,* 8:74.

Cadotis.

SEE JERUSALEM.

Caecilia.

SEE CECILIA.

Caecilian.

SEE DONATISTS

Caedmon Or Cedmon,

an Anglo-Saxon Benedictine and poet, born in Northumberland, died at Whitby in 676 or 680. He is' the first person of whom we possess any metrical composition in our vernacular. It is a kind of ode, of eighteen lines, celebrating the praises of the Creator, preserved in Alfred's translation of Bede. "Bede gives the following account. Caedmon seems to have had the care of the cattle of the monks of Whitby. It appears to have been the custom of our Saxon forefathers to amuse themselves at supper with improvisatore descants accompanied by the harp, as is still practiced at meetings of the Welsh bards. Caedmon, when the harp passed round among the guests, was fain, as it approached him, to shrink away from the assembly and retire to his own house. Once, after it had thus happened, as he was sleeping at night, some one seemed to say to him, 'Cadmon, sing me something.' 'He replied, 'I cannot sing;' and he told how his inability to sing had been the cause of his quitting the hall. 'Yet thou must sing to me,' said the voice. 'What must I sing?' said he. 'Sing me the origin of things.' The subject thus given him, he composed the short ode in question. When he awoke, the words were fast in his mind. Caedmon in the morning told his vision and repeated his song. The effect was, that the abbeas Hilda, and the learned men whom she had collected round her in her monastery at Whitby, believed that he had received from heaven the gift of song, and

when on the morrow he returned with a poetic paraphrase of a passage of Scripture which they had given him to versify as a test of his inspiration, they at once acknowledged the verity, and earnestly besought him to become a member of their company. He composed numerous poems on sacred subjects, which were sung in the abbey. Sacred subjects were his delight, and to them he confined himself. He continued in the monastery for the remainder of his life, and there he died, as is conjectured, about 680. The authenticity of the little poem above mentioned is perhaps unquestionable. But, besides this, a very long Saxon poem, which is a metrical paraphrase on parts of the Scriptures, is attributed to Caedmon. An edition of it was printed at Amsterdam in 1655, under the care of Junius. Hickes expresses doubts whether this poem can be attributed to so early a period as the time of Caedmon. He thinks he perceives certain Dano: Saxonisms in it which would lead him to refer it to a much later period.' It has been again printed, with a much more accurate text, by Mr. Thorpe, as a publication by the Society of Antiquaries (Lond. 8vo, 1832). Mr. Thorpe is of opinion that it is substantially the work of Cedmon, but with some sophistications of a later period, and in this opinion our best Anglo-Saxon scholars appear inclined to coincide." — *Penny Cyclopvadia, s.v.*; Hoefer, *Biographie Generale*, 8:84.

Caelestius.

SEE CELESTIUS.

Caerularius, Michael,

patriarch of Constantinople (A.D. 1043-1059). He was one of the chief promoters of the great schism between the Eastern and Western churches. In 1054 Pope Leo IX sent legates to Constantinople to accommodate matters; but they, being displeased at the treatment they received, left a written letter of excommunication, directed against the patriarch, on the altar of the church of St. Sophia, and departed, having shaken off the dust from their feet. The ostensible causes of difference between the churches, as detailed in a letter written by Caerularius and Leo, archbishop of Acryda, to John, bishop of Trani, were the following: that the Latins consecrated with unleavened bread; that they added the words *Flioque* to the creed of the Church; that they taught that the souls of the faithful make expiation in the fires of Purgatory; and that in some other respects they differed in their customs from those of the East. After this outrage on the

part of the Roman legates, Caerularius called together a synod at Constantinople 1054, and excommunicated them and their adherents. Caerularius himself was a man of ambitious views and arrogant disposition, and little likely to ward off the final rupture with Rome, which in fact took place. However, the Emperor Isaac Comnenius took umbrage at his behavior, and, A.D. 1059, having caused him to be seized, sent him to Praeconnesus. Caerularius refused to resign the patriarchal throne as the emperor endeavored to compel him to do, but died shortly afterward in exile Baron. *Annal;s,* 11, A.D. 1054; Moshelm, *Ch. Hist.* cent. 11, pt. 2, ch. 3; Neander, *Ch. History,* 3:580.

Caesar

(Graecized Καῖσαρ; hence the Germ. title *Kaiser,* Russian *Czar),* a name assumed by or conferred upon all the Roman emperors after Julius Caesar (who is said to have been so named from his having been born by a surgical operation, *ccEsus).* In this way It became a sort of title, like Pharaoh, and, as such, is usually applied to the emperors in the New Testament, as the sovereign of Judaea (<43195>John 19:15; <44707>Acts 17:7), without their distinctive proper names. *SEE AUGUSTUS.* It was to him that the Jews paid tribute (<41227>Matthew 22:17; <42022>Luke 20:22; 23:2), and to him that such Jews as were *cives Romani* had the right of appeal (<44511>Acts 25:11; 26:32; 28:19); in which cise, if their cause was a criminal one, they were sent to Rome (<44512>Acts 25:12, 21; comp. Pliny, *Epp.* 10:97), where was the court of the emperor (<50422>Philippians 4:22). The Caesars mentioned in the New Testament are Augustus (<42001>Luke 2:1), Tiberius (<42301>Luke 3:1; 20:22), Claudius (<44128>Acts 11:28), Nero (<44218>Acts 25:8); Caligula, who succeeded Tiberius, is not mentioned. See each name. On <50422>Philippians 4:22, *SEE HOUSEHOLD.*

Caesare’a

Picture for Caesare’a

(Καισάρεια, in the Targum ˆyr syq), the name of several cities under the Roman rule, given to them in compliment of some of the emperors; especially of two important towns in Palestine.

1. CAESARÇA PALAESTÎNAE (Καισάρεια ἡ Παλαιστίνης), or “Caesarea of Palestine” (so called to distinguish it from the other Caesarea), or simply Cesarea (without addition, from its eminence as the

Roman metropolis of Palestine, and the residence of the procurator). The numerous passages in which it occurs (<4040>Acts 8:40; 9:30; 10:1, 24; 11:11; 12:19; 18:22; 21:8, 16; 23:23, 33; 25:1, 4, 6, 13) show how important a place this city occupies in the Acts of the Apostles. It was situated on the coast of Palestine, on the line of the great road from Tyre to Egypt, and about half way between Joppa and Dora (Josephus, *War*, 1:21, 5). The journey of the apostle Peter from Joppa (<4410>Acts 10:24) occupied rather more than a day. On the other hand, Paul's journey from Ptolemais (<4210>Acts 21:8) was accomplished within the day. The distance from Jerusalem is stated by Josephus in round numbers as 600 stadia *(Ant.* 13:11, 2; *War,* 1:3, 5). The Jerusalem Itinerary gives sixty-eight miles *(Wesseling,* p. 600; see Robinson, *Bib. Res.* 3:45). It has been ascertained, however, that there was a shorter road by *Antipatris* than that which is given in the Itinerary a point of some importance in reference to the night-journey of Acts 23. *:SEE ANTIPATRIS.* The actual distance in a direct line is forty-seven English miles.

In Strabo's time there was on this point of the coast merely a town called "Strato's Tower," with a landing-place (πρόσορμον ἔχων), whereas, in the time of Tacitus, Caesarea is spoken of as being the head of Judaea ("Judaaee caput," Tac. *Hist.* 2:79). It was in this interval that the city was built by Herod the Great (Josephus, *Ant.* 15:9, 6; Strabo, 16:2, 27; Pliny, *H. N*. v. 15). The work was, in fact, accomplished in ten years. The utmost care and expense were lavished on the building of Caesarea. It was a proud monument of the reign of Herod, who named it in honor of the Emperor Augustus. The full name was *Ccesarea Sebaste* (Καισάρεια Σεβαστή, Joseph. *Ant.* 16:5, 1). It was sometimes called *Cesarea Stratonis,* and sometimes also (from its position) *Maritime Ccesarea* (παραλιός, Joseph. *War,* 3:9, 1, or ἡ ἐπί θαλάττῃ, *ib.* 7:1, 3). The magnificence of Cesarea is described in detail by Josephus in two places *(Ant.* 15:9; *War,* 1:21). The chief features were connected with the harbor (itself called Σεβαστὸς λιμήν, on coins and by Josephus, *Ant.* 17:5, 1), which was equal in size to the Piraeus of Athens. The whole coast of Palestine may be said to be extremely inhospitable, exposed as it is to the fury of the western storms, with no natural port affording adequate shelter to the vessels resorting to it. To remedy this defect, Herod, who, though an arbitrary tyrant, did much for the improvement of Judaea, set about erecting, at immense cost and labor, one of the most stupendous works of antiquity. He threw out a semicircular mole, which protected the port of Caesarea on the south and

west, leaving only a sufficient opening for vessels to enter from the north; so that, within the enclosed space, a fleet might ride at all weathers in perfect security. This breakwater was constructed of immense blocks of stone brought from a great distance, and sunk to the depth of 20 fathoms in the sea. Broad landing-wharves surrounded the harbor, and conspicuous from the sea was a tem. pie dedicated to Caesar and to Rome, and containing colossal statues of the emperor and the imperial city. Besides this, Herod added a theater and an amphitheatre; and, when the whole was finished, he fixed — his residence there, and thus elevated the city to the rank of the civil and military capital of Judeea, which rank it continued to enjoy as long as the country remained a province of the Roman empire (see Dr. Mansford, *Script. Gazetteer).* Vespasian was first declared emperor at Caesarea, and he raised it to the rank ‘of a Rot man “colony” (q.v.), granting it, first, exemption from the capitation tax, and afterward from the ground taxes (the real *jus Italicum).* The place was, however, inhabited chiefly by Gentiles, though some thousands of Jews lived in it (Joseph. *War,* 3:9, 1; 3:14; *Ant.* 20:8, 7; *Life,* 11). It seems there was a standing dispute between the Jewish and Gentile inhabitants of Caesarea to which of them the city really belonged. The former claimed it as having been built by a Jew, meaning King Herod; the latter admitted this, but contended that he built it for them, and not for Jews, seeing that he had filled it with statues and temples of their gods, which the latter abominated (Joseph. *War,* 2:13, 7). This quarrel sometimes came to blows, and eventually the matter was referred to the Emperor Nero, whose decision in favor of the Gentiles, and the behavior of the latter thereupon, gave deep offense to the Jews generally, and afforded occasion for the first outbreaks, which led to the war with the Romans (Joseph. *War,* 2:14). One of the first acts of that war was the massacre of all the Jewish inhabitants by the Gentiles to the number of 20,000 *(ib.* 2:18, 1). This city was the head-quarters of one of the Roman cohorts (q.v.) in Palestine.

Caesarea is the scene of several interesting circumstances described in the New Testament, such as the conversion of Cornelius, the first-fruits of the Gentiles (Acts 10); the residence of Philip the Evangelist (<42108>Acts 21:8). It was here also, in the amphitheatre built by his grandfather, that Herod Agrippa was smitten of God and died (<44122>Acts 12:21-23). From hence the apostle Paul sailed to Tarsus when forced to leave Jerusalem on his return from Damascus (<40930>Acts 9:30), and at this port he landed after his second missionary journey (<44822>Acts 18:22). He also spent some time at Caesarea

on his return from the third missionary journey (Acs 21:8, 16), and before lone was brought back a prisoner to the same place (Acts 23:23, 33), where he remained some time in bonds before his voyage to Italy (Acts 25:1, 4, 6, 13). After the destruction of Jerusalem, Caesarea became the spiritual metropolis of all Palestine; but, since the beginning of the 5th century, when the land was divided into three provinces, Palestina Prima, Secunda, and Tertia, it became the capital of only the first province, and subordinate to the bishopric of Jerusalem, which was elevated into a patriarchate with the rights of primacy over "the three Palestines." Caesarea is chiefly noted as the birthplace and episcopate of Eusebius, the celebrated Church historian, in the beginning of the 4th century, and was conspicuous for the constancy of its martyrs and confessors in the various persecutions of the Church, especially the last (Euseb. *Hist. Eccl.* viii, s. f.). It was also the scene of some of Origen's labors and the birthplace of Procopius. It continued to be a city of some importance even in the time of the Crusades. It still retains the ancient name in the form of *Kaiseryeh,* but has long been desolate. The most conspicuous ruin is that of an old castle at the extremity of the ancient mole. A great extent of ground is covered by the remains of the city. A low wall of gray stone encompasses these ruins, and without this is a moat now dry. Between the accumulation of rubbish and the growth of long grass, it is difficult to define the form and nature of the various ruins thus enclosed. Nevertheless, the remains of two aqueducts, running north and south, are still visible. The one next the sea is carried upon high arches; the lower one, to the eastward, carries its waters along a low wall in an arched channel five or six feet wide. The water is abundant and of excellent quality, and the small vessels of the country often put in here to take in their supplies. Caesarea is, apparently, never frequented for any other purpose ;even the high-road leaves it wide; and it has not been visited by most of the numerous travelers in Palestine. The present tenants of the ruins are snakes, scorpions, lizards, wild boars, and jackals. See G. Robinson's *Travels,* 1:199 Bartlett's *Jerusalem,* p. 6; Traill's *Josephus,* p. xlix; Conybeare and Howson's *Life and Epistles of St. Paul,* 2:279; Rosenmüller, *Alterth.* II, 2:326 sq.; Reland, *Palcest.* p. 670 sq.; Otho, *Lex Rabb.* p. 108 -sq.; Thomson, *Land and Book,* 2:234 sq. Ritter, *Erdk.* 16:598 sq.; Wilson, *Bible Lands,* 2:250 sq.; Prokesch, *Reise,* p. 28 sq.; Sieber, *De Ccesarec Palestince Episcopis* (Lips. 1734); Wiltsch, *Geography and Stat. of the Church,* 1:53, 214 sq.

Caesarea, Councils Of.

Picture for Caesarea, Councils of

Several councils have been held at this place. The most important are, *I*, in 334, an Arian council, against Athanasius; 2, in 358, in which Cyril (q.v.). bishop of Jerusalem, was deposed. Smith, *Tables of Church Hist.;* Landon, *Manual of Councils.*

2. CAESARCA PHILIPPI, or "Cesarea of Philip" (Καισάρεια ἡ Φιλίππου, *so* Joseph. *Ant.* 20:8, 4; *War*, 3:8, 7; 2, 1; Euseb. *Hist. Eccl.* 7:17), as having been in later times much enlarged and beautified by Philip the tetrarch (Joseph. *Ant.* 18:2, 1; *War*, 2:9, 1), who called it Caesarea in honor of Tiberius the emperor, adding the cognomen of Philippi to distinguish it from Ceesarea of Palestine. It was also known as CESAREA-PANEAS (Καισάρεια Πανεάς or Πανιάς, Joseph. *Ant.* 18:2, 3; *War*, 2:9, 1; Ptolemy, 5:15, 21; Pliny, 5:15, 15; Sozomen, 5:21; on coins, K. ὑπὸ Πανείῳ or πρὸς Πανείω; in Steph. Byz. incorrectly πρὸς τῇ Πανειάδι), or simply *Panias* (Πανεάς, Πανιάς, or Πανειάς, Hierocl. p. 716), its original name (Joseph. *Ant.* 15:10, 3; comp. Pliny, 5:15; *IHavatg* in Cedren. p. 305; Samar. saynp); from the adjoining mountain *Panius* (Πάνιον or Πανεῖον), which, with the spring therein, was dedicated to the heathen *Pan* (Philostorg. 7:3), and which latter name has alone been retained in the present name *Banias* (Burckhardt, 1:90; comp. *Targ.* Jonath. on <04811>Numbers 34:11); being, according to many, no other than the early LAISH *SEE LAISH* (q.v.) of Dan (<07107>Judges 18:7, 29), or LESHEM *SEE LESHEM* (<06940>Joshua 19:47; comp. Theodoret, *Quecst. in Judic.* 26). Caesarea Philippi is mentioned only in the first two Gospels (<40163>Matthew 16:13; <41827>Mark 8:27), and in accounts of the same transactions. The story of the early Christian writers that the woman healed of the issue of blood, and supposed to have been named Berenice, lived at this place, rests on no foundation (Euseb. *Hist. Eccl.* 7:18; Sozom. 5:21; Theophan. *Chronogr.* 41; Phot. *Cod.* 271, p. 823). *SEE SHEPHAM.*

This city lay about 120 miles north from Jerusalem, and a day and a half's journey from Damascus, at the springs of the Jordan, and near the foot of Isbel Shrik, or the Prince's Mount, a lofty branch of Lebanon, forming in that direction the boundary between Palestine and Syria Proper. Here Herod the Great erected a temple to Augustus (Joseph. *Ant.* 15:10, 3; ccmp. *War*, 1:21, 3). *Panium* became part of the territory of Philip,

tetrarch of Trachonitis, who enlarged and embellished the town, and called it *Caesarea Philippi,* partly after his own name and partly after that of the emperor *(Ant.* 18:2, 1; *War,* 2:9, 1). Agrippa II followed in the same course of flattery, and called the place *Nercnias (Ant.* 20:9, 4). Josephus seems to imply *(Life,* 13) that many heathens resided here. Titus exhibited gladiatorial shows at Caesarea Philippi after the downfall of Jerusalem, in which the Jewish prisoners were compelled to fight like gladiators, and numbers perished in the inhuman contests *(War,* 7:2, 1). The old name was not lost. Coins of *Caesarea Paneas* continued through the reigns of many emperors. Under the simple name of *Paneas* it was the seat of a Greek bishopric in the period of the great councils (the second bishop being present at the Council of Nicc, and the last at the Council of Chalcedon in 451), and of a Latin bishopric of Phoenicia during subsequent Christian occupancy, when it was called *B-Inas.* "During the Crusades," says Dr. Robinson, "it was the scene of various changes and conflicts. It first came into the possession of the Christians in 1129, along with the fortress on the adjacent mountain, being delivered over to them by its Israelite governor, after their unsuccessful attempt upon Damascus in behalf of that sect. The city and castle were given as a fief to the Knight Rayner Brus. 'In 1132, during the absence of Rayner, Banias was taken, after a short assault, by the Sultan Ismail of Damascus. It was recaptured by the Franks, aided by the Damascenes themselves. In 1139 the temporal control was restored to Rayner Brus, and the city made a Latin bishopric, under the jurisdiction of the ArchBishop of Tyre" *(Researches,* 3:360).

The site is still called *Eanias,* the first name having here, as in other cases, survived the second. It has now dwindled into a paltry and insignificant village, whose mean and destitute condition contrasts strikingly with the rich and luxuriant character of the surrounding country. Yet many remains of ancient architecture are found in the neighborhood, bearing testimony to the former grandeur of the place, although it is difficult to trace the site of the splendid temple erected here in honor of Augustus. The place itself is remarkable in its physical and picturesque characteristics, as well as in its historical associations. It was at the easternmost and most important of the two recognized sources of the Jordan, the other being at Tell el-Kady. The spring rises, and the city was built, on a limestone terrace in a valley at the base of Mount Hermon. On the north-east side of the present village, the river, held to be the principal source of the Jordan, issues from a spacious cavern under a wall of rock. Around this source are many hewn stones. In

the face of the cliff, directly over the cavern and in other parts, several niches have been cut, apparently to receive statues. Each of these niches had once an inscription; and one of them, copied by Burckhardt, appears to have been a dedication by a priest of Pan. The situation is unique, combining in an unusual degree the elements of grandeur and beauty. It nestles in its recess at the southern base of the mighty Hermon, which towers in majesty to an elevation of 7000 or 8000 feet above. The abundant waters of the glorious fountain spread over the terrace luxuriant fertility and the graceful interchange of copse, lawn, and waving fields (Robinson, *Later Bib. Res.* p. 404).

About three miles north-east of Banias are the re. mains of an immense ancient castle, covering one of the spurs of Lebanon, about fifteen hundred feet above the plain and city. It is enclosed by walls of immense strength and thickness, and must have been an almost impregnable fortress. It is of Saracenic architecture; but many of the fine *bevelled* stones with which the noble round towers are constructed must have belonged to a far more ancient edifice. This castle received the name of *es-Subeibeh* about the time of the Crusades, perhaps from the half-gipsy Arab tribe of the same name that still inhabit the vicinity. A short distance east of this castle there is a very ancient ruin, surrounded by a thick grove of venerable oaks. There are also ruins west of Banias, consisting of columns, capitals, and foundations of buildings, together with canals that formerly conveyed the water of the brook now crossed by a stone bridge. Above the fountain are Greek inscriptions in the rock, confirming the testimony of Josephus that Agrippa adorned Banias with royal liberality, and also sustaining the ancient statements that the fountain was held sacred to Pan *(Biblioth. Sacra,* 1846, p. 194). See Reland, *Palcest.* p. 918 sq.; Eckhel, *Doctr.* ◂0033▸*Numbers* 3:339 sq.; Burckhardt, *Syria,* p. 37 sq.; Buckingham, 2:314 sq.; Thomson, *Land: and Book,* 1:344 sq.; Schwarz, *Palest.* p. 144; *Mod. Traveller,* p. 327 sq., Am. ed.; Bamlmer, *Palast.* p. 215; Wilson, *Lands of Bible,* 2:175 sq.; Porter, *Damascus,* 1:307 sq.

Cesarius, St., Of Arles

was born in 469 at Chalons-sur-Saone. He early developed monkish tendencies, and privately withdrew from his parents to the monastery of Lerins, where he was appointed to the office of cellarer. Afterward, falling ill from extreme asceticism, he was obliged to remove to Aries, and was beloved by Eonius the bishop, whom, in 502, he succeeded in the see of

Aries. He died in 542, leaving many homilies, containing evidence of much piety combined with great superstition. A volume of them was edited by Stephen Baluze (Paris, 1669, 8vo). The others are given in the *Biblioth. Patrumm,* 8:819, 860, and 27:324. His *Regula Monachorum* (contained in Holstenii *Codex Regul. Monast.* Rome, 1661) was adopted by many convents and often used by the founders of orders. Monks and nuns of St. Caesarius existed until the rule of Benedict was generally adopted. A graphic sketch of his life and labors is given by Neander, *Light in Dark Places, p.* 50. Mosheim, *Ch. Hist.* 1:164, 166; Neander, *Ch. Hist.* 2:261, 304, 650; Cave, *Bist. Lit.* anno 502.

Caesarius Of Heisterbach,

a preacher and historian of note, in 1199 became a Cistercian monk in the monastery of Heisterbach, in the diocese of Cologne. He became eventually prior of the convent of the Valley of St. Peter, near Bonn. He lived until the year 1227, but when he died is unknown. His writings are,

1. *De miraculis et visionibus sui temporis* (chiefly in Germany, Cologne, 1591, 8vo); the first edition is without name of place or date: —

2. *Vita S. Engelberti archiep. Colon.* (Cologne, 1633, and in Surius, November 7th): —

3. *Homilia,* edited under the title of *Fasciculi Moralitatis,* ,by Coppenstein (Cologne, 1615): —

4. *Catalogus Episcoporum Coloniensium,* published, with a continuation by another author, in vol. 2 of the *Fontcs Rerum Gerzman.* (1845): —

5. An inedited *Vita S. Elizabethoe* is preserved among the manuscripts of the library of Brussels. Many of his sermons are highly praised for their evangelical tone, as well as for their eloquence. His *De Miraculis* affords a graphic picture of the state of his times. See Kauffmann, *Caesarus v. Heisterbach* (Koln, 1850); Cave, *Hist. Lit.* anno 1225; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 2:490.

Caesarius Of Nazianzus,

a younger brother of Gregory Nazianzen, was educated first at Alexandria, whence he proceeded to Constantinople, where he obtained high honors, resisted the attempts of the Emperor Julian to win him from the faith, and

died under Valens in 368. He was distinguished for his proficiency in physics and mathematics. Gregory delivered his funeral sermon *(Oratio funebris in laudem ,Caesarii fratris,* Or. 8), in which his piety and devotion are lauded. According to Suidas, he wrote *contra Gentes,* and four Dialogues are given as his in the Latin editions of St. Gregory and in the *Bibliotheca Patrum.* — Ullmann, *Life of Gregory,* p. 132; Cave, s. a. 362.

Csesennius.

SEE PAETUS

Caffraria.

SEE KAFFRES.

Cage

Picture for Cage

(bWlK, *kelub',* φυλακή). Bird-cages are named in <24527>Jeremiah 5:27; <66182>Revelation 18:2; and are perhaps implied in <18405>Job 41:5, where "playing with a bird' is mentioned. *SEE BIRD*. In the first of these passages the Sept. renders it by παγίς, a *snare,* implying that it was used for holding decoys with which to entrap other birds until the cage was full — an idea which the derivation of the Hebrews word confirms (from blK; to *clasp* together by the shutting of the valves or trap). This interpretation is therefore better than that of the margin, "coop," or that of the Talmud, "a place of fattening," implying that it was used for holding wild or tame fowls until they became fit for the table. The same article is referred to in Ecclus. 11:30, under the term κάρταλλος, which is elsewhere used of a tapering basket. *SEE FOWLING*. In <66182>Revelation 18:2, the Greek term is φυλακή, meaning a prison or restricted habitation rather than a cage. This just suffices to show that the ancient Israelites kept birds in cages; but we have no farther information on the subject, nor any allusions to the singing of birds so kept. The cages were probably of the same forms which we still observe in the East, and which are shown in the annexed engraving. It is remarkable that there is no appearance of bird-cages in any of the domestic scenes which are portrayed on the mural tablets of the Egyptians. In <30812>Amos 8:12, the same word *kelub'* denotes a fruit-basket, so called, doubtless, from its resemblance toa cage. *SEE BASKET.*

Caians

(1.), a name given by Irenaeus, Epiphanius, and Theodoret to a sect of Ophites, whom modern writers call more correctly Cainites (q.v.).

(2.) A sect mentioned by Tertullian, which rejected the doctrine of baptism. It is doubtful whether this sect is identical with the preceding. Tertullian mentions a certain Quintilla, as the founder, and some have concluded from this that the sect is identical with the Quintillians (q.v.).

Cai'aphas

(Κα άφας, perhaps from the Chald. apyK; *depression),* called by Josephus *(Ant.* 18:2, 2) *Joseph Caiaphas* (Ἰώσηπος, ὁ καὶ Καιάφας), was high-priest of the Jews in the reign of Tiberius Caesar, at the beginning of our Lord's public ministry (<4302>Luke 3:2), A.D. 25, and also at the time of his condemnation and crucifixion (<4026>Matthew 26:3, 57; <4314>John 11:49; 18:13, 14, 24, 28; <4406>Acts 4:6), A.D. 29. The Procurator Valerius Gratus, shortly before his leaving the province (A.D. 25), appointed him to the dignity, which was before held by Simon ben-Camith. He held it during the whole procuratorship of Pontius Pilate, but soon after his removal from that office was deposed by the Proconsul Vitellius (A.D. 36), and succeeded by Jonathan, son of Ananus (Joseph. *Ant.* 18:4, 3). Some in the ancient Church confounded him with the historian Josephus, and believed him to have become a convert to Christianity (Assemani, *Biblioth. Orient.* 2:165). His wife was the daughter of Annas, or Ananus, who had formerly been high-priest, and who still possessed great influence and control in sacerdotal matters, several of his family successively holding the high-priesthood. The names of Annas and Caiaphas are coupled by Luke, "Annas and Caiaphas being the high-priests;" and this has given occasion to no small amount of discussion. Some maintain that Annas and Caiaphas then discharged the functions of the highpriesthood by turns ; but this is not reconcilable with the statement of Josephus. Others think that Caiaphas is *called* high-priest, because he then actually exercised the functions of the office, and that Annas is so called because he had formerly filled the situation. But it does not thus appear why, of those who held the high-priesthood before Caiaphas, Annas in particular should be named, and not Ishmael, Eliazer, or Simon, who had all served the office more recently than Annas. Hence Kuinol and others consider it as the more probable opinion that. Caiaphas was the high-priest, but that Annas was his vicar or

deputy, called in the Hebrew ˆg22s, *sagans*. Nor can that office be thought unworthy of a man who had filled the pontifical office, since the dignity of sagan was also great. Thus, for instance, on urgent occasions he might even enter the Holy of Holies (Lightfoot, *Hor. Heb.* ad Luc. 3:2). Nor ought it to seem strange or unusual that the vicar of a high-priest should be called by that name. For if, as it appears, those who had once held the office were after by courtesy called high-priests, with greater justice might Annas, who was both a pontifical person and high-priest's vicar, be so called. In fact, the very appellation of high-priest is given to a sagan by Josephus *(Ant.* 17:6, 4). (See the commentators on <4002>Luke 3:2, particularly Hammond, Lightfoot, Kuinol, and Bloomfield.) *SEE ANNAS.* Caiaphas belonged to the sect of the Sadducees (<4057>Acts 5:17). (See Hecht, *De Sadducceismo Caiaphce,* Bud. 1718.) *SEE HIGH-PRIEST.*

The wonderful miracle of raising Lazarus from the dead convinced many of the Jews that Christ was sent fromi God; and the chief priests and the Pharisees,. alarmed at the increase of his followers, summoned a council, and pretended that their liberties were in danger; that the Romans would become jealous of them, and that their destruction was inevitable if something were not done at once to check his progress. Caiaphas was a member of the council, and expressed his decided opinion in favor of putting Jesus to death, as the only way of saving the nation from the evils which his success would bring upon them. His language was, "Ye know nothing at all; nor consider that it is expedient for us that one man should die for the people, and that the whole nation perish not" (<4811>John 11:49). This counsel was wicked and unjust in the highest degree; but as there was no offense charged, it seemed the only plausible excuse for putting Christ to death. The high-priest's language on this occasion was prophetic, though he did not intend it so. The evangelist, in giving an account of this extraordinary occurrence, enlarges on the prophetic language of the high-priest, and shows the extent and blessedness of the dispensation of mercy through Jesus Christ. Nothing of this, however, was in the mind of the cruel and bigoted high-priest. After Christ was arrested, he was first taken before Annas, who sent him to his son-in-law Caiaphas, who probably lived in the same house; he was then arraigned before Caiaphas, and an effort was made to produce false testimony sufficient for his condemnation. This expedient failed; for though two persons appeared to testify, they did not agree, and at last Caiaphas put our Savior himself upon oath that he should say whether he was indeed the Christ, the Son of God, or not. The answer.

was, of course, in the affirmative (q.v.), and was accompanied with a declaration of his Divine power and majesty. The high-priest pretended to be greatly grieved at what he considered the blasphemy (q.v.) of our Savior's pretensions, and forthwith appealed to his enraged enemies to say if this was not enough. They answered at once that he deserved to die, and then, in the very presence of Caiaphas, and without any restraint from him, they fell upon their guiltless victim with insults and injuries. As Caiaphas had no power to inflict the punishment of death, Christ was taken from him to Pilate, the Roman governor, that his execution might be duly ordered (<4026>Matthew 26:3, 57; <4318>John 18:13, 28). The bigoted fury of Caiaphas exhibited itself also against the first efforts of the apostles (<4006>Acts 4:6).

Treatises more or less general on the character and conduct of Calaphas in the above transaction have been written in Latin by Baumgarten-Crusius- (Opusc. p. 149 sq.), Hase (Brem. 1703, also in Iken's *Thesaur. 2:*549 sq.), Hecht (Buding. 1719), Haufen (Viteb. 1713), Hoder (Upsal, 1771), Hofmann (in Menthenii *Thes. 2:*216-222), Lungershausen (Jea. 1695), Saltznann (Argent. 1742), Scharbau (Lubec, 1715), Schickendanz (Fcft. and V. 1772), Weber (Viteb. 1807), Seltner (Altdorf, 1721); in French by Dupin (Paris, 1829). See also Evans, *Script. Biog.* 2:257.

Caiet (Or Cayet), Pierre Victor Palma,

was born at Montrichard, in Touraine, in 1525. He became a Protestant under the instructions of Peter Ramus, at Paris; afterward studied theology at Geneva, and about 1582 was a minister in Poitou. Catharine of Bourbon made him her chaplain, and brought him to Paris. Here, under the influence of cardinal Duperron, he abjured Protestantism, Nov. 9,1595, became professor of Hebrew and Oriental languages in the college of Navarre, and died March 10, 1610. He left many controversial works, on the motives which led to his conversion; on the Eucharist; on the Mass; on the Church and the Apostolical Succession, etc. His best known works are his *Chronologie Septenaire* and *povennaire*, 1598-1604 (Paris, 1605, 8vo). — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog.* <0010>*Genesis* 9:309.

Cain

(Hebrews *Ka'yin,* ˆyqi a *lance* [but see below]), the name of a man and of a city. *SEE KENITE; SEE TUBAL-CAIN.*

1. (Sept. and N.T. Κά ν. The root seems to be ˆWq, to *beat,* perhaps with allusion to the murder; the context, however, ver. 1, makes this = hnq; to *create, obtain;* others, as Eusebius and Chrysostom, derive it from some root signifying *envy;* Von Bohlen, *Introd. to* <01018>*Genesis 2:*85, seeks it in the Arabic *kayn,* a *smith,* from the arts introduced bythe Cainites; Josephus Grsecizes it, Κά ς, - ος, *Ant.* 1:2, 2.) The first-born (B.C. apparently cir. 4170) of the human race, and likewise the first murderer and fratricide, B.C. cir. 4043. His history is detailed in Genesis chap. iv; the facts there given are in brief these: He was the eldest son of Adam and Eve; he followed the business of agriculture; in a fit of jealousy, roused by the rejection of his own sacrifice and the acceptance of Abel's, he committed the crime of murder, for which he was expelled from the vicinity of Edemi, and led the life of an exile; he settled in the land of Nod, and built a city, which he named after his son Enoch; his descendants are enumerated, together with the inventions for which they were remarkable. Occasional references to Cain are made in the N.T. (<58104>Hebrews 11:4; <62312>1 John 3:12; Jude 11).

Among all the instances of crime, none impress the mind with a stronger feeling of horror than that of Cain. It is not, however, clear that he had fully premeditated taking the *Ife* of his brother, if, indeed, he was aware by what a slight accident death would ensue; for this was the first instance of human mortality. But it is certain that he had resolved upon some desperate outrage upon his brother's person, and he deliberately took occasion to perpetrate it. Abel, as most think, brought two offerings, the one an oblation, the other a sacrifice. Cain brought but the former mere acknowledgment, it is supposed, of the sovereignty of God-neglecting to offer the sacrifice, which would have been a confession of fallen nature, and, typically, an atonement for sin. It was not, therefore, the mere difference of feeling with which the two offerings were brought which constituted the virtue of the one or the guilt of the other brother. "The malignity of his temper showed itself in his unwillingness to ask his brother for a victim from among his herd. He offered before God an unlawful sacrifice," because a bloodless one, <58922>Hebrews 9:22 (Jarvis, *Church of the Redeemed,* p. 14). The circumstances connected with this offense are related in a brief but graphic manner in the Hebrews text, the force of which is not well brought out in the Auth. Vers. (<01042>Genesis 4:2-16). Abel, being a herdsman, naturally brought at the: end of the week (for the Sabbath was already a well-known institution) an offering of the first-born

and fattest of his flocks, while Cain, as a husbandman (hence the greater severity of the curse which blasted his professional hopes), presented an oblation of vegetable productions. The undevout temper and wicked nature of Cain are sufficiently evinced by his resentment against the Aimighty, as if partial to his brother (see below). The Divine Being condescends to expostulate with him on his unreasonable behavior, and to warn him of the danger of cherishing the jealousy which he seems to have already entertained against Abel: "If thou reformest, there is forgiveness [with me for thy past. offenses]; but if not, [then beware, for] sin crouches at thy door [like a wild beast ready to seize thee on the first opportunity], and against thee is its design; but do thou subdue it [i.e. thy evil disposition]." Instead of heeding this advice, however, the ill-natured man, taking the first occasion to narrate the circumstance to his brother (probably in an upbraiding manner), fell into the very snare of Satan against which he had been warned; his feelings became' again excited, as they two were alone conversing in the open field, and, there being no one near to witness or avert the consequences, he suddenly turned against his brother, and by an angry blow (probably with some agricultural implement, in the formation of which he had doubtless already begun to exercise the mechanical ingenuity for which his descendants became famous) he laid him dead upon the ground. Instead of the penitence which the sight of his brother's blood ought to have inspired in his horror-stricken soul, the craven murderer insolently demands of the all-seeing God, when questioned as to his crime, "I know nothing about the matter; am I my brother's keeper?" But when conviction is fastened upon him, and the penalty-announced, with the despairin, but still impenitent remorse of Judas, the guilty wretch exclaims, "My iniquity is too great for forgiveness! (a/cNmiyn/[}l/dG; Sept. μείζων ἡ αἰτία μοῦ τοῦ ἀφεθῆναί με:) for thou hast utterly driven me out this day from the face of the ground [of this pleasant region]," and I shall be in danger of starvation, and even of perishing by the hand of every stranger whom I may meet. (See Kitto's *Daily Bible I'lust.* in loc.; Fechtii *Hist. Abelis et Caini,* Rost. 1704.)

The punishment which attended the crime admitted of no escape, scarcely of any conceivable alleviation. "He lost the privileges of primogeniture, was deprived of the priesthood, banished from 'the presence' of the divine glory between the cherubim, shut out from the hopes of mercy, and, with his descendants, delivered over unprotected to the assaults of the great adversary" (Jarvis, *Church of the Redeemed,* p. 14). Cursed from the earth

himself, the earth was doomed to a double barrenness wherever the offender should set his foot. Physical want and hardship, therefore, were among the first of the miseries heaped upon his head. [Next came those of mind and conscience: “The voice of thy brother’s blood crieth unto me from the ground.” Nor did any retreat remain to him from the terrors of his own soul or those of Divine vengeance: “From thy face shall I be hid,” was his agonizing and hopeless cry. The statement that “Cain went out from the presence of the Lord” represents him as abiding, till thus exiled, in some favored spot where the Almighty still, by visible signs, manifested himself to his fallen creatures. The expression of dread lest, as he wandered over the face of the earth, he might be recognized and slain, has an awful sound when falling from the mouth of a murderer. But he was to be protected against the wrath of his fellow-men; and of this God gave him assurance, not, says Shuckford, by setting a mark upon him, which is a false translation, but by appointing a sign or token which he himself might understand as a proof that he should not perish by the hand of another, as Abel had perished by his. This sign was probably no other than the Divine denunciation uttered at the time against any one who should venture to do him injury, and which, being well known, would prove a sufficient *caveat.* As such it is referred to by his descendant Lamech (<01024>Genesis 4:24). ‘The passage may therefore be rendered, “Thus Jehovah appointed a token for Cain, so that no one who met him should slav him.” What was the Divine purpose in affording him this protection it is difficult to determine. That it was not with the intention of prolonging his misery may be conjectured from the fact that it was granted in answer to his own piteous cry for mercy. Some writers have spoken of the possibility of his becoming a true penitent, and of his having at length obtained the Divine forgiveness (Ortlob, *Cainus non desperans,* Lips. 1706).

It may be worthy of observation that especial mention is made of the fact that Cain, having traveled into the land of Nod, there built a city; and further, that his descendants were chiefly celebrated for their skill in the arts of social life. In both accounts may probably be discovered the powerful struggles with which Cain strove to overcome the difficulties that attended his position as one to whom the tillage’ of the ground was virtually prohibited. The following points also are deserving of notice.

(1.) The position of the “land of Nod.” The name itself tells us little; it means *flight* or *exile,* in reference to <01042>Genesis 4:12, where a cognate word is used: Von Bohlen’s attempt to identify it with India, as though the

Hebrew name *Hind* (דנה) had been erroneously read *hazl-Nod*, is too far fetched; the only indication of its position is the indefinite notice that it was "east of Eden" (<010416>Genesis 4:16), which, of course, throws us back to the previous settlement of the position of Eden itself. Knobel *(Comm.* in loc.), who adopts an ethnological interpretation of the history of Cain's descendants, would identify Nod with the whole of Eastern Asia, and even hints at a possible connection between the names Cain and China. It seems vain to attempt the identification of Nod with any special locality; the direction "east of Eden" may have reference to the previous notice in <010324>Genesis 3:24, and may indicate that the land was opposite to (Sept. κατέναντι) the entrance, which was barred against his return. It is not improbable that the *east* was further used to mark the direction which the Cainites took, as distinct from the Sethites, who would, according to Hebrew notions, be settled toward the west. Similar observations must be made in regard to the city Enoch, which has been identified with the names of the Heniochi, a tribe in Caucasus (so Hasse), Anuchta, a town in Susiana (Huetius), Chanoge, an ancient town in India (Von Bohlen), and Iconium, as the place where the deified King Annacos was honored (EWald): all such attempts at identification must be subordinated to the previous settlement of the position of Eden and Nod. *SEE NOD.*

(2.) The "mark set upon Cain" has given rise to various speculations, many of which would never have been broached if the Hebrew text had been consulted the words probably mean that Jehovah *gave a siqn to* Cain, very much as signs were afterward given to Noah (<010913>Genesis 9:13), Moses (<020302>Exodus 3:2, 12), Elijah (<111911>1 Kings 19:11), and Hezekiah (<230807>Isaiah 38:7, 8). Whether the sign was perceptible to Cain alone, and given to him once for all, in token that no man should kill him, or whether it was one that was perceptible to others, and designed as a precaution to them, as is implied in the A. V. is uncertain; the nature of the sign itself is still more uncertain (but see above). (See Kraft, *De Signo Caini*, in his *Obss. Sacr.* 1:3.) *SEE MARK.*

(3.) The narrative implies the existence of a considerable population in Cain's time; for he fears lest he should be murdered in return for the murder he had committed (<010414>Genesis 4:14). Josephus *(Ant.* 1:2,1) explains his fears as arising, not from men, but from wild beasts; but such an explanation is wholly unnecessary. The family of Adam may have largely increased before the birth of Seth, as is indeed implied in the notice of Cain's wife (<010417>Genesis 4:17), and the mere circumstance

that none of the other children are noticed by name may be explained on the ground that their lives furnished nothing worthy of notice. These neighbors must, of course, have been the relatives of Cain, who had now branched out into a considerable community, and as his banishment would necessarily estrange him from them, he entertained the natural apprehension lest in the course of his remaining lifetime they might even become his enemies, especially as they would regard him as a murderer. *SEE BLOOD-REVENGE.* His wife must evidently have been one of his sisters (comp. "sons and daughters," Genesis 5:4). Tradition calls her *Save* (Epiphan. *Hoer.* 29:6) or *Azura* (Malalas, p. 2); the Arabs call Cain himself *Kabel* by alliteration with the name of his brother (D'Herbelot, *Bibl. Or. s.v.* Cabil). *SEE ADAM.*

(4.) The character of Cain deserves a fuller notice. He is described as a man of a morose, malicious, and revengeful temper; and that he presented his offering in this state of mind is implied in the rebuke contained in Genesis 4:7, which may be rendered thus: "If thou doest well (or, as the Sept. has it, ἐὰν ὀρθῶς προσενέγκῃς), is there not an elevation (תאֵ) [of the countenance] (i.e. perhaps *cheerfulness* and *happiness)?* but if thou doest not well *[there is a sinking of the countenance],* sin lurketh (as a wild beast) at the door, and to thee is its desire; but thou shalt rule over it." (So Gesenius and others; but see above.) The narrative implies therefore that his offering was rejected on account of the temper in which it was brought (Sticht, *De colloquio Dei cum Caino,* Alt. 1766). *SEE ABEL.*

(5.) The descendants of Cain are enumerated to the sixth generation. Some commentators (Knobel, Von Bohlen) have traced an artificial structure in this genealogy, by which it is rendered parallel to that of the Sethites; e.g. there is a decade of names in each, commencing with Adam and ending with Jabal and Noah, the deficiency of generations in the Cainites being supplied by the addition of the two younger sons of Lamech to the list; and there is a considerable similarity in the names, each list containing a Lamech and an Enoch, while Cain in the one=Cain-an in the other, Methusael =Methuselah, and Mehujael =Mahalaleel; the inference from this comparison being that the one was framed out of the other. It must be observed, however, that the differences far exceed the points of similarity; that the order of the names, the number of generations, and even 'the meanings of those which are noticed as similar in sound, are sufficiently

distinct to remove the impression of artificial construction. (See Bochart, *Hieroz.* 1:537.) *SEE PATRIARCH.*

(6.) The social condition of the Cainites is prominently brought forward in the history. Cain himself was an agriculturist, Abel a shepherd: the successors of the latter are represented by the Sethites and the progenitors of the Hebrew race in later times, among whom a pastoral life was always held in high honor from the simplicity and devotional habits which it engendered: the successors of the former are depicted as the reverse in all these respects. Cain founded the first city; Lamech instituted polygamy; Jabal introduced the nomadic life; Jubal invented musical instruments; Tubal-cain was the first smith; Lamech's language takes the stately tone of poetry; and even the names of the women, Naamah *(pleasant),* Zillah *(shadow),* Adah *(ornamental),* seem to bespeak an advanced state of civilization. But, along with this, there was violence and godlessness; Cain and Lamech furnish proof of the former, while the concluding words of Genesis 4:26, imply the latter. *SEE ANTEDILUVIANS.*

(7.) The contrast established between the Cainites and the Sethites appears to have reference solely to the social and religious condition of the two races. On the one side there is pictured a high state of civilization, unsanctified by religion, and productive of luxury and violence; on the other side, a state of simplicity which afforded no material for history beyond the declaration, "Then began men to call upon the name of the Lord." The historian thus accounts for the progressive degeneration of the religious condition of man, the evil gaining a predominance over the good *by* its alliance with worldly power and knowledge, and producing the state of things which necessitated the flood. *SEE DELUGE.*

(8.) Another motive may be assigned for the introduction of this portion of sacred history. All ancient nations have loved to trace up the invention of the arts to some certain author, and, generally speaking, these authors have been regarded as objects of divine worship. Among the Greeks Apollo was held to be the inventor of music, Vulcan of the working of metals, Triptolemus (see Hygin. 277) of the plough. A similar feeling of curiosity prevailed among the Hebrews; and hence the historian has recorded the names of those to whom the invention of the arts was traditionally assigned, obviating at the same time the dangerous error into which other nations had fallen, and reducing the estimate of their value by the position which their inventors held. *SEE ART; SEE ARTIFICER.*

Additional treatises: Stockmann, *De Caino prcenmo wnto* (Jen. 1792); Danz, *id.* (ib. 1681, 1732); Bosseck, *D sacrisciis Caini et' Habel* (Lips. 1781); Niemeyer, *Charakt.* 2:57 sq.; Buttmann, *lMythl. 1:*164 sq.; Otho, *Lex. Rab.* p. 109 sq.; Eisenmenger, *Entd. Judenth.* 1:462, 471, 832, 836; Hottinger, *Hist. Orientalis,* p. 25; *Hamb. verm. Biblioth. 2:*945 sq.; Sack, in the *Brem. u; Verd. Biblioth.* I, 3:61; Rosenmüller, *Scholia,* in. loc. Gen.; Philo, *Opp.* 1:185; *Whately, Prototypes,* p. 15; Dupin, *Nouv. Bibl.* p. 4; Kitto, *Daily Bible Illust.* in loc.; Evans, *Script. Biog.* 2:1 sq.; Hunter, *Sac. Biog.* p. 17 sq. *SEE MURDER.*

2. (Hebrews, with the article, *hkk-Ka'yin,* ˆyQhi = "the lance;" but may be derived from ˆqe*ken,* "a nest," possibly in allusion to its position; Sept. Ζακανα μ v. r. Ζανωακείμ, by including the name preceding; Vulg. *A ccain.)* One of the cites in the low country *(Shefe-lah)* of Judah, named with Zanoah and Gibeah: (Joshua 15:56); apparently the modern village *Yukin'* a short distance south-east of Hebron (Van de *Velde,'Memoir,* p. 300), now a Mohammedan station, said to be the place where Lot stopped after his flight from Sodom (Robinson, *Researches,* 2:190).

Cai'nan

(Hebrews *Keyinan',* ˆnyqe derivation ambiguous, as in the case of "Cain" [q.v.], and signifying either *possessor* [so Furst] or *forgeman* [so Gesenius]; Sept. Καϊνᾶν, *but* Καϊνάν in Chron. and N.T.; Josephus Καϊνᾶς, *Ant.* 1:3, 4), the name of one or two men.

1. The fourth antediluvian patriarch, being the (oldest) son of Enos (who was 90 years of age at his birth), B.C. 3846. He was himself 70 years old at the birth of his (first) son Mahalaleel, B.C. 3776, after which he lived 840 years, and died B.C. 3031, aged 910 (Genesis 5:9-14). *SEE LONGEVITY.* The rabbinical tradition was that he first introduced idol-worship and astrology — a tradition which the Hellenists transferred to the postdiluvian Cainan. Thus Ephraem-Syrus asserts that the Chaldees in the time of Terah and Abram worshipped a graven god called Cainan; and Gregory BarHIebraeus, another Syriac author, also applies it to the son of Arphaxad (Mill, *Vindlca. of Genea!ogies,* p. 150). The origin of the tradition is not known; but it may probably have been suggested by the meaning of the supposed root in Arabic and the Arammean dialects, just as another signification of the same root seems to have suggested the tradition that the daughters of Cain were the first who made and *sang* to musical

instruments (Gesenius, *Thesaur.* s.v. ˆWq). His name is Anglicized “Kenan” in the Auth. Vers. at <013002>1 Chronicles 1:2.

2. The son of Arphaxad, and father, of Sala, according to <420335>Luke 3:35, 36, and usually called the second Cainan. He is also found in the present copies of the Sept. in the genealogy of Shem, <011024>Genesis 10:24; 11:12 and 13 (where his history is given in full like the rest: “And Arphaxad lived 135 years, and begat Cainan, And Arphaxad lived after he begat Cainan 400 years, and begat sons and daughters.. And he died. And Cainan lived 130 years, and begat Salah, And Cainan lived after he begat Salah 330 years, and begat sons and daughters. And he died”), and <130118>1 Chronicles 1:18 (though he is omitted in <130124>1 Chronicles 1:24), but is nowhere named in the Hebrew text, nor in ally of the versions made from it, as the Samaritan, Chaldee, Syriac, Vulgate, etc. As the addition of his generation of 10 years in the series of names is of great chronological importance, and is one of the circumstances which render the Septuagint computation of time longer than the Hebrew, this matter has engaged much attention, and has led to great discussion among chronologers. *SEE CHRONOLOGY.* Some have suggested that the Jews purposely excluded the second Cainan from their copies, with the design of rendering the Septuagint and Luke suspected; others that Moses omitted Cainan, being desirous of reckoning ten generations only from Adam to Noah, and from Noah to, Abraham. Some suppose that Arphaxad was father of Cainan and Salah — of Salah naturally, and of Cainan legally; while others allege that Cainan and Salah were the same person under two names. It is believed by many, however, that the name of this second Cainan was not originally in the text even of Luke, but is an addition of inadvertent transcribers, who, remarking it in scmi copies of the Septuagint, added it (Kuinol, *ad Luc.* 3:36) Hales, though, as an advocate of the longer chronology, predisposed to its retention, decides that we are fully warranted to conclude that the second Cainan was not originally in the Hebrew text, at least, nor in the Septuagint and other versions derived from it *(Chronology,* 1:291). Some of the grounds for this conclusion are,

1. That the Hebrew and Samaritan, with all the ancient versions and targums, concur in ,the omission;

2. That the Septuagint is not consistent with itself; for in the repetition of genealogies in <130124>1 Chronicles 1:24, it omits Cainan and agrees with the Hebrew text;

3. That the second Cainan is silently rejected by Josephus, by Philo, by John of Antioch, and by Eusebius; and that, while Origen retained the name itself, he, in his copy of the Septuagint, marked it with an obelisk as an unauthorized reading.

'It certainly was not contained in any copies of the, Bible which Berosus, Eupolemus, Polyhistor, Theophilus of Antioch, Julius Africanus, or even Jerome, had access to. Moreover, it seems that the intrusion of the name even into the Sept. is comparatively modern, since Augustine is the first writer who mentions it as found in the O.T. at all. Demetrius (B.C. 170), quoted by Eusebius *(Proep. Evang.* 9:21), reckons 1360 years from the birth of Shem to Jacob's going down to Egypt, which '*seems* to include the 130' years of Cainan. But in the great fluctuation of the numbers in the ages of the patriarchs, no reliance can be placed on this argument. Nor have we any certainty that the figures have not been altered in the modern copies of Eusebius, to make them agree with the computation of the altered copies of the Sept. 4. That the numbers indicating the longevity, and paternity of this patriarch are evidently borrowed from those immediately adjoining, as is the name itself from that of the antediluvian patriarch. See Heidegger, *Hist. Patriarch.* 2:8-15; Bochart, *Phaleg,* lib. 2, cap. 13; Mill's *Vindic. of our Lord's Geneal.* p. 143. sq; Rus, *Harmon. Evang.* 1:364 sq.; Michaelis, *De Chronolog. Mosis post dillue.* (in the *Commentat. Soc. Gott.* 1763 sq.; translated in the *Am. Bib. Repos.* July, 1841, p. 114 sq.); Vater, *Comment. zum Pent.* 1:174 sq. *SEE GENEALOGY (OF CHRIST).*

Cainites,

a sect of Gnostics that sprung up about the year 130 and is classed with the Ophites (q. v) or Serpentinians. They held that *Sophia* (Wisdom) found means to preserve in every age in this world, which the Demiurge had created, a race bearing within them a spiritual nature similar to her own, and intent upon opposing the tyranny of the Demiurge. The Cainites regarded Cain as the chief of this race. They honored Cain, and the evil characters of Scripture generally, on the ground that, in proportion to the hatred such characters evinced of the laws of the God of this world (the Demiurge), the more worthily did they act as the sons of *Sophia,* whose chief work is to destroy the kingdom of the Demiurge. For the same reason, they honored Korah, Dathan, and Abiram, as well as the inhalitants of Sodom, and Judas Iscariot, whom they regarded as procuring the death

of Christ from the purest motives; for he knew that this was the only possible way of effecting the destruction of the Demiurge's kingdom. Hippolytus mentions the Cainites in his *Philosophoumena,* 8:12. — Neander, *Ch. Hist.* 1:448; August. *De Haeres.* cap. 18; Tertull. *De Prescript.* cap. 47; Lardner, *Works,* 8:560.

Caius (Of The New Test.)

SEE GAIUS.

Caius (Emperor Of Rome).

SEE CALIGULA.

Caius Or Gaius,

a presbyter of the Church of Rome, who flourished about 210, in the time of Zephyrinus and Callistus. Photius calls him τῶν ἐθνων ἐπίσκοπος, a designation the meaning of which is not clear. When at Rome, he held a celebrated disputation with Proclus, the head of a sect of Montanists, which he afterward reduced to writing in the form of dialogues. Eusebius quotes fragments of this work in lib. 2, cap. 25, and also in lib. 3, cap. 28, and lib. 6, cap. 20. Caius also wrote a book called *The Labyrinth,* and another against Artemon, unless the former be the same with the work attributed to Origen, as Cave supposes. Eusebius gives an extract from the *Parvus Labirinthus* against Artemon and Theodotus, lib. 5, cap. 28. Photius also attributes to this Caius a Treatise on the Universe, but both this and the "Labyrinth" are now attributed to Hippolytus. See Bunsen, *Hippolytus and hs 'Times;* also *Origen' or fli polytus,* in the *WMeth. Quarterly Revieu',* 1151, p. 646; Landon, s.v. *SEE HIPPOLYTUS.*

Caius Or Gaius,

a Dalmatian, elected bishop of Rome in 283, and is said to have suffered martyrdom under Diocletian, April 21, 296. His epistle was edited, with notes, etc., by Caes. Becillus, a priest of the oratory of Urbino, and subjoined to the Acts of his Martyrdom, published at Rome in 1628.

Caius, John

(Kaye or *Key,* Latinized into *Caius),* M.D., was born at Norwich Oct. 6, 1510, and became successively first physician to Edward VI, Mary, and

Elizabeth. He died July 29,1573. He founded the college which bears his name at Cambridge for twenty-three students. He was a good classical scholar, and wrote many treatises on subjects connected with medicine and natural history. He published also a treatise on the antiquity of the University of Cambridge (which he states was founded by *one Cantaber,* 394 *years before Christ),* and another on the pronunciation of Greek and Latin. His tomb still remains in Caius College, with only this inscription, "Fui Caius."

Cajetan (Gaetano Tommaso Di Vio),

cardinal, surnamed from Gabta, where he was born, Feb. 20,1469 (others say July 25,1470). His proper name was Jacob, but he assumed that of Thomas in honor of Thomas Aquinas. At fifteen he became a Dominican, and in 1508 he was made general of his order. In 1517 Leo X made him cardinal, and also his legate in Germany, the principal object of his mission being to bring back Luther to the obedience of the Holy See before his separation was finally completed. Cajetan fulfilled his mission in a haughty and imperious manner, and nothing came of it. In 1519 he was appointed to the see of Gaeta, after which he was employed in other missions, and died at Rome in 1534. He published a *Version of the 0. T. (Libr. Vet. Test.)* (Lyons, 1639, 5 vols, fol.): — *In Summare Thomas Aquinatis Comment.* — *Opuscula* (among which is his treatise on the authority of the pope, in which he gives vent to the extremest views of ultra-montanism, and which was refuted by order of the faculty of Paris)*: — Tractatus de comparatione papce et concilii* (Venice, 1531). His works are collected, and somewhat modified (Lyons, 1619, fol.). — Mosheim, *Ch. Hist.* 3:23 *note;* Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog, Generale,* 8:142; Horne, *Bibliog. Alpendix,* pt. 1, ch. 1, sect. 4.

Cake

(represented by several Hebrews words; see below). The Hebrews used various sorts of cakes; which was the form usually given to Oriental bread (100692 Samuel 6:19; 117121 Kings 17:12). *SEE LOAF.* They were leavened or unleavened. They also offered cakes in the Temple made of wheat or of barley, kneaded sometimes with oil and sometimes with honey. For the purposes of offering, these cakes were salted, but unleavened (02912Exodus 29:2; 03204Leviticus 2:4). In 24718Jeremiah 7:18; 44:19, we read of the Hebrews kneading their dough "to make cakes to the queen of heaven",

SEE ASHTORETH, which appears to have been, from early times, an idolatrous practice, and was also the custom of the Greeks and Romans. The ancient Egyptians also made offerings of cakes to their deities. In Hosea 7:8, Ephraim is called "a cake not turned." This figurative expression illustrates the mixture of truth and idolatry (Jews and Gentiles among the Ephraimites) by dough baked on one side only, and, therefore, neither doughnor bread. *SEE BREAD.*

1. *For secular Use.* —The ordinary (wheaten) bread of the Hebrews certainly had the shape of flat biscuits; and as this has been already sufficiently discussed under the article BAKE *SEE BAKE* , we will here consider only those finer sorts, which appear to have been of more artificial manufacture.' The terms for these are as follows:

(1.) *Ash-cakes,* t/G[,µuggoth'. *SEE ASH-CAKE.*

(2.) *Pancakes,* baked in oil in the tvj,rjmi *marche' sheth,* or *pot* (Leviticus 2:7; see Jarchi in Rosenmüller, ad loc.), perhaps like modern *dcWuh-nuts. SEE FRYING-PAN.* Different are the t/bybil] *lebiboth'* (2 Samuel 13:6-18; Sept. κολλυρίδες), cakes kneaded of dough (ver. 8), which, boiled in a deep pan, were emptied out from it tender, but not liquid (ver. 8, 9). The import of this last, from the etymology, is very uncertain (see Rodiger, *De interpret. Arab. libr. hist.* p. 94; Thenius on Samuel 13:6; Gesenius, *Thes.* p. 141). It was probably a kind of fancy cake, the making of which appears to have been a rare accomplishment, since Tamar was required to prepare it for Ammon in his pretended illness (2 Samuel 13:6).

(3.) *Hole-cakes,* t/Ljj *challoth'* (2 Samuel 6:19), which were mingled with oil (ˆm,VBi t/lWlB] see Bahr, *Symbol. 2:*301), and baked in the oven (Leviticus 2:4).

(4.) *Wafers,* µyqiyqir] *rekkim'* (Exodus 29:2; Leviticus 8:26; 1 Chronicles 23:29), made very thin (Gr. λάγανα), and spread with oil (ˆm,VBi µyjivm] Sept. διακεχαρισμένα ἐν ἐλαίῳ). *SEE WAFER.*

(5.) *Crackers,* the µyDQum *nikkuddim',* of 1 Kings 14:3, translated "cracknels" in the Authorized Version, an almost obsolete word, denoting a kind of crisp cake, q. d. "crumb-cake." The original-would seem, by its etymology (if from dqn *speckled,* spotted, Genesis 30:32 sq.), to

denote something spotted or sprinkled over, etc. Buxtorf *(Lex. Talm.* col. 1386) explains thus: "'Little circles of bread like the half of an egg, *Terumoth,* 100:5;" and in another place *(Epit. ad. Hrebr.* p. 544), Also the crackers, <111403>1 Kings 14:3, commonly called *biscuit,* received their name because they were formed in little *round* slices as if stamped out, or because they were punctured in some peculiar manner." It is, indeed, not improbable that they may have been' a sort of biscuit, or small and hard-baked cakes, calculated to keep (for a journey or some other purpose) by reason of their excessive hardness (or perhaps being *twice baked,* as the word *biscuit* implies). Not only are such hard cakes or biscuits still used in the East, but they are, like all biscuits, *punctured* to render them more hard, and sometimes, also, they are sprinkled with seeds, either of which circumstances sufficiently meets the conditions suggested by the etymology of the Hebrew word. The existence of such biscuits is further implied in <060905>Joshua 9:5, 12, where the Gibeonites describe their bread as having become as *hard as biscuit* (not "mouldy," as in the Authorized Version) by reason of the length of their journey. *SEE CRACKNEL.*

(6.) *Honey-cakes,* vBidÞBi tyjiPix], *tsappichith' bidbash'* (<021631>Exodus 16:31; Talm. ˆyniv;bD]D, Mishna, *Challa,* 1:4), such as are still much relished by the Arabs. *SEE HONEY.* Different from these were the *raisin-cakes,* µybiN;[}yvey[ia}, *ashishey' anabim'* (<280301>Hosea 3:1; Sept. πέμματα μετὰ σταφίδας, Authorized Version "flagons of wine"), probably a mass of dried grapes pressed into form; comp. the *lumps* (" cakes") *ofJigs,* µylibÞD], *dcebelim',* in <092518>1 Samuel 25:18. *SEE FIG.* The term hvyvia}, *ashishah'* (as explained by the Targ. of Ps. Jonathan at <021631>Exodus 16:31; also the Mishna, *Nedar. 6:*10; see Gesen. *Thes.* 1:166 sq.), seems to denote the same kind of cakes as used for refreshment (<220205>Song of Solomon 2:5; <100619>2 Samuel 6:19; <131603>1 Chronicles 16:3). *SEE FLAGON.* A species of cake prepared with honey is thought (so Jerome) to be referred to in <261613>Ezekiel 16:13 (see Rosenmüller, in loc.).

(7.) The *hashed fragments of the offering,* ynePiTu µyTiPi tj'n]mi, *tuppiney' minchath' pattim'* (lit. *cookings (f* the *offering of [i.e.* in] *pieces,* Auth. Ver. "baken pieces of the meat-offering," <030621>Leviticus 6:21, i:e. cooked and prepared like the meat-offering, and then broken up into pieces; comp. <030204>Leviticus 2:4 sq.; 7:9), are probably cooked pieces that were again kneaded up with oil and baked (comp. Wansleb in Paulus, *Samml.* 3:330; Bahr, *Symbol.* 2:302). For this purpose use was made of a *frying-pan,*

tbijmi *machabath'* (Leviticus 2:5, etc.), probably a flat iron plate (stew-pan or griddle), beneath which the fire was kindled (comp. Niebuhr, 1:234). *SEE PAN.*

(8.) The *thin cakes,* µynIWKi *kavanim'* (" cakes," Jeremiah 7:18; 44:19), a sort of wafer used in heathen offerings, are rendered in-the Sept. by the Graecized term χαυῶνες, which is explained by Suidas and other ancient glossarists as signifying barley-cakes steeped in oil; compare the cakes and barley-meal used with sacrifices among the Greeks and Romans (see Smith's *Dict. of Class. Antiq.* s.v. Sacrificium). *SEE QUEEN OF HEAVEN.*

The only remaining Hebrews words relating to the subject, or rendered "cake" in the Auth. Vers., are, gj/[m; *magq', a cake,* i.e. whole piece (q. d. "slice") of bread (1 Kings 17:12; in Psalm 35:16, in the phrase gj/[m; ygeWli *cake-buffoons, scurrce placentace* "mockers in feasts," i.e. table-jesters); hXmi *matstsah'* (Joshua 5:11; Judges 6:19, 20, 21; 1 Chronicles 23:29, etc.), *sweet* or unleavened bread, as usually rendered, *SEE LEAVEN*; and lWlx] *tselul',* lylix] *tselil* (Judges 7:13), a *round cake* of barley-bread. The yrijo *chori',* of Genesis 40:16 (where it only occurs in the expression yrijo/Lsi Sept. κανᾶ χονδριτῶν , Vulg. *canistra farince,* Auth. Vers. *"white* baskets," marg. "basketsfull *of holes"),* may signify either *white bread,* as made of fine flour (in the Mishna, *Edaioth,* 3:10, yrj is a species of bread or cake like the Arab. *chumauray,* white bread or flour), or it may refer to some peculiarity of the baskets merely. *SEE BASKET.* In the Mishna, *Challa,* 11:4 sq., many other kinds of cake are referred to, but the import of the words there employed is very uncertain. On the Greek cakes, see especially Athen. 14:644 sq. See generally Rau, *Diss. de re cibari hebrceor.* (Tr. ad Rh. 1769). *SEE FOOD.*

2. *As sacriflcial Offerings.* — The second chapter of Leviticus gives a sort of list of the different kinds of bread and cakes in use among the ancient Israelites, for the purpose of distinguishing the kinds which were from those which were not suitable for cfferings. Of such as were fit for offerings, we find,

(1.) *Bread baked in ovens* (Leviticus 2:4); but this is limited to two sorts, which appear to be, first, the bread baked inside the vessels of stone, metal, or earthenware, as was customary. In this case the oven is half filled

with small smooth pebbles, upon which, when heated and the fuel withdrawn, the dough is laid. Bread prepared in this mode is necessarily full of indentations or holes, from the pebbles on which it is baked. Second, the bread prepared by dropping with the hollow of the hand a thin layer of the almost liquid dough upon the outside of the same oven, and which, being baked dry the moment it touches the heated surface, forms a thin,. wafer-like bread or biscuit. The, first of these Moses appears to distinguish by the characteristic epithet of t/Lj¡ *challoth'* (see above), *perforatcd, or full of holes* (<0292>Exodus 29:2; <0304>Leviticus 2:4; 7:12; <0465>Numbers 6:15, etc.), and the other by the name of µyqiWqr] *rekukim', thin* cakes, being, if correctly identified, by much the thinnest of any bread used in the East. A cake of the former was offered as the first of the dough (<0826>Leviticus 8:26), and is mentioned in <1069>2 Samuel 6:19, with the addition of "bread" — *perforated bread.* Both sorts, when used for offerings, were to be unleavened (perhaps to secure their being prepared for the special purpose); and the first sort, namely, that which appears to have been baked inside the oven, was to Le *mix(d up* with oil, while the other (that baked outside the oven), which, from its thinness, could not possibly be thus treated, was to be only smeared with oil. The fresh olive oil, which was to be used for this purpose, imparts to the bread something of the flavor of butter, which last is usually of very indifferent quality in Eastern countries.

(2.) *Bread baked in a pan* — 1st, that which, as is still usual, is baked in, or rather on, the *tajen.* This also, as an offering, was to be unleavened and mixed with oil. 2d. This, according to <0306>Leviticus 2:6, could be broken into pieces, and oil poured over it, forming a distinct kind of bread and offering. And, in fact, the thin biscuits baked on the *tajin,* as well as the other kinds of bread, thus broken up and remade into a kind of dough, form a kind of food or pastry in which the Orientals take much delight, and which makes a standing dish among the pastoral tribes. The ash-cake answering to the Hebrew hG;[¡ *uggah,* is the most frequently employed for this purpose. When it is baked, it is broken up into crumbs and rekneaded with water, to which is added, in the course of the operation, butter, oil, vinegar, or honey. Having thus again reduced it to a tough dough, the mass is broken into pieces, which are baked in smaller cakes and eaten as a dainty. The preparation for the Mosaical offering was more simple, but it serves to indicate the existence of such preparations among the ancient Israelites.

(3.) *Bread baked upon the hearth* — that is to soy, baked upon the hearth-stone, or plate covering the fire-pit, which frequently answers the purpose of an oven. This also was to be mixed with oil (Leviticus 2:7).

As these various kinds of baked bread were allowed as offerings, there is no question that they were the best modes of preparing bread known to the Hebrews in the time of Moses; and as all the ingredients were such as Palestine abundantly produced, they were such offerings as even the poorest might without much difficulty procure. *SEE SHEW-BREAD.*

Ca'lah

(Heb. *Ke'lach*, לַכְ, *vigrorous* old age, as in Job 5:26; in pause *Ka'lach*, לַכָ; Sept. Χαλάχ, Vulg. *Chale)*, one of the most ancient cities of Assyria, whose foundation is ascribed either to Asshur or Nimrod (Genesis 10:11). The place has been thought identical with the *ChalLach* (לַחְ; Sept. Ἀλαέ) named elsewhere, *SEE HALAH*, (2 Kings 17:6; 18:11; 1 Chronicles 5:26); but, on monumental evidence, the Rawlinsons *(Herod.* 1:368) regard the site of Calah as marked by the *Nimruid* ruins, which have furnished so large a proportion of the Assyrian antiquities. The Talmud *(Yoma*, x) locates it on the Euphrates, near Borsippa (בוּרְסִפָּא). If at Nimrud, Calah must be considered to have been at one time (about B.C. 930-720) the capital of the empire. It was the residence of the warlike Sardanapalus and his successors down to the time of Sargon, who built a new capital, which he called by his own name, on the site occupied by the modern *Khorsabad.* This place still continued under the later kings to be a town of importance, and was especially favored by Esarhaddon, who built there one of the grandest of the Assyrian palaces. In later times Calah gave name to one of the chief districts of the country, which appears as *Calacioe* (Καλακινή, Ptolem. 6:1, 2), or *Calachek* (Καλαχηνή, 'Strabo, xvi, p. 530, 736), in the geographers. Layard *(Nineveh and its Remaiss, 2:*55) suggests that it may possibly be extant in the very extensive ruins called *Kaleh* Shergat, on the west side of the Tigris, above its junction with the Lesser Zab. But *SEE RESEN.* Less probable is the identification with *Chanlan*, the former summer residence of the caliphs in Arabia or Babylonian Irak, according to Abulfeda, five days' journey north of Bagdad (in Anville, 63° long., 34° lat.), which, according to Assemani *(Bibl. Or.* III, 2:418 sq., 753), is also called *Chalcha* (comp. Michaelis, *Suppl.* p. 767; Rosenmüller, *Alterth.* I, 2:98).

Ephraem Syrus (in loc. Gen.) understands the old Mesopotamian *Chetro* on the Tigris (Rosenmüller, *ib.* p. 120; but see Michaelis, *Spicileg.* 1:245 sq.). As it would seem to have been at some distance from Nineveh, the city of Resen lying between them, most earlier writers concur in placing it on the Great Zab (the ancient Lycus), not far from its junction with the Tigris, and Resen is placed higher up on the same river, so as to be between it and Nineveh (Bochart, *Phaleg,* 4:22). *SEE ASSYRIA.*

Calamol'alus

(Καλαμώλαλος, Vulg. *Cliomus),* given (1 Esdr. 5:22) as the name of a place whose sons" were restored after the exile; apparently a corrupt agglomeration of the names ELAM, HARIM, LOD, and HADID in the genuine text (<151231>Ezra 2:31, 32).

Calãmon.

SEE SYCAMINA.

Cal'amus

Picture for Cal'amus

occurs in three passages of the Auth. Vers. for the Hebrews hnq; *kanek'* (Sept. κάλαμος, elsewhere "reed"): <021023>Exodus 30:23, among the ingredients of the holy anointing oil; <220414>Song of Solomon 4:14, in an enumeration of sweet scents; and <262719>Ezekiel 27:19, among the articles brought to the markets of Tyre. The term designates the marsh and river reed generally, *SEE REED*; but in the places just referred to it appears to signify the *sweet flag* (κάλαμος ἀρωματικός, Dioscor. 1:17), an Oriental plant *(calamus odoratus,* Plin. 12:12, 48); of which the Linnsean name is *Acorus calamus.* No doubt the same plant is intended in <234324>Isaiah 43:24; <240620>Jeremiah 6:20, where the Auth. Vers. has *sweet cane.* In the latter text the Hebrews is b/Fhihnq; *kaneh' hat-tob'* (i.e. *good cane),* and in <021023>Exodus 30:23, µçb hnq; *kaneh' bo'sem* (i.e. *odoriferous cane).* "A scented cane is said to have been found in a valley of Mount Lebanon (Polyb. 5:46; Strab. 16:4). The plant has a reed-like stem, which is exceedingly fragrant, like the leaves, especially when bruised. It is of a tawny color, much jointed, breaking into splinters, and having the hollow stem filled with pith like a spider's web" (Kalisch on <021023>Exodus 30:23.) The cal. amus of Scripture is probably the reed by that name sometimes

found in Europe, but usually in Asia (Thephrast. *Plantt. 9:*7; Pliny, 12:12), and especially in India and Arablia (Diod. Sic. 2:49; Pliny, 12:48). It grows in moist places in Egypt and Judaea, and in several parts of Syria, bearing from the root a knotted stalk, containing in its cavity a soft white pith. It has an agreeable aromatic smell, and when cut, dried, and powdered, it forms an ingredient in the richest perfumes (Pliny, 15:7; see Celsii *Hierob. 2:*326 sq.). The plant from which the aromaticus" of modern shops is obtained appears to be a different species *(Penny Cyclopcedia,* s.v. Acorus). *SEE CANE.*

Calãmus Sacer

(also called *pugillaris orfistula),* a tube made of gold or silver, with a larger orifice at one end than at the other, through which the consecrated wine was drawn into the mouth, the large end of the tube being inserted into the chalice. *SEE CHALICE.*

Calamy, Edmund,

an eminent English divine, was born in London A.D. 1600, and took his B.A. degree at Pembroke Hall, Cambridge, in 1619. After spending some years as chaplain to the bishop of Ely, in 1626 he was made a lecturer at Bury St. Edmund's, where he continued until the publication of bishop Wren's "Articles," and the enforcement of the order for the reading of the "Book of Sports," compelled him to protest, and to leave the diocese. He then received the living of Rochford, but in 1639, having avowed himself a Presbyterian, he was made lecturer of St. Mary's, Aldermanbury, in London, which office he filled for twenty years. In the ecclesiastical controversies of the times he bore a prominent part. He joined with Marshall, Young, Newcomen, and Spurstow in writing, under the title of *Smectymnuus,* a reply to bishop Hall's "Divine Right of Episcopacy." As a preacher Mr. Calamy was greatly admired, and listened to by persons of the first distinction during the twenty years that he officiated in St. Mary's. His celebrity was so well established by his writings, as well as by the distinguished station which he occupied among the ministers in the metropolis, that he was one of the divines appointed by the House of Lords in 1641 to devise a plan for reconciling the differences which then divided the Church in regard to ecclesiastical discipline. This led to the Savoy Conference (q.v.), at which he appeared in support of some alterations in the Liturgy, and replied to the reasons urged against them by the Episcopal

divines. As a member of the Westminster Assembly (q.v.), he earnestly opposed the execution of king Charles, and promoted the restoration of his son, who made him one of his chaplains, and offered him the see of Lichfield and Coventry, which he refused. When the Act of Uniformity was passed he resigned his preferment, but refused, like many others, to gather a congregation, preferring regularly to attend the church in which he had so long officiated. He died Oct. 29,1666, of a nervous disorder occasioned by the sight of the misery caused by the fire of London. He published *The Godly Man's Ark, Sermons* on Psalm 119:72 (Lond. 1693, 17th ed. 12mo); *The Noble-man's Pattern* (Lond. 1643, 4to), and many single sermons, etc.

Calamy, Edmund, D.D.,

grandson of the preceding, was born in London April 5, 1671. At the age of seventeen he went to the University of Utrecht, where he was placed under the tuition of the distinguished professors De Vries and Graevius. In 1691, when Principal Carstairs was sent to Holland in quest of a gentleman to fill a professor's chair in the University of Edinburgh, he applied to Calamy, and pressed him to accept the situation; but he declined the honor, though soon afterward he returned to England for the purpose of pursuing his studies in the Bodleian Library. In 1700 he began to preach among the Nonconformists, and in 1703 he took charge of a congregation in Westminster, which he held for many years. In 1703 he arranged for the press *Baxter's Life and Times,* which publication gave rise to a dispute between Calamy and Hoadley. In 1709 he was made D.D. by the universities of Edinburgh, Glasgow, and Aberdeen. After a laborious life, divided between preaching and writing, he died, June 3, 1732. Among his works are *Discourses on Inspiration* (Lond. 1710, *8vo): — Sermons on the Trinity* (Lond. 1722, 8vo): — *Defense of moderate Non-conformity* (Lond. 1703-5, 3 vols. 8vo): — *The Non-conformist's Memorial* (Lond. 1721, 2 vols. *8vo): — History of his Life and Times,* edited by Rutt (Lond. 1829, 2 vols. 8vo).

Calas, Jean,

an unfortunate merchant of Toulouse, of the Protestant religion. His son, Marc Antoine, hung himself in a fit of melancholy Oct. 13,17161. The father was seized as guilty of the murder, on the ground that his son intended to embrace Romanism the next day. No proof could be offered

against him, but the fanatical passion of the mob was roused. The corpse was honored as that of a martyr. “The clergy exerted all their influence to confirm the populace in their delusion. At Toulouse the White Penitents celebrated with great solemnity the funeral of the young man, and the Dominican monks erected a scaffold and placed upon it a skeleton, holding in one hand a wreath of palms, and in the other an abjuration of Protestantism: The family of Calas was, in consequence of the popular excitement, brought to trial for the murder, and several deluded and (most probably) some bribed witnesses appeared against them. A Catholic servantmaid, and the young man Lavaysse, were also implicated in the accusation. Calas, in his defense, insisted on his uniform kindness to all his children; reminded the court that he had not only allowed another of his sons to become a Catholic, but had also paid an annual sum for his maintenance since his conversion. He also argued from his own infirmity that he could not have prevailed over a strong young man, and referred to the well-known melancholy moods of the deceased as likely to lead to suicide; and, lastly, he pointed out the improbability that the Catholic servant-maid would assist in such a murder. But all his arguments proved unavailing, and the Parliament of Toulouse sentenced the wretched man — by a majority of eight against five — to torture and death on the wheel! With great firmness, and protestations of his innocence to the last, the old man died on the wheel, March 9,1762. His property was confiscated. His youngest son was banished for life from France, but was captured by the monks, and compelled to’ abjure Protestantism. The daughters were sent to a convent” (Chambers, s.v.). The family of the unhappy man retired to Geneva, and Voltaire subsequently undertook to defend his memory. He succeeded in drawing public attention toward the circumstances of the’ case, and a revision of the trial was granted. Fifty judges once more examined the facts, and on March 9, 1765, the Parliament of Paris declared Calas altogether innocent. Louis XV ordered the property of Calas to be restored to his family, and made to the latter a present of 30,000 livres. The investigation at last led to the *toleration edict* of Louis XVI in 1787. — Bun gener, *Priest and Huguenot,* vol. ii; Coquerel, *Histore des Fglises du Desert* (2 vols. Paris, 1841); Haag, *La France Protestante,* in, 96; Coquerel, *Jean Calas et saf mille* (Paris, 1858, 12mo).

Calasanza, Giuseppe

(Josephus a matre Dei founder of the order of the *Piarists (q.v.*), was born in Aragon in 1556. He entered holy orders in 1582, and went to Rome,

where he obtained the protection of Clement VIII, Paul V, and Gregory XV, the latter of whom, after the new order had been founded by Calasanza, named him general of it in 1622. He died in 1648, and was canonized in 1767. He is commemorated on August 27. — Fehr, *Geschichte d. Moinchsorden,* 2:51.

Calasio, Mario Di,

named from a village of that name in the Abruzzo, where he was born in 1550. He became a Franciscat, and devoted himself to Hebrew, in which he soon became so great a proficient that Pope Paul V made him D.D. and professor of Hebrew at Rome. He is best known by his *Hebrew Concordance,* which occupied him during forty years, even with the aid of other learned men. He was about to commit this work to the press, when he died, in 1620. It appeared under the title *Concordantice Sacrorum Bibliorum Hebraicce cur convenientiis ling. Arab. etSyr.* (Rome, 1621, 4 vols. fol.). Another edition was published by Romaine at London in 1747, but it is not considered so accurate as that of 1621. He is said to have died chanting the Psalms in *Hebrew. — Biog. Univ.* 6:504.

Calatrava,

Picture for Calatrava 1

Picture for calatrava 2

a military order of Spain, named from' the town of Calatrava, in New Castile. It had its origin in the following circumstances: When Alphonso, the father of Sanchez III, had taken the town of Calatrava, in 1147, from the Moors, he gave it to the Templars to defend; but when it was spread abroad in 1158 that the Arabs were about to attempt the recapture of the place, the Templars resigned it again to Sanchez, who thereupon presented it to Raymond, abbot of the Cistercian monastery of St. Mary. the Arabs, after all, did not attempt the place; but many of the warriors who had been drawn together for its defense (as well as many of the lay brethren of the convent) entered the Cistercian order, but under a habit more fit for military exercises than for those of monks, and designated as the order of Calatrava. It was approved by Pope Alexander III in 1164, and confirmed by Gregory VIII 1187. The knights at first I wore a white scapulary and hood, but in 1397 the Anti-pope Benedict XIII permitted them a secular dress, distinguished by a red cross *flenr-delis'e.* In 1486, Ferdinand and

Isabella obtained a bull from Pope Innocentius VIII, which reserved the nomination of the grand master to the pope. Adrian VI, however, annexed the grand mastership of this order to the crown of Spain. The knights made a vow of obedience. poverty, and conjugal chastity (for they were permitted to marry once), and were bound to maintain the immacilate conception of the Blessed, Virgin. As a monastic order the institution has ceased to exist, but I there are now said to be nearly eighty commanderies and priories in Spain, generally given as rewards of merit to political favorites. Since 1219 the order had also nuns, who had to prove, before being admitted, their descent from noble houses. They wore the dress of the Cistercian nuns, and their principal monastery was at Almagro. They are now likewise secularized. Helyot, *Ordres Relig.* vol. i; Landon, *Eccl. Diet.* s.v.

Cal'col

(1316 1 Chronicles 2:6). *SEE CHALCOL.*

Calcutta,

the capital of Bengal, and an episcopal see of the Church of England, on the Hboogly. The bishopric was erected in 1814, and the bishop is metropolitan of India. The incumbents have been, 1. Thomas Fanshaw Middleton, May 8,1814; 2. Reginald Heber, June 1, 1823; 3. John T. James, June 4, 1827; 4. J. Matthias Turner, May 17, 1829; 5. Daniel Wilson, April 29,1832, died 1858; who commenced the building of a cathedral church, and the foundation of a chapter; 6. George Edward Lynch Cotton, D.D., consecrated 1858; 7. Rolert Milman, February 2, 1867. Calcutta has been the center of an important system of Protestant missions, both English and American. *SEE INDIA.*

Calderon.

SEE KALDERON.

Calderwood, David,

a Scotch divine, was born in 1575, and in 1604 became minister of the parish of Crealing. When James I in 1617 sought to bring the Scottish Church into conformity with the Church of England, Calderwood was strenuous in opposition. Persecution and threats having failed to shake Calderwood, he was imprisoned, and afterward banished. He retired to

Holland, where he published *A ltare Damascenumis sen ecclesice Anglicance politia,* etc. (L. Bat. 1623, best ed. 1708, 4to), in which he enters into a full examination of the principles of the Church of England, its government, ceremonies, and connection with the state. The work made a great impression at the time, and was translated into English under the title of *The Altar of Damascus, or the Pattern of the English Hierarchy and Church obtruded upon the Church of Scotland* (1621, 12mo). A report having been spread that Calderwood was dead, a man named Patrick Scot published a pretended recantation, with the title “Calderwvood’s Recantation, directed to such in Scotland as refuse Conformity to the Ordinances of the Church” (London, 1622). Calderwood, in the mean time, had returned secretly to Scotland, where he lived some years in concealment. He collected the materials for *a History of the Kirk of Scotland,* which he left in MS., and which has been published by the *Woodrow Society* (Edinb. 1842 9, 8 vols. 8vo). From the materials of this work Calderwood wrote his *True History of the Church of Scotland from the B(g’nning of the Reformation unto the End of the Reign of James VI* (1678, fol.). He died about 1650.

Caldron,

Picture for Caldron

prop. a large cooking vessel, is the rendering in certain passages of the Auth. Vers. for the following words:

1. ˆ/mgæ}ai, *agmon`* (<184120>Job 41:20 [12]), a heated *kettle,* others a burning *reed* (“rush” else-where);

2. dWD, *dud* (<143513>2 Chronicles 35:13; “pot,” <184120>Job 41:20 [12]; <198106>Psalm 81:6; “kettle,” <090214>1 Samuel 2:14), a large *boiler* (also a “basket”);

3. rysæ, *sir* (<245218>Jeremiah 52:18, 19; <261103>Ezekiel 11:3, 7, 11, elsewhere “pot”), the most general term for a kettle or basin (also a “thorn”);

4. tjiLqi, *kallach’ath* (<090214>1 Samuel 2:14; <330303>Micah 3:3), a pan or pot (so called from *pouring) ;*

5. λέβης (2 Macc. 7:3), a *kettle, in* this case a large caldron for torture. Metallic vessels of this description have been obtained from the ruins of Egypt, and still more lately two copper caldrons were discovered by Mr.

Layard among the excavations at Nimroud *(Nin!, and Bab.* p. 149 sq.), about 21 feet in diameter, and 3 feet deep, resting upon a stand of brick work, with their mouths closed by large tiles, and containing a variety of smaller bronze objects. *SEE POT.*

Caldwell, David, D.D.,

a Presbyterian minister, was born in Lancaster county, Pa., March 22, 1725, graduated at Princeton in 1761, and was licensed to preach by the New Brunswick Presbytery in 1763. Being ordained in 1765, he became pastor of the congregations of Buffalo and Alamance, N. C., in 1768. In 1776 he was a member of the Convention which formed the State Constitution, and some years later he declined the offer of the presidency of the University of North Carolina, by which institution he was made D.D. in 1810. He died Aug. 25, 1824, in his 100th year. — Sprague, *Annals,* in, 263.

Caldwell, James,

a Presbyterian minister, was born -in Charlotte county, Va., 1734, graduated at Princeton in 1759, and in 1761 was ordained pastor of ‘the Presbyterian church of Elizabethtown, N. J. At the Revolution he entered with spirit into the controversy, and was soon branded as a rebel; and on the formation of the Jersey brigade; he was at once selected as its chaplain. Throughout the war he suffered severely; toward the close of it, his church was burnt and his wife murdered by the enemy. The people reposed great confidence in him, and his labors, counsels, and exhortations were of great assistance to the cause he had espoused. This honored patriot was killed in 1781, at Eliiabethport, by a drunken soldier named Morgan, who was tried, convicted, and hung upon the charge of murder. Caldwell was a man of unwearied activity and of wonderful powers of endurance. As a preacher he was uncommonly eloquent and pathetic. — Sprague, *Annals,* 3:222.

Caldwell, Joseph, D.D.,

a Presbyterian minister, the author of a *System of Geometry* and a *Treatise of Plane Trigonometry,* was born in Lamington, N. J., April 21, 1773, graduated at Princeton 1791, and became Professor of Mathematics at the University of North Carolina in 1796, in which same year he was licensed as a Presbyterian minister. From 1804 till his death, Jan, 24, 1835, with an intermission of five years, he was President of the University, and to his

exertions it owes the respectable position which it now occupies. — Sprague, *Annals,* 4:173.

Caldwell, Merritt, A.M.,

Professor of Metaphysics, was born in Hebron, Me., November 29, 1806. His early education, both religious and academical, was very carefully conducted, and he graduated with honor at Bowdoin, College in 1828. In the same year he became principal of the Maine Wesleyan Seminary, Readfield. In 1834 he was elected Professor of Mathematics and Vice-president of Dickinson College, Pa. In 1837 he was transferred to the ‘chair of Metaphysics and English Literature, which he occupied during the rest of his life. He soon became known as a strong thinker and excellent writer by his elaborate contributions to the *Methodist Quarterly Review.:* Nor did his devotion to literature prevent him from taking an interest in the moral questions of the times; and in the cause of temperance especially his labors were abundant and even excessive. In 1846 he visited England as a delegate to the “World’s Convention,” which formed the “Evangelical Alliance,” and took an active part in its proceedings. His health, which had previously been impaired, was apparently improved by his European tour, but in 1847 it failed again, and he died June 6; 1848. Professor Caldwell was a man of uncommonly firm and masculine character. As a professor and college officer he had few superiors; as a writer, he was always clear, logical, and forcible. Many of his contributions to the periodical press were of rare excellence. He also published *Manual of Elocution, including Voice and Gesture* (Phila. 1846, 12mo, often reprinted), perhaps the best hand-book of the subject extant*:* — *Philosophy of Christian Perfection* (Phila. 1847, 18mo), “a model of clear thinking and forcible expression*:”* — *Christianity tested by eminent Men* (N. Y. 1852, 18mo): — The *Doctrine of the English Verb* (1837, *12mo). — Methodist Quarterly Review,* 1852, p. 574.

Caldwell, Zenas,

brother of Merritt, was born in Hebron, Oxford county, Me., on the 31st of March, 1800, graduated at Bowdoin College in 1824, and soon after leaving college took charge of the Academy of Hallowell. In 1825 he was licensed as a local preacher, and for most of the time of his connection with the Hallowell Academy he supplied the Methodist congregation in Winthrop. In the same year he was unanimously elected principal of the

new Methodist Seminary at Kent's Hill, Readfield, Me., and proved himself abundantly adequate to any service that devolved upon him. But his whole work was to be performed within six months; his lungs became seriously affected, and he died triumphantly on Dec. 26, 1826. In 1855 a small duodecimo volume by the Rev. S. M. Vail, D.D., was published, containing a memoir and several of his productions, in prose and poetry. — Sprague, *Annals*, 7:699 sq.

Ca'leb

(Hebrews *Kalel'*, b l K; appar. for b l K, a *dog)*, the name of two or three men. *SEE CALEB-EPHRATAH*; *SEE NEGEB-CALEB.*

1. (Sept. Χαλέβ.) The last-named of the three sons of Hezron, Judah's grandson (<130209>1 Chronicles 2:9, where he is called CHELUBAI). His three sons by his first wife, Azubah or Jerioth (q.v.), are enumerated (<130218>1 Chronicles 2:18); he had also another son, Hur, by a later wife, Ephrath (<130219>1 Chronicles 2:19; perhaps only the oldest of several, <130250>1 Chronicles 2:50); besides whom another (his "first-born") is named (<130242>1 Chronicles 2:42, by what wife is uncertain), in addition to several by his concubines Ephah and Maachah (<130246>1 Chronicles 2:46, 48). B.C. post 1856. The text is possibly corrupt, however, in some of these distinctions.

2. (Sept. Χαλέβ.) A "son of Hur, the first-born of Ephratah" above named (and therefore the grandson of the preceding), according to <130250>1 Chronicles 2:50, where his sons are enumerated. B.C. ante 1658. Some, however, have identified him with the foregoing, supposing a corruption in the text.

3. (Sept. Χάλεβ, but Χαλέβ in <130249>1 Chronicles 2:49; Ecclus. 46:9; 1 Macc. 2:56; v.r. Χαλούβ in <093014>1 Samuel 30:14; Josephus Χάλεβος, *Ant.* in, 14,4, etc.) Usually called "the son of Jephunneh" (<041306>Numbers 13:6, and elsewhere, *SEE JEPHUNNEH*), sometimes with the addition "the Kenezite" (<043212>Numbers 32:12; <061406>Joshua 14:6, 14), from which some have hastily inferred that he may have been a foreigner, and *onlyproselyted* to Judaism. *SEE KENAZ.* Caleb is first mentioned in the list of the rulers or princes (aycæ;), called in the next verse (µyvær) "heads," one from each tribe, who were sent to search the land of Canaan in the second year of the Exode (B.C. 1657), where it may be noted that these officers are all different from those named in Numbers

1, 2, 7, 10, as at that time phylarchs of the tribes. Caleb was one of these family chieftains in the tribe of Judah, perhaps as chief of the family of the Hezronites, at the same time that Nahshon, the son of Amminadab, was prince of the whole tribe. He and Oshea or Joshua, the son of Nun, were the only two of the whole number who, on their return from Canaan to Kadesh-Barnea, encouraged the people to enter in boldly to the land, and take possession of it, for which act of faithfulness they narrowly escaped stoning at the hands of the infuriated people. In the plague that ensued, while the other ten spies perished, Caleb and Joshua alone were spared. Moreover, while it was announced to the congregation by Moses that, for this rebellious murmurinr, all that had been numbered from twenty years old and upward, except Joshua and Caleb, should perish in the wilderness, a special promise was made to the latter that he should survive to enter into the land which he had trodden upon, and that his seed should possess it. Accordingly, forty-five years afterward (B.C. 1612), when some progress had been made in the conquest of the land, Caleb came to Joshua and reminded him of what had happened at Kadesh, and of the promise which Moses made to him with an oath. He added that though he was now eighty-five years old (hence he was born B.C. 1698), he was as strong as in the day when Moses sent him to spy out the land, and he claimed possession of the land of the Anakim, Kirjath-Arba, or Hebron, and the neighboring hill-country (Joshua xiv). This was immediately granted to him, and the following chapter relates that he took possession of Hebron, driving out the three sons of Anak; that he offered Achsah, his daughter, in marriage (comp. <09175>1 Samuel 17:25; Hygin. *Fab.* 67) to whoever would take Kirjath-Sepher, i.e. Debir; and that when Othniel, his younger brother, had performed the feat, he not only gave him his daughter to wife, but with her the upper and nether springs of water which she asked for. After this we hear no more of Caleb, nor is the time of his death recorded. But we learn from <06213>Joshua 21:13, that, in the distribution of cities, out of the different tribes for the priests and Levites to dwell in, Hebron fell to the priests, the children of Aaron, of the family of the Kohathites, and was also a city of refuge, while the surrounding territory continued to be the possession of Caleb, at least as late as the time of David (<09253>1 Samuel 25:3), being still called by his name (<09014>1 Samuel 30:14). His descendants are called *Calebites* (wBalke; for yBalke; *Kalibbi'*, <09253>1 Samuel 25:3; Sept. translates as if a paronomasia were intended,

κυνικός, Auth. Vers. — house of Caleb”). His name seems to be inserted in <130249>1 Chronicles 2:49, by way of distinction from the others in the same list. See Ewald, *Isr. Gesch.* 2:288 sq.

Ca’leb-Eph’ratah,

a name occurring only in the present text of <130224>1 Chronicles 2:24, as that of a place where Hezron died (h t ;r p]a, b l ek;B], *be-Kaleb’ Ephra’thah, in Caleb to Ephrath).* But no such place is elsewhere referred to, and the composition of the name is a most ungrammatical one. Again, neither Hezron or his son could well have given any name to a place in Egypt, the land of their bondage, nor did Hezron probably die, or his son live, elsewhere than in Egypt. The present text therefore seems to be corrupt, and the reading which the Sept. and Vulg. suggest (ηλθεν Χαλὲβ εἰς Ἐφραθά, *ingressus est Caleb ad Ephratha)* is probably the true one, h t ;r p]a, b l ek;aB; meaning either “Caleb came to Ephrath,” i.e. BethlehemEphratah), or, still better, “Caleb came in unto Ephrah.” The whole information given seems to be that Hezron had two wives, the first, whose name is not given, the mother of Jerahmeel, Ram, and Caleb or Chelubai; the second, Abiah, the daughter of Machir, whom he married when sixty years old, and who bare him Segub and Ashur. Also that Caleb had two wives, Azubah, the first, apparently the same as Jerioth, and Ephrah, the second, the mother of Hur; and that this second marriage of Caleb did not take place till after Hezron’s death. *SEE NEGEB-CALEB.*

Calendar, Jewish.

1. *Hebrew Lunar Calendar, of Feasts and Fasts.* — The year of the Hebrews is composed of twelve (and occasionally of thirteen) lunar months, of thirty and twenty-nine days alternately. The year begins in autumn as to the civil year, and in the spring as to the sacred year. The Jews had calendars anciently wherein were noted all the feasts, all the fasts, and all the days on which they celebrated the memory of any great event that had happened to the nation (<380819>Zechariah 8:19; <170806>Esther 8:6, in Graec.). These ancient calendars are sometimes quoted in the Talmud (Mishna, *Taanith,* 8), but the rabbins acknowledge that they are not now in being (see Maimonides and Bartenora, in loc.). Those that we have now, whether printed or in manuscript, are not very ancient (see Genebrar. *Bibliot. Rabinic.* p. 319; Buxtorf, *Levit. Talmnud.* p. 1046; Bartolocci, *Bibl. Rabbinic. 2:*550; Lamy’s *Introduction to the Scripture;* and Plantav.

Isagog. Rabbin. ad fin.). That which passes for the oldest is *Megillath Taanith*, "the volume of affliction," which contains the days of feasting and fasting heretofore in use among the Jews, which are not now observed, nor are they in the common calendars. We here insert the chief historical events, taken as well from this volume, *Taanith*, as from other calendars. The Jewish months, however, have been placed one lunation later than the rabbinical comparison of them with the modern or Julian months, in accordance with the conclusions of J. D. Michaelis, in his treatise published by the Royal Soc. of Gottingen. *SEE MONTH*. For the details, compare each month in its alphabetical place. See also *Critica Biblica*, vol. iv, and the following formal treatises: Clauder, *De forma anni lMosaico-prophetica* (Viteb. 1716); Dresde, *Annus Judaicus* (Lips. 1766); Fischer, *De anno HFebrceor.* (Viteb. 1710); Felseisen, *De civili Judxorum die* (Lips. 1702); Klausing, *Deforma anni patriarcharun* (Viteb. 1716); Roschel, *id.* (Viteb. 1692); Lanshausen, *De mense vett. Hebrews lunari* (Jen. 1713); Lund, *De mensibus Hebrceor.* (Abose, 1694); Nagel, *De Calendario vett. Hebrceor.* (Altorf, 1746); Selden, *De anno civili Hebrceor.* (Lond. 1644); Sommel, *De anno Hebrceor. eccles. et civ.* (Lund. 1748); Strauch, *De anno Hebrceor. ecclesiastico* (Viteb. 1655); Von Gumpach, *Ueber den alt. Jidisch. Kalender* (Briissel, 1848). *SEE TIME.*

ABIB OR NISAN.

The first month of the sacred year, the seventh month of the civil year; it has thirty days, and ancestors generally to the moon of MARCH *and* APRIL.

Day 1. — New moon; a fast for the death of the sons of Aaron (Leviticus 10:1, 2).

10. — A fast for the death of Miriam, sister of Moses (Numbers 20:1); also in memory of the scarcity of water that happened, after her death, to the children of Israel in the desert of Kadesh (Numbers 20:2).

On this day every one provided himself a lamb or a kid, preparatory to the following Passover.

14. — On the evening of this day they killed the paschal lamb; they began to use unleavened bread, and ceased from all servile labor.

15. — The solemnity of the Passover, with its octave; the first day of unleavened bread, a dry of rest; they ate none but unleavened bread during eight days.

After sunset they gathered a sheaf of barley, which they brought into the Temple *(Menachot. 6:*3).

Supplication for the reign of the spring (Geneb.).

16. On the second day of the feast they offered the barley which they had provided the evening before, as the first-fruits of the harvest; after that time it was allowed to put the sickle to the corn.

The beginning of harvest.

From this day they began to count fifty days to Pentecost. *SEE PENTECOST.*

21. — The octave of the feast of the Passover; the end of unleavened bread. This day is held more solemn than ‘the other days of the octave, yet they did not refrain from manual labor on it.

26. — A fast for the death of Joshua (Joshua 24:29).

30. — Alternate of the first new moon of the succeeding month.

The book called *Mregillath Ta-nith* does not notice any particular festival for the month Nisan.

ZIF OR IJAR.

The second ecciesiastica, or eighth civil month, contains twenty-nine days; corresponds to the moon of APRIL *or* MAY.

Day 1. — New moon.

6. — A fast of three days for excesses committed during the feast of the Passover; that is, on the Monday, Thursday, and the Monday following *(Calendar* Barto locci).

7. — The dedication of the Temple, when the Asmonaeans consecrated it anew, after the persecutions of the Greeks *(Meqill. Taanith,* 100:2).

10. — A fast for the death of the high-priest Eli, and for the capture of the ark by the Philistines.

14. — The second Passover, in favor of those who could not celebrate the first, on the 15th of the foregoing month.

23. — A feast for the taking of the city of Gaza by Simon Maccabseus *(Calend.* Scalig.; 1 Macc. 13:43, 44); or for the taking and purification of the citadel of Jerusalem by the Maccabees *(Calendar* of Sigonius; 1 Macc. 13:49, 53; 16:7, 36); a feast for the expulsion of the Caraites out of Jerusalem by the Asmonseans or Macca bees *(leg. Taanith; SEE TEBETH* 28).

27. — A feast for the expulsion of the Galilseans, or those who attempted to set up crowns over the gates of their temples and of their houses, and even on the heads of their oxen and asses, and to sing hymns in honor of false gods. The Maccabees drove them out of Judea and Jerusalem, and appointed this feast to perpetuate the memory of their expulsion *(Megill. Taanith).*

28. — A fast for the death of the prophet Samuel (1 Samuel 25:1).

SIVAN.

The third sacred, or ninth civil month; thirty days; the moon of MAY *or* JUNE.

Day 1. —New moon.

6. — Pentecost, the fiftieth day after the Passover — called also the Feast of Weeks, because it happened seven weeks after the Passover. We do not find that it had any octave. But *SEE SABBATH.*

15, 16. — A feast to celebrate the victory of the Maccabees over the people of Bethsan (1 Macc. 5:52; 12:40, 41; *Megill. Taanitm).*

17. — A feast for the taking of Cesarea by theAsmonseans, who drove the pagans from thence, and settled the Jews there *(Megill. Taanith).*

22. — A fast in memory of the prohibition by Jeroboam, son of Nebat, to his subjects, forbidding them to carry their first-fruits to Jerusalem (1 Kings 12:27).

25. — A fast in commemoration of the death of the rabbins Simeori, son of Gamaliel; Ishmael, son of Elisha; and Chanina, the high-priest’s deputy.

A feast in honor of the solemn judgment pronounced in favor of the Jews by Alexander the Great against the Ishmaelites, who, by virtue of their birthright, maintain a possession of the land of Canaan; against the Canaanites, who claimed the same as being the original possessors; and against the Egyptians, who demanded restitution of the vessels and other things borrowed by the Hebrews when they left Egypt (see *Mlegillath Taanith);* but the Gemara of Babylon *(Sanhedrzim* c. 11) puts the day of this sentence on Nisan 14, *SEE CHISLEU,* 21.

27. — A fast, because Rabbi Chanina, the son of Thardion, was burnt with the book of the law.

30. — Alternate of the first new moon of the following month.

TAMMUZ.

The fourth sacred, tenth civil month; twenty-nine days; moon of JUNE *or* JULY.

Day 1. — New moon.

14. — A feast for the abolition of a perniciols book of the Sadducees and Bethusians, by which they endeavored to subvert the oral law and all the traditions *(Megill. Taanith).*

17. — A fast in memory of the tables of the law broken by Moses (Exodus 32:19).

On this day the city of Jerusalem was taken; the perpetual evening and morning sacrifice was suspended during the siege of Jerusalem by Titus. Epistemon tore the book of the law, and set up an idol in the Temple; it is not said whether this happened under Nebuchadnezzar, Antiochus Epiphanes, or the Romans.

AB.

The fifth sacred, eleventh civil month; thirty days; moon of JULY *or* AUGUST.

Day 1. — New moon; a fast for the death of Aaron, the high priest.

5. — A commemoration of the children of Jethuel, of the race of Judah, who, after the return from the captivity, furnished wood to the temple *(Megill. Taanith).*

9. — A fast of the fifth month in memory of God's declaration to Moses, on this day, that none of the murmuring Israelites should enter the land of promise (<04429>Numbers 14:29, 31).

On the same day the Temple was taken and burnt: Solomon's Temple first by the Chaldaeans; Herod's Tem ple afterward by the Romans.

18. — A fast, because in the time of Ahaz the evening lamp went out.

21. — Xylophoria; a feast on which they stored up the necessary wood in the Temple (Selden; see Josephus, *Wir, 2:*17). Scaliger places this festival on the 22d of the next month.

24. — A feast in memory of the abolition of a law by the Asmonseans, or Maccabees, which had been introduced by the Sadducees, enacting that both sons and daughters should alike inherit the estates of their parents *(MeOill. Tmnitlh).*

30. — Alternate of the first new moon of the following month

ELUL.

The sixth slaced, twelfth civil month; twentynine days; tnoon of AUGUST or SEPTEMBER.

Day 1. — New moon.

7. — Dedication of the walls of Jerusalem by Nehemiah (Ezra 12:27). We read in <16615>Nehemiah 6:15, that these walls were finished Elul 25; but as there still remained many things to be done to complete this work, the dedication might have been deferred to the Tth of Elul of the year following *(AMefill. Taanith;* Seld.).

17. — A fast for the death of the spies who brought an ill report of the land of promise (<04436>Numbers 14:36).

A feast in remembrance of the expulsion of the Romans [rather the Greeks], who would have prevented the Hebrews from marrying, and who dishonored the daughters of Israel. When they intended to use violence toward Judith, the only daughter of Mattathias, he, with the assistance of

his sons, overcame them, and delivered his country from their yoke; in commemoration of which deliverance this festival was appointed.

21. — Xylophoria a feast in which they brought to the Temple the necessary provision of wood for keeping up the fire of the altar of burnt-sacrifices. The calendar of Scaliger places this feast on the 22d (see the 21st of the foregoing month).

22. — A feast in memory of the punishment inflicted on the wicked Israelites, whose insolence could not be otherwise restrained than by putting them to death; for then Judaea was in the possession of the Gentiles. They allowed these wicked Israelites three days to reform; but as they showed no signs of repentance, they were condemned to death *(Megill. Taanith).*

[From the beginning to the end of this month, the cornet is sounded to warn of the approaching new civil year.] *SEE YEAR.*

ETHANIM OR TISRI.

The seventh sacred, first civil month; thirty days; mloon of SEPTEMBER *or* OCTOBER.

Day 1. — New moon. Beginning of the civil year.

The Feast of Trumpets (Leviticus 23:24; Numbers 29:1, 2).

8. — Fast for the death of Gedaliah (2 Kings 25:25; Jeremiah 41:2).

The same day, the abolition of written contracts. The wicked kings having forbidden the Israelites to pronounce the name of God, when they were restored to liberty the Asmonmeans or Maccabees ordained that the name of God should be written in contracts after this manner: “In such a year of the high-priest N., who is minister of the most high God,” etc. The judges to whom these writings were presented decreed they should be satisfied, saying, for example, “On such a day, such a debtor shall pay such a sum, according to his promise, after which the schedule shall be torn.” But it was found that the name of God was taken away out of the writing, and thus the whole became useless and ineffectual; for which reason they abolished all these written contracts, and appointed a festival day in memory of it *(Megill. Taanith,* 100:7).

5. — The death of twenty Israelites. Rabbi Akiba, son of Joseph, dies in prison.

7. — A fast on account of the worshipping the golden calf, and of the sentence God pronounced against Israel in consequence of that crime (<02316>Exodus 32:6-8, 34).

10. — A fast of expiation (<03239>Leviticus 23:19, etc.).

15. — The Feast of Tabernacles, with its octave (<03234>Leviticus 23:34).

21. — Hosanna-Rabba. The seventh day of the Feast of Tabernacles, or the Feast of Pranches.

22. — The octave of the Feast of Tabernacles.

23. — The rejoicing for the law; a solemnity in memory of the covenant that the Lord made with the Hebrews in giving them the law by the mediation of Moses. On this same day, the dedication of Solomon's Tem ple (<11065>1 Kings 8:65; 66).

30. — Alternate of the first new moon of thefollowing month.

MARCHESVAN OR BUL.

The eighth sacred, second civil month; twenty-nine days; moon of OCTOBER *or* NOVEMBER.

Day 1. — The new moon, or first day of the month.

6, 7. — A fast, because Nebuchadnezzar put out the eyes of Zedekiah, after he had slain his children before his face (<12507>2 Kings 25:7; <24510>Jeremiah 52:10).

19. — A fast on Monday and Tuesday [Thursday?], and the Monday following, to expiate faults committed on occasion of the Feast of Tabernacles *(Calendar,* ed. Barto locci).

23. — A feast or memorial of the stones of the altar, profaned by the Greeks, which were laid aside in expectation of a prophet who could declare to what use they might be applied (1 Macc. 4:46; *Mcgill. Taan.* 100:8).

26. — A feast in memory of some places possessed by the Cuthites, which the Israelites recovered at their return from the captivity.

A dispute of Rabbin Jochanan, son of Zachai, against the Sadducees, who pretended that the Toaves of the first-fruits (<03237>Leviticus 23:17, 18) were not to be offered on the altar, but to be eaten hot *(Mcgill. Taan.* 100:9).

CHISLEU.

The ninth sacred, third civil month; thirty days; amon of NOVEMBER *or* DECEMBER.

Day 1. — New moon, or the first day of the month.

3. — A feast in memory of the idols which the Asmonaeans threw out of the courts, where the Gentiles had placed them *(Megill. Talanith).*

6. — A fast in memory of the book of Jeremiah, torn and burnt by Jehoiakim (<24623>Jeremiah 36:23).

7. — A feast in memory of the death of Herod the Great, son of Antipater, who was always an enemy to the sages *(Megili. Taan.* 100:11).

21. — The feast of Mount Gerizim. The Jews relate that when their high-priest Simon, with his priests, went out to meet Alexander the Great, the Cutheans or Samaritans went also, and desired this prince to give them the Temple: of Jerusalem, and to sell them a part of Mount Moriah, which request Alexander granted. But the high-priest of the Jews afterward presenting himself, and Alexander asking him what he desired, Simon entreated him not to suffer the Samaritans to destroy the Temple. The king replied to him that he delivered that people into his hands, and he might do what he pleased with them. Then the high-priest and inhabitants of Jerusalem took the Samaritans, bored a hole through their heels, and, tying them to their horses' tails, dragged them along to Mount Gerizim, which they ploughed and sowed with tares, just as the Samaritans had intended to do to the Temple of Jerusalem. In memory of this event they instituted this festival (comp. SIVAN 25).

24. — Prayers for rain *(Calendar* Bartolocci).

25. — The dedication or renewing of the Temple, profaned by order of Antiochus Epiphanes, and purified by Judas Maccabseus (1 Macc. 4:52; 2 Mmfcc. 2:16; <43022>John 10:22). This feast is kept with its octave. Josephus

says that in his time it was called the Feast of Lights; perhaps, he says, because this good fortune of restoring the Temple to its ancient use appeared to the Jews as a new day *(Aif.*12:11). But the Jewish authors give another reason for the name of lights. They report that when they were employed in cleansing the Temple, after it had been profaned by the Greeks, they found there only one small phial of oil, sealed up by the high. priest, which would hardly suffice to keep in the lamps so much as one night; but God permitted that it should last several days, till they had time to make more, in memory of which the Jews lighted up several lamps in their synagogues and at the doors of their houses. (See Selden, *De Si'ned.* lib. in, cap. 13.) Others affirm (as the *Acholatical History,* also Thomas Aquinas and Cardinal Hugo, on 1 Macc. 4:52) that the appellation of the Feast of Lights was a memorial of that the from heaven which inflamed the wood on the altar of burnt-offerings, as related in 2 Macc. 1:22.

Some think this feast of the dedication was instituted in memory of Judith. (See Sigon. *De Reputbl. Hebr.* lib. in, cap. 18.) But it is doubted whether this ought to be understood of Judith, daughter of Merari, who killed Holofernes, or of another Judith, daughter of Mattathias, and sister of Judas Maccabseus, who slew Nicanor, as they tell us. (See Ganz, *Zemach Dai'd;* Millenar. 4, an. 622, et apud Selden, *De Synedriis,* lib. in, cap. 13, n. 11.) This last Judith is known only in the writings of the rabbins, and is not mentioned either in the Maccabees or in Josephus. But there is great likelihood that the Jews have altered the Greek history of Judith to place it in the time of Judas Maccabaeus. A prayer for rain. Time of sowing begins in Judaea.

30. — Alternate of the new moon of the following month.

TEBETH.

The tenth sacred, fourth civil month; twenty-nine days; moon of DECEMBER *or* JANUARY.

Day 1. — New moon.

8. — A fast, because of the translation of the law out of Hebrew into Greek. This day and the three following days were overcast by thick darkness.

The fast of the tenth month *(Calend.* Bartolocci).

9. — A fast for which the rabbins assign no reason.

10. — A fast in memory of the siege of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar (2 Kings 25:1).

28. — A feast in memory of the exclusion of the Sadducees out of the Sanhedrim, where they had all the power in the time of King Alexander Jannasus. Rabbi Simeon, son of Shatach, found means of excluding them one after another, and of substituting Pharisees *(Megillath Taanith). SEE IJAR* 23.

SHEBAT.

The eleventh sacred, fifth civil month; thirty days; moon of JANUARY *or* FEBRUARY.

Day 1. — New moon, or the first day of the month.

2. — A rejoicing for the death of King Alexander Jannea us, a great enemy to the Pharisees *(Mleill. Tasnith).*

4 or 5. — A fast in memory of the death of the elders who succeeded Joshua (Judges 2:10).

15. — The beginning of the year of trees; that is, from hence they begin to count the four years during which trees were judged unclean, from the time of their being planted (Leviticus 19:23-25). Some place the beginning of these four years on the first day of the month.

22. — A feast in memory of the death of one called Niscalenus, who had ordered the placing images or figures in tie Temple, which was forbidden by the law; but he died, and his orders were not executed. The Jews place this under the high-priest Simon the Just. It is not known who this Niscalenus was *(Megill. Taan.* 100:11).

23. — A fast for the war of the ten tribes against that of Benjamin (Judges 20).

They also call to remembrance the idol of Micah (Judges 18).

29. — A memorial of the death of Antiochus Epiphanes, an enemy of the Jews (1 Macc. 6:1; *Megiil. Taanith).*

30. — Alternate new moon of the next month.

ADAR.

The twelfth sacred, sixth civil month: *twenty-nine days; months of* FEBRUARY or MARCH.

Day 1. — New moon.

7. — A fast, because of the death of Moses (Deuteronomy 34:5).

8, 9. — The trumpet sounded by way of thanksgiving for the rain that fell in this month, and to pray for it in future *(Megillath Tal'raith).* A fast in memory of the schism between the schools of Shammai and Hillel [called Taanith Tsadehim].

12. — A feast in memory of the death of two proselytes, Hollianius and Pipus his brother, whom one Tyrinus or Turianus would have compelled to break the law, in the city of Laodicea; but they chose rather to die than to act contrary to the law (Selden, *De Synedr*. lib. 3, cap. 13, ex *Megfil!. lT-anith).*

13. — Esther's fast; probably in memory of that of Esther 4:16 (Geneb. and Bartolocci);

A feast in memory of the death of Nicanor, an enemy of the Jews (1 Macc. 7:44; 2 Macc. 15:30, etc.). Some of the Hebrews insist that Nicanor was killed by Judith, sister of Judas Maccabseus.

14. — The first Purim, or lesser Feast of Lots (Esther 9:21). The Jews in the provinces ceased from the slaughter of their enemies on Nisan 14, and on that day made great rejoicing; but tie Jews of Shushan continued the slaughter till the 15th; therefore Mordecai settled the Feast of Lots on the 14th and 15th of this month.

15. — The great Feast of Pulrin or Lots; the second Purim. These three days, the 13th 14th, and 15th, are commonly called the days of Mordecai, though the feast for the death of Nicanor has no relation either to Esther or to Mordecai.

The collectors of the half shekel, paid by every Israelite (Exodus 30:13), received it on Adar 15 in the cities, and on the 25th in the Temple (Talmud, *Shekmlim).*

17. — The deliverance of the sages of Israel, who, flying from the persecution of Alexander Jannseus, king of the Jews, retired into the city of

Koslik in Arabia; but, finding themselves in danger of being sacrificed by the Gentiles, the inhabitants of the place, they escaped by night *(Mcgill. Taanith).*

20. — A feast in memory of the rain obtained from God by one called Onias Ham-magel, during a great drought in the time of Alexander Janneaes *(Meill. Taanith).*

23. — The dedication of the temple of Zerubbabel (1866Ezra 6:16). The day is not known, so some put it on the 16th; the *Calmndar* of Sigonius puts it on the 23d.

28. — A feast in commemoration of the repeal of the decree by which the kings of Greece had forbidden the Jews to circumcise their children, to observe the Sabbath, and to decline foreign worship *(Megill. Taznith,* et Gemar. *Taanith,* 100:2). — Calmet, *Append.*

VEADAR.

INTERCALARY MONTH.

When the year consit' of thirteen lunar months, they place here, by way of intercalation, the second month of Adar, or Ve-Adar. SEE YEAR.

II. *Modern Julian Calendar of the Temperature and Agricultural Products of Palestinefor each Month of the Year.* — These were first carefully collected by J. G. Buhle, in a prize essay presented to the Royal Society of Gottingen, printed in Latin among their transactions under the title *Calendarium Palestince (Economicum* (1785), and translated at large by Mr. Taylor in the *Fragments* added to his edition of Calmet's *Dictionary* (in, 693 sq.), of which the subjoined synopsis is an abridgment. Much valuable information, similarly obtained from Oriental itineraries, combined with personal observation, may be touna in Kitto's *Phys. Hist. of Palest.* vol. 2, ch. 7 *SEE PALESTINE.*

JANUARY.

Weather. — According to the seasons (q.v.) as divided among the Hebrews, this month is 'the second in winter, and the cold is more or less severe in different situations. There is frequently a considerable fall of snow. which, however, is speedily dissolved in most places. In the plain of Jericho the cold is little felt (Josephus, *tar,* 5:4). Heavy rains now fall,

especially in the night, which swell the rivers and lakes. Early in the day the thermometer is generally between 40° and 46°, and it does not rise above 3° or 4° in the afternoon. Toward the latter end of this month, when the sky is clear, it becomes so hot that travelers cannot, without some difficulty, prosecute their journey. The wind is generally north or east.

Productions. — All kinds of grain or corn are now sown. The beans are in blossom, and trees in leaf. Earliest appears the blossom of the almond here, even before it has leaves. If the winter he mild, the violet fig (of a longer shape than the summer fig, and gathered early in the spring) is still found on the trees, though they are stripped of their leaves. The mistletoe and the cotton-tree now flourish. Among the flowers and garden herbs of this month, the cauliflower, the blue and the white hyacinth, the gold-streaked daffodil, different violets, tulips in great variety, wormwood, the lentisc-tree, anemones, ranunculusses, and colchicas, a kind of lily resembling the Persian when blown.

FEBRUARY.

Weather. — This is much the same as during the last month, except that toward the close, in southerly parts, the snow and rain begin to cease. Like the other features of the rainy season, this month is chiefly remarkable for heavy showers of rain and sometimes falls of snow. The sky is frequently covered with clear light clouds; the atmosphere becomes warm; the wind continuing north or east, but latterly changing westward. During the first 14 days the mercury usually stands between 42° and 47°.

Productions. — The latter crops are now appearing above ground, and a delightful verdure begins to be seen on every side. Barley continues to be sown till the middle of the month; beans acquire a husk, and are soon fit for use; cauliflowers and parsnips are now gathered; the peach and early apple tree are blossoming, and a great variety of herbs are in flower, which, says a traveler, “render these parts so delightful that the beholder is often charmed and transported at the sight” (see Thomson’s *Travels,* 1:137).

MARCH.

Weather. — In Palestine this month is the forerunner of spring, but rains, with thunder and hail, are not yet over (Pococke’s *Travel., 2:*11). The weather is generally warm and temperate, except on the mountains, and sometimes extremely hot, especially in the plain of Jericho (Thomson’s *Travels, 2:*27). In the middle of the month, the mercury stands at 52°, and

nearer the close between 56° and 58° (Russel, *A leppo*, p. 149,150). Toward the end, the rivers are much swollen by rain and the thawing of snow upon the tops of mountains (Egmont and Heyman's *Travels, 1:*335). Earthquakes sometimes take place, and they are accounted for by Shaw in his *Travele*, p. 136.

Productions. — While the wheat is scarcely in ear, the barley is now ripe in Jericho (Shaw's *Travels*, p. 290, 291). Indian wheat, rice, and corn of Damascus are now sown in Lower Egypt (Thomson's *Travels, 2:*169). Several kinds of pulse, as beans, lentils, and chick-pease, become ripe *(Itiner.* B. Tudel. p. 103). Every tree is at this time in full leaf (Russel's *A leppo*, p. 10). The fig, the palm, etc., together with many shrubs and herbs, are now in blossom. The Jericho plum begins to ripen. The vine, having yielded its first clusters, is pruned. Various aromatic garden herbs are becoming fit for use.

APRIL.

Weather. — The "latter rains; (ὑετὸς ὄψιμοι) now fall, as Korte asserts *(Reise nach deim gelobten Lande,* p. 489)? and Shaw affirms that none are observed after them until summer *(Travels*, p. 290). The rain ceases about the close of the month, and the sky generally becomes serene. The sun's heat is excessive in the plains of Jericho, but in other parts of Judaea the spring is now most delightful (Maundrell's *Jour.* p. 96). Concerning the meteorology of Palestine, some interesting observations are made by Mariti *(Viaggi*, in, 226) and Dr. Shaw *(Travels*, p. 289). The mercury advances from 60° to 66°.

Productions. — The time of harvest depends upon the duration of the rainy season. After the rains cease, the corn soon arrives at maturity, according to the situation. Wheat, zea or spelt, and barley, now ripen (Korte's *RAisce* p. 187; *Itiner. Hierosolym.* p. 93). The spring fig is still hard (Shaw, p. 290). The almond and orange trees now produce fruit (Maundrell, p. 62), and the terebinth-tree ("oak," Celsii *Hierobot.* p. 34) is in blossom (Sandys, p. 176). A new shoot, bearing fruit, springs from that branch of the vine that was left in the former month, which must now be lopped (Brocard, *Decsipt. T. S.* p. 332). Syria and Palestine produce canes from which they obtain sugar (Ignatius von Rheinfelden, *Hierosolym. Pilgerfahrt*, p. 46, 47). Tulips, ranunculuses, anemones, etc., etc., are now in flower at Aleppo and Tripoli (Thevenot, in, 92; Rauwolf, 1:58). The

grass is now very high, and the Arabs lead out their horses to pasture (Mariti, 2:25, 28). The same is likewise done in Persia (Chardin, 3:12).

MAY.

Weather. — In this month the summer season commences, when the excessive heat of the sun renders the earth barren (Korte, p. 257). A few showers are observed about Aleppo, sometimes accompanied with hail and thunder (Russel, p. ‘151). At the beginning of the month the mercury reaches 70°; then it rises gradually from 76° to 80°, being greatly affected by the direction of the variable winds. The snows on Lebanon thaw rapidly now, but the cold is still very sharp on the summits (Maundrell, p. 236).

Productions. — The harvest is completed during this month. Wheat is now cut in Galilee (Hasselquist, p. 8S). About the beginning of the month barley is generally ripe (Egmont and Heyman’s *Travels, 2:*27). Rice, however, is not quite ripe (Schweigger, p. 317). The early apples in Palestine now come to maturity, at least toward the end of this month (Pococke, 2:126). The common early apples may now be gathered in She warmer situations, but the better varieties ripen later — (Shaw’s *Travels,* p. 129). Cotton is said to be sown in the Holy Land at this period (Hasselquist, p. 176). The early shoots of the vine, which had been lopped, now produce the latter grapes (Brocard, *Des(r. Ter. Sanct.* p. 332, 333). They still continue, after the harvest, to sow various garden herbs, part of which are unknown to us; and many of them, as cucumbers, cauliflowers, and others, come to maturity twice in the same year, in spring and autumn (Korte, p. 187). In Palestine the grass and herbs have grown to such a height this month, that when Thevenot was riding from Nazareth toAcre, on the 5th of May, they reached the girth of his saddle *(Voyayes au Levant,* 2:671).

JUNE.

Weather — During this month the sky is generally clear, and the weather becomes extremely hot (Radzivil’s *Peregrin. Hierosol!ym.* p. 27). As the month advances, the mercury gradually rises in the morning from 76° to 80°; in the afternoon it stands between 84° and 92° (Thevenot, in, 11)2). The inhabitants pass their nights in summer upon the roofs of their houses, which are not rendered damp by any dew (Russel, p. 152). The summits of the mountains of Palestine are not, however, yet free from snow (Pococke, 2:153).

Productions. — At Aleppo the corn is sometimes not all cut before the beginning of June; although Russel's testimony differs from this assertion of Thevenot's, yet Shaw says that in Africa the harvest sometimes lasts till the end of June (Trav*el*, p. 123). The early figs, black and white, now ripen and immediately fall off. When they do not come to their proper size and maturity, they are called μυ῾κες, ὄλυνδοι, which names are used for unripe fruit in general. The process of caprification is now performed (Shaw, p. 296). Apples (a few of the earliest of the better sorts), plums, mulberries, cherries, etc., are also ripe in this month, but of the last there are very few trees in Palestine. The cedar gum, or *cedrinum,* a clear white resin, which is said to have great medicinal virtue when hardened, distils spontaneously in the summer time, and without any incision being made, from the bark of the coniferous cedar. In extracting a greater quantity, they cut the bark (Arvieux, *Memn. 2:*413, 414). Of the shrubs and herbs, the balm-tree is worthy of notice, which grows chiefly about Jericho. From this the Arabs, by making an incision, get the "Balm of Gilead" during this and two following months (Sandys, *Tour,* p. 197). The Arabs, as the summer advances, lead their flocks to the hills northward (De la Roque, *Voyfage,* p. 174; Radzivil, p. 45).

JULY.

Weather. — All travelers who have been exposed to the open air this month affirm that the heat is now extremely intense. Radzivil found the brooks of the "valley of the terebinths" dried up on the 9th. At Jerusalem the heat is much less than about Jericho *(Peregri. Hirool.* p. 97, 98). The snow on the tops of mountains, thawing gradually during the summer, yields a large supply of water to the brooks below. It cannot, however, be affirmed that the snows on the summits of Lebanon are entirely dissolved every year (Korte, p. 419). The winds generally blow from the west, but, when they fail, the heat is excessive. The mercury usually stands, in the beginning of the month, at 80°, and toward the end at 85° or 86° (Russel, p. 152, 153).

Production. — Grapes are now ripe about Aleppo, but remain till November or December (Torte, p. 571). Dates are to be found ripe at Jericho, but they seldom come to maturity at Jerusalem (Shaw, p. 297). Apple and pear trees present ripe fruit, but of an inferior kind. The nectarine yields a fruit most agreeable in flavor and immense in size (Shaw, p. 129, 130). The vintage begins in favored situations. The cauliflower and

parsnip are sown this month (Russel, p. Cr5: Shaw, p. 126). The gourd called *cit'ul* ripens (Russel, p. 25). There is no longer a supply of pasturage for the cattle (Shaw, p. 150).

AUGUST.

Weather. — The sky is serene and fair during this month, and the heat is extreme (Schulz, *Leit. d. Hochst. v.* 272). The mercury, until those days when the clouds rise, continues the same as in the last month; afterward it falls about 4° or 5°. So at Aleppo (Russel, p. 152). On the 18th snow is seen on the summits of Lebanon (Korte, *ieise,* p. 471).

Productions. — The first clusters of the vine, which blossomed at Antaradus in March, now come to maturity, and are ready for gathering (Brocard, p. 333). The fig, properly so called, which remains a long while on the tree, and is always reckoned, in the sacred writings, among summer fruit, may now be gathered at Algiers (Shaw, p. 129). The cultivated olive-tree yields ripe olives this month in the environs of Jericho (Tschudi, *leyss).* Pomegranates ripen. The shrub *alHeinl,,* brought out of Egypt into Palestine, puts forth leaves this month, and then fragrant blossoms, which the Turks, by various artificial methods, endeavor to produce sooner (Rauwolf, 1:58).

SEPTEMBER.

Weather. — The mercury remains the same at the beginning of this month as at the end of August, except that in the afternoon it rises (Russel, p. 14). Although the days are very hot, the nights are extremely cold (Schulze, p. 417-420). Rain falls toward the end of the month, but the rainy season generally commences now (Tschudi, p. 236).

Productions. — Russel says that the Syrians begin to plough about the end of this month *(A leppo,* p. 16). The palm presents ripe dates now in Upper Egypt (Radzivil, p. 172). The pomegranate, pear, and plum trees are laden with fruit in this month in the gardens of Damascus (Schulze, p. 443). According to Korte, cotton, which was sown the year before, and has lain all the winter, is now gathered ripe *(Reiee,* p. 576).

OCTOBER.

Weather. — The extreme heat is now abated, although still great in the daytime, the air being much refreshed by cold in the night, by which the dew, that is much more dense in this southern climate, is frozen (Korte, p.

257). The rains which now fall are called early or former rains (hr/y, πρώιμοι), and come in frequent showers. The winds are seldom very strong, but variable. After the rains the mercury descends gradually to 60° (Russel's *Aleppo,* p. 155).

Productions. — Wheat is sown by the Arabs about Algiers in the middle of this month (Shaw, p. 123). Russel informs us that it is sown at Aleppo about the same time; so that it seems probable this is the time of sowing it in Palestine *(Alen. I* s, p. 16). The third clusters of the vine, which in the month of May had produced another small branch, loaded with the latter grapes, must be gathered this month (Brocard, p. 333). The olive-tree produces ripe olives toward the latter end of October in the empire of Yorocco, and the pomegranate also now yields ripe fruit at the same place (Hist, p. 304, 307). Lettuces, endives, cresses, spinach, beets, etc., may be gathered at Algiers from this mouth till June (Shaw's *Travels,* p. 126).

NOVEMBER.

Weather. — If the rains have not already fallen, they certainly fall this month (Shaw's *Travel.,* p. 200). The sun's heat, although not so great in the daytime, is, however, still violent; but the nights are very cold and uncomfortable for travelers, many of whom journey by night, carrying torches before them (Cotovic. *Plin. Hiea os.* p. 334). The mercury, as the month advances, gradually falls from 60° to 50° (Russel, p. 156).

Productions. — This is the time for the general sowing of corn, as wheat, zea or spelt, and barley, in Palestine, at Aleppo, and in Lower Egypt (Korte, p. 189; Shaw, p. 123). Dates are still gathered in Egypt in the middle of this month (Thomson, 2:176). The trees till this period retain their leaves; and at Aleppo the vintage lasts to the 15th inst. (Russel, p. 14).

DECEMBER.

Weather. — This is the first winter month; the cold is piercing, and sometimes fatal to those not inured to the climate. Yet rain is more common than snow. which, when it falls, very quickly thaws (Korte, p. 555; Mariti. 2:187). The winds, as in the last month, usually blow from the east or north. They are seldom violent. The mercury stands at 46°, and is subject to very slight alterations (Russel, p. 115, 156).

Productions. — Corn and pulse are sown during this month, as at the end of October. Sugar-canes now ripenened and cut down at Cyprus (Cotovicus, *Itiner. Hi'PoP.* p. 117). The grass and herbs are again springing out of the ground after the rains, and the Arabs now drive their flocks down from the mountains into the plains (Rauwolf, 1:118). *SEE AGRICULTURE.*

Calendar, Roman.

For this in its most complete and final form, the world is indebted to 'Julius Caesar, who, during his office as Pontifex Maximus, undertook the memorable task known as the "reform of the calendar." The Roman year had hitherto consisted of 355 days, with a month of thirty days intercalated every third year, so that the average, length of the year was 365 days. This arrangement was attributed to Numa Pompilius, who added two months to the short year of Romulus; its regulation was left to the pontiffs. If the intercalation had been regularly made, the Romans would have lost nearly one day in every four years, since the real length of the solar year is about 365 days; but the business was so carelessly executed that the difference between the civil and the solar year sometimes amounted to several months. Caesar called on the astronomers, especially on Sosigenes of Alexandria, to rectify the discrepancy and prevent future error. It was determined to make the first of January of the Roman year U.C. 709 coincide with the first of January of the solar year which we call B.C. 45. But it was calculated that this Jan. 1 of the year U.C. 709 would be 67 days in advance of the true time; in other words, it would not concur with Jan. 1 of B.C. 45, but with Oct. 22 of B.C. 46. Two intercalary months, making together 67 days, were therefore inserted between the last day of November and the first of December of the year U.C. 708. An intercalary month of 23 days had already been added to February of that year, according to the old method. The Roman year 708 was thus made to consist in all of the prodigious number of 445 days (i.e. 355+-2 +67). It was hence scoffingly called "the year of confusion ;" more justly it should be named, as Macrobius observes, "the last year of confusion." To prevent future errors, the year was lengthened from 355 to 365 days, each month except February being lengthened (by one or two days, nearly alternately), according to the rule which we still observe. But as the solar year consists of very nearly 365+ days, it was manifestly necessary to add one day in every four years, and this was done at the end of February, as at present in our "leap year." Such was the famous *Julian Calendar,* which, with a

slight alteration, continues in use in all Christian countries to the present day.

Gregorian Calendar. — The addition of one day for every four years would be correct if the solar year consisted exactly of 365+ days, or 365 days and 6 hours; but, in fact, it consists of only 365 days, 5 hours, 47 minutes, 51½ seconds; so that the Julian year is longer than the true solar year by about 12 minutes. Caesar's astronomers are supposed to have been aware of this, but to have neglected it. Accordingly, in the year A.D. 1582, the beginning of the Julian year was found to be about 10 days behind the true time, the vernal equinox falling on the 11th instead of the 21st of March, its date at the Council of Nice, A.D. 325. The time of Easter, therefore, and of the other movable festivals, had been unsettled by the progressive recession of days, and it was matter of importance for ecclesiastical as well as civil purposes that the calendar should be rectified. Pope Gregory XIII (q.v.) therefore "ordained that ten days should be deducted from the year 1582, by calling what, according to the old calendar, would have been reckoned the 5th of October, the 15th of October, 1582; and in order that this displacement might not recur, it was further ordained that every hundredth year (1800, 1900, 2100, etc.) should not be counted a leap-year, except every fourth hundredth, beginning with 1600. In this way the difference between the civil and the natural year will not amount to a day in 5000 years. In Spain, Portugal, and part of Italy the pope was exactly obeyed. In France the change took place in the same year, by calling the 10th the 20th of December. In the Low Countries, the change was from the 15th of December to the 25th; but it was resisted by the Protestant part of the community till the year 1700. The Romanist nations in general adopted the *style* ordained by their sovereign pontiff; but the Protestants were then too much inflamed against Romanism in all its relations to receive even a purely scientific improvement from such hands. The Lutherans of Germany, Switzerland. and, as already mentioned, of the Low Countries, at length gave way in 1700, when it had become necessary to omit *eleven* instead of ten days. A bill to this effect had been brought before the Parliament of England in 1585, but does not appear to have gone beyond a second reading in the House of Lords. It was not till 1751, and after great inconvenience had been experienced for nearly two centuries, from the difference of the reckoning, that an act was passed (24 Geo. II, 1751) for equalizing the style in Great Britain and Ireland with that used in other countries of Europe. It was then enacted that eleven days

should be omitted after the 2d of September, 1752, so that the ensuing day should be the 14th." Russia still adheres to the Old Style, so that her reckoning is now 12 days behind that of the rest of Europe.

Calendar of the French Republic. — By a decree of the National Convention, on November 24, 1793, it was ordained that a new era should date from the beginning of the Republic, September 22, 1792; the midnight preceding which, being the autumnal equinox, was fixed upon as the epoch, from which the years were to be reckoned as Year One, Year Two, etc. The year was divided into 12 months, each of 30 days, to which new names were given, as *Vendemiaire* (vintage month), *Brumaire* (foggy month), *Frimaire* (frost month), etc. The months were divided into periods of 10 days, called *Primidi, Duodi, Tridi,* etc. The tenth day was to be the day of rest, the Christian Sabbath being done away. Five intercalary days were added for each year, viz. the festivals 'of *Genius, Labor, Action, Reward, Opinion.* In every fifth year there was to be an intercalary festival of *The Revolution.* This calendar went into use Nov. 26, 1793, and was abolished in 1805 by Napoleon, who ordered the Gregorian Calendar to be resumed on Jan. 1, 1806. — Carlyle, *French Revolution,* 2:336; *Penny Cyclopcedia,* s.v.; Chambers's *Encyclopcedia,* s.v. *SEE CHRONOLOGY.*

Calendar, Ecclesiastical.

1. A table of the order and series of days, weeks, months, and holy days in the year (so called from the *calendmc,* or first day of the Roman month). The oldest extant calendar containing the Christian festivals is that of Silvius (A.D 448), published in the *Acta Sanct.* June (7:176). There is a fragment of a Gothic calendar, supposed to be of the 4th century, covering the latter part of October and the whole of November, which gives seven days with saints' names. It may be found in Mai, *Scriptor. Veter. nova collectio,* 5:1. *SEE FEASTS AND FASTS.*

2. The *Fasti,* or catalogues in which different churches preserved the names of those saints whom they especially honored, as their bishops, martyrs, etc., to which they added the names of some other saints, but generally those of the neighboring churches. The calendars differed from the martyrologies in this, that the former contained but few names of saints unconnected with the particular church; the latter contained all the saints honored by the whole Church. The most ancient known calendar is that of the Roman Church, which, according to Baillet, was formed about the

middle of the fourth century, under Pope Liberius, or, according to Chatelain, in 336, under Pope Julius (Antwerp, 1634, ed. Boucher). See Landon, *Eccl. Diet. 2:*488. The most copious work on the subject is Assemani, *Kalendaria Ecclesice Universm* (Romans 1755, 6 vols. 4to). The present Saints' Calendar of the Romish Church is very copious; it may be found, more or less complete, in the Roman almanacs from year to year.

The German Lutheran Church retained the Romanist Calendar (with the saints' days of that age) at the Reformation. Professor Piper constructed in 1850 an Evangelical Calendar for the use of the Evangelical Church of Germany, which is issued annually, full of biographical and other matter of interest, along with the calendar of feasts, fasts, etc. See Piper, *Die Verbesserung d. Evang. Kalenders* (Berlin, 1850).

The calendar of the Church of England, as it stands in the large editions of the Prayer-book, consists of nine columns: the first contains the golden number or cycle of the moon; the second shows the days of the month in their numerical order; the third contains the Dominical or Sunday letter; the fourth the calends, nones, and ides, (this was the Roman method of computation, sand was used by the early Christians); the fifth contains the holy days of the Church, as also some festivals of the Romish Church, set down for public convenience rather than for reverence; and the remaining four contain the portions of Scripture and of the Apocrypha appointed for the daily lessons.

The list of saints' days and festivals includes a number of the Romish holidays, properly so called, viz.: Lucian, priest and martyr, Jan. 8; Hilary, bishop and confessor, Jan. 13; Prisca, virgin and martyr, Jan. 18; Fabian, bishop and martyr, Jan. 20; Agnes, virgin and martyr, Jan. 21; Vincent, deacon and martyr, Jan. 22; Blasius, bishop and martyr, Feb. 3; Agatha, virgin and martyr, Feb. 5; Valentine, bishop and martyr, Feb. 14; David, tutelar saint of Wales, March 1; Cedde or Chad, bishop, March 2; Perpetua, martyr, March 7; Gregory, bishop and confessor, March 12; Patrick, tutelar saint of Ireland, March 17; Edward, king of the West Saxons, March 18; Benedict. abbot, March 21; Richard, bishop, April 3; Ambrose, bishop, April 4; Alphege, archbishop, April 19; George, saint and martyr, April 23; Cross, invention of, May 3; John, saint, evangelist, May 6; Dunstan, archbishop, Mray 19; Augustine, archbishop, May 26; Bede, venerable, May 27; Nicomede, martyr, June 1; Boniface, bishop and martyr, June 5; Alban, saint and martyr, June 17; Edward, translation of,

June 20; Mary, Virgin, visitation of, July 2; Martin, bishop and confessor, July 4; Swithin, bishop, July 15; Margaret, virgin and martyr, July 20; Magdalene, saint Mary, July 22; Anne, saint, July 23; Lammas Day, Aug. 1; Transfiguration of our Lord, Aug. 6; Jesus, name of, Aug. 7; Laurence, archdeacon and martyr, Aug. 10; Augustine, bishop of Ilippo, Aug. 28; John Baptist, beheading of, Aug. 29; Giles, abbot and confessor, Sept. 1; Enurchus, bishop, Sept. 7; Mary, Virgin, nativity of, Sept. 8; Holy Cross, recovery of, Sept. 14; Lambert, bishop and martyr, Sept. 17; Cyprian, archbishop and martyr, Sept. 26 ; Jerome, priest and confessor, Sept. 30; Remigius, bishop, Oct. 1; Faith, virgin and martyr, Oct. 5; Denys, bishop and martyr, Oct. 9; Edward, translation of, Oct. 13; Ethelreda, virgin, Oct. 17; Crispin, saint and martyr, Oct. 25; Leonard, confessor, Nov. 6; Martin, bishop and confessor, Nov. 11; Britins, bishop, Nov. 13; Machutus, bishop, Nov. 15; Hugh, bishop, Nov. 17; Edmund, king and martyr, Nov. 20; Cecilia, virgin and martyr, Nov. 22; Clement I, bishop and martyr, Nov. 23; Catharine, virgin and martyr, Nov. 25; Nicholas, bishop, Dec. 6; Lucy, virgin and martyr, Dec. 13; 0 Sapientia, Dec. 16; Silvester, bishop, Dec. 31.

These are omitted in the calendar of the Protestant Episcopal Church, which retains only the scriptural festivals. Wheatly assigns the following reasons for their retention by the English Church:

“Some of them being retained upon account of our courts of justice, which usually make their returns on these days, or else upon the days before or after them, which are called in the writs *Vigil. Fest.* or *Crast.*, as in *Vigil. Martin, Fest. Martin, Crast. Martin,* and the like. Others are probably kept in the calendar for the sake of such tradesmen, handicraftsmen, and others, as are wont to celebrate the memory of their tutelar saints, as the Welshmen do of St. David, the shoemakers of St. Crispin, etc. And again, churches being in several places dedicated to some or other of these saints, it has been the usual custom in such places to have wakes or fairs kept upon those days, so that the people would probably be displeased if, either in this or the former case, their favorite saint’s name should be left out of the calendar. Besides, the histories which were writ before the Reformation do frequently speak of transactions happening upon such a holy day, or about such a time, without mentioning the month; relating one thing to be done at Lamnmas-tide, and another about Martinmas, etc., so that, were these names quite left out of the calendar, we might be at a loss to know when several of these transactions happened. But for this and the foregoing

reasons our second reformers under queen Elizabeth (though all those days had been omitted in both books of kirig Edward VI, excepting St. George's Day, Lammas Day, St. Laurence, and St. Clement, which were in his second book) thought convenient to restore the names of them to the calendar, though not with any regard of their being kept holy by the Church." — Wheatly, *On Common Prayer,* ch. 1; Procter, *On Common Prayer,* 62; Piper, in Herzog's *Real-Encyklopddie,* 7:232; Coleman, *Ancient Christianity,* ch. 26, § 5; *Christian Remembrancer,* 40:391.

Calendârum Festum,

Feast of the Calends. This heathen festival was retained by many Christians, and is called *bota* and *vota.* It was in some periods celebrated, with great indecencies, under the namesfestum *kalendsrum, festumn hypodiaconorum, Jestum stultorum.* In later times, the people met masked in the churches, and, in a ludicrous way, proceeded to the election of a ok bishop, who exercised a jurisdiction over them suited to the festivity of the occasion. Fathers and councils long labored to restrain this license, but to little purpose. Tertullian, Chrysostom, and Augustine declaim, in the strongest terms, against this festival; and the Council in Trullo, A.D. 692, forbids the dancings which were used both by men and women, under the penalty of excommunication. In some instances the practice of sacrificing a calf was adopted, especially at the *bota,* a feast of the god Pan. The Council of Auxerre takes notice of the remains of some heathen superstition in France, in offering a hind or calf, which it designates a diabolical observation. Bingham, *Orig. Eccl.* bk. 20; *Farrar, — Eccl. Dict.* s.v.

Calendârum Fratres, or *Calendar Brethren,* a society formerly spread over France, Germany, and Hungary, and which is said to have originated in Saxony in the thirteenth century. It assembled in various places on the first day of each month to regulate the observance of the ensuing festivals, the distribution of alms, days of fasting, the burial of the dead, etc. It was, in fact, a sort of beneficial society, under the patronage of the bishop of the diocese. It afterward led to abuses, carousals, etc., and most of the societies were abolished at the Reformation. Some, however, were still in existence at the beginning of the nineteenth century. Even in the Protestant city of Brunswick a caland has nominally maintained itself. One caland ("the caland of princes at Kahla") consisted merely of members of princely houses; several (as, e.g. the caland at Bergen) of knights and members of

the higher clergy; others of knights only. See Feller, *Diss. de Fratr. Kal.* (Frankf. 1692, 4to); Blumberg, *Ueber d. Caldndsbrider* (Chemn. 1721); Ledebur, in vol. iv of the *Midrkischo Forschungen* (Berl. 1850).

Calf

(prop. lg,[e, *e'gel,* μόσχος; fem. hlg][, *eglah',* δάμαλις; sometimes wPi or wP; *par,* a *steer* or young bullock; also periphrastically rqB;ˆB, *son ofthe herd),* the young of the ox species. *SEE BEEVE; SEE BULL,* etc. There is frequent mention in Scripture of calves, because they were made use of commonly in sacrifices. The "fatted calf" was regarded by the Hebrews as the choicest animal food. It was stall-fed, frequently with special reference to a particular festival or extraordinary sacrifice (<092824>1 Samuel 28:24; <300604>Amos 6:4; <421523>Luke 15:23). The allusion in <243418>Jeremiah 34:18, 19, is to an ancient custom of ratifying a contract or covenant, in the observance of which an animal was slain and divided, and the parties passed between the parts (comp. Homer, *II.* in, 20'), signifying their willingness to be so divided themselves if they failed to perform their covenant (<011509>Genesis 15:9, 10, 17, 18). The expression "calves of our lips," in <281402>Hosea 14:2, is figurative, signifying the fruits of our lips (Wolf, *Juvenci labiorum,* Viteb. 1711). As calves were used in sacrifices, the injunction requires us to render the sacrifice of prayer and praise to God, instead of the animal sacrifice (<581315>Hebrews 13:15). *SEE HEIFER.*

Calf-Worship.

Picture for Calf 1

— This appears to have originated in Egypt, where we know that brutes of nearly all sorts were held in reverence by some one or another of the various nomes into which that country was divided. *SEE ANIMAL WORSHIP.* Of all these creatures, however, the calf, or rather bullock, seems to have been most generally adored, especially a peculiar description, or rather peculiarly-colored bull, to which, under the name of Apis or Mnevis, divine honors of the most extraordinary kind were paid throughout Egypt. It is from this form of idolatry that the scriptural examples of calf-worship are clearly derived. Yet it is possible that the commentators are not quite correct in supposing *Apis* to be the deity whose worship was imitated by the Jews, at least in the first instance. The Egyptians gave that name to a living bull which they worshipped at

Memphis; but they also worshipped another living bull in the city of On, or Heliopolis, which they called *Mne,* or, according to the Greek form, *Mnevis,* and which they adored as the living emblem of the sun. Now the Israelites, from the circumstance of their living in the land of Goshen, in or near which Heliopolis was situated, and also from the connection of Joseph, the head of their nation, with one of the priestly families of that city, must have been well acquainted with its peculiar forms of idolatry. It is also very probable that many of them had joined in those rites during their sojourn. We might therefore naturally suppose that they would adopt them on this occasion; and the supposition that they did so is confirmed by a very curious fact, which has not yet been noticed, as baring upon this question. Champollion has observed, in his *Pantheon Egyptien,* that Mnevis is said by Porphyry and Plutarch to have been a *black* bull, as Apis unquestionably was; but he assures us that this is not the case with regard to the existing remains of ancient Egypt; for, although in the Egyptian paintings Apis is either colored black or black and white, Mnevis, on the contrary, in the only figure of him hitherto discovered; is colored *bright yellow,* evidently with the intention of representing a *golden image.* . This fact, though not ‘a conclusive proof, affords a strong presumption that the golden calf was made according to the usual form and color of the images of Mnevis. The annexed engraving represents this symbolical deity of Heliopolis as he is painted on the coffin of a mummy at Turin, the name being distinctly written in hieroglyphical characters, MNE, without the Greek termination. It differs in color only, and not in form, from another painting on the same coffin, which bears the name of Apis. Both have the same trappings — the sun’s disk between the horns, surmounted by the plume of ostrich feathers, signifying justice, and the whip, the emblem of power; and both are accompanied by the serpent, representing the spirit of the gods. The bull Mnevis or MIne-for *vus* is merely a Greek termination-was sumptuously lodged in the city On or Heliopolis, and this is all that we find recorded of him in ancient writers. Far more ancient than Apis, the era of his consecration is lost, and perhaps forever. The only circumstance which is of importance, save that the Israelites fell into his worship, is that he appears to have represented the zodiacal sign which was depicted yellow, while, by a curious anomaly, Apis, whose attributes all coincide with those of the sun, was black. The worship paid to him, though lasting till the downfall of the Egyptian hierarchy, gradually diminished before the more important and popular rites of Apis, and little is said of Mnevis. *SEE IDOLATRY.*

Picture for Calf 2

1. The most ancient and remarkable notice in the Scriptures on this head is that of the golden calf which was cast by Aaron while the Israelites were encamped at the foot of Sinai. In <02304>Exodus 32:4, we are told that Aaron, constrained by the people, in the absence of Moses, made a molten calf of the golden earrings of the people, to represent the Elohim which brought Israel out of Egypt. He is also said to have "finished it with a graving-tool;" but the word ֶחֶרֶט, *che'ret,* may mean a *mould* (comp. <12523>2 Kings 5:23, Auth. Vers. "bags;" Sept. θυλάκοις). Bochart *(Hieroz.* lib. ii, car. xxxiv) explains it to mean, "he placed the earrings in a bag," as Gideon did (<07024>Judges 8:24). Probably, however, it means that, after the calf had been cast, Aaron ornamented it with the sculptured wings, feathers, and other marks which were similarly represented on the statues of Apis, etc. (Wilkinson, 4:348). It does not seem likely that the earrings would have provided the enormous quantity of gold required for a *solid* figure. More probably it was a wooden figure laminated with gold, a process which is known to have existed in Egypt. "A *gilded* ox covered with a pall" was an emblem of Osiris (Wilkinson, 4:335). *SEE GOLD.*

To punish the apostasy, Moses burnt the calf, and then, grinding it to powder, scattered it over the water, where, according to some, it produced in the drinkers effects similar to the water of jealousy (Numbers v). He probably adopted this course as the deadliest and most irreparable blow to their superstition (Jerome, *Ep.* 128; Plut. *De Isaiah* p. 362), or as an allege rical act (<18516>Job 15:16), or with reference to an Egyptian custom (Herod. 2:41; Poll *Syncpsis,* in loc.). It has always been a difficulty to explain the *process* which he used; some account for it by his supposed knowledge of a forgotten art (such as was one of the boasts of alchemy) by which he — could reduce gold to dust. Goguet *(Orgine des Lois)* invokes the assistance of natron, which would have had the additional advantage of making the draught nauseous. Baumgarten easily endows the fire employed with miraculous-properties. Bochart and Rosenmüller merely think that he cut, ground, and filed the gold to powder, such as was used to, sprinkle over the hair (Josephus, *Ant.* 8:7, 3). There seems little doubt that the Hebrews term here rendered "burnt" (שָׂרַף; Sept. κατακαίω) properly has this signification (Hivernick's *Introd. to the Pentat. p.* 292). Those commentators who have been at so great pains to explain in what manner Moses reduced the golden calf to such a state as to make it potable in

water seem to have overlooked the consideration that, as the science of making gold leaf for gilding was already practiced in Egypt, there could be no great difficulty, even if chemical processes had not then been discovered, in effecting the object. *SEE METAL.*

The legends about the calf are numerous. The suggestion is said by the Jews to have originated with certain Egyptian proselytes (Godwyn's *Mos. and A aa. 4:*5); Hur, "the desert's martyr," was killed for opposing it; Abulfeda says that all except 12,000 worshipped it; when made, it was magically animated (<02324>Exodus 32:24). "The devil," says Jonathan, "got into the metal and fashioned it into a calf" (Lightfoot, *Works,* v. 398). Hence the Koran (7:146) calls it "a corporeal calf, made of their ornaments, *which lowed."* This was effected, not by Aaron (according to the Mohammedans), but by al-Sameri, a chief Israelite, whose descendants still inhabit an island of the Arabian Gulf. He took a handful of dust from the footsteps of the horse of Gabriel, who rode at the head of the host, and threw it into the mouth of the calf, which immediately began to low. No one is to be punished in hell more than forty days, being the number of days of the calf-worship (Sale's *Koran,* ed. Davenport, p. 7, note; and see Weil's *Legends,* p. 125). It was a Jewish proverb that "no punishment befalleth the Israelites in which there is not an ounce of this calf" (Godwyn, *ut sup.). SEE AARON.*

2. The next notice refers to an event which occurred ages after, when Jeroboam, king of Israel, returning from his long exile in Egypt, set up two idols in the form of a calf, the one in Dan (comp. Josephus, *War,* 4, 1:1) and the other in Bethel, the two extremes of his kingdom, to prevent the ten tribes from resorting to Jerusalem to worship, and so more effectually to separate them from the house of David. Temples were built and altars erected for these images; priests were appointed from all the tribes without distinction, and the priestly functions performed even by the monarch himself. The calves continued to be a snare to the people of Israel until the captivity. The calf at Dan was carried away by Tiglath-Pileser, and that of Bethel ten years after by his son Shalmaneser (<111529>1 Kings 15:29; 17:13; Prideaux, *Connection,* 1:15). Jeroboam's sin is always mentioned whenever his name is used (<111140>1 Kings 11:40; 12:26-33; <141115>2 Chronicles 11:15; <280105>Hosea 8:5, 6; 10:5; 13:2). *SEE JEROBOAM.*

Bochart thinks that the ridiculous story of Celsus about the Christian worship of an ass-headed deity (called Θαφαβαὼθ ἢ Ὀνιήλ-a story at the

source of which Tertullian, Ὀνοκοίτης, *Apol.* 16; *Ad Nat. 1:*14, could only guess) sprang from some misunderstanding of such emblems as the golden calf (Minuc. Fel. *Apol.* ix). But it is much more probable, as Origen conjectured, that the Christians were confounded with the absurd mystic *Ophiani,* or Ophite Gnostics (Tacitus, *Hist.* 5:4; Merivale, *Hist. of Emp. 6:*564). *SEE ASS'S HEAD.*

Picture for Calf 3

Theory of this Idolatry. — This almost incomprehensible degradation of human reason was, more particularly in the first instance, no doubt the result of the debasing influences which operated on the minds of the Israelites during their sojourn in Egypt, where,' amid the daily practice of the most degrading and revolting religious ceremonies, they were accustomed to see the image of a sacred calf, surrounded by other symbols, carried in solemn pomp at the head of marching armies, such as may still be seen depicted in the processions of Rameses the Great or Sesostris. The accompanying figure is a representation of a calf-idol, copied from the original collection made by the artists of the French Institute of Cairo. It is recumbent, with human eyes, the skin flesh-colored, and the whole afterparts covered with a white and sky-blue diapered drapery; the horns are not on the head, but above it, and contain within them the symbolical globe surmounted by two feathers. Upon the neck is a blue and yellow yoke, and the flagellum, of various colors, is suspended over the back; the whole is fixed upon a broad stand for carrying, as here shown. The rendering of the Auth. Vers., which alludes to the image being finished with a graving-tool, is obviously correct, for all the lines and toolings of the covering cloth, of the eyes, and of the feathers must have required that manual operation (2304Exodus 32:4). It is doubtful whether this idolatrous form is either Apis or Mnevis; it may perhaps represent the sun's first entrance into Taurus, or, more probably, be a symbol known to the Egyptians by an undeciphered designation, and certainly understood by the Edomites of later ages, who called it *bahumed and/kharuf,* or the calf, the mysterious *anima mundi;* according to Von Hammer (Pref. to *Ancient Alphabets),* the Nabathmean secret of secrets, or the beginning and return of every thing. With the emblems on the back, it may have symbolized the plural Elohim long before the cabalistical additions of this mysterious type had changed the figure. At the time of the departure of the Israelites from Egypt this may have been the Moloch of their neighbors, for that idol was figured with the head of a calf or steer. A similar divinity belonged to the

earliest Indian, Greek, and even Scandinavian mythologies, and therefore it may be conceived that the symbol, enduring even to this day, was at that period generally understood by the multitude, and consequently that it was afterward revived by Jeroboam without popular opposition. Egyptian paintings illustrate the contempt which the prophet Hosea (Hoesa 10:5) casts upon the practice of those whom he designates as *"coming to sacrifice and kiss the calves."* *SEE BAAL.*

a. Some regard the golden calf both of Aaron and Jeroboam as intended by the Jews for an Egyptian god. The arguments for this view are,

1. The ready apostasy of the Jews to Egyptian superstition (<44739>Acts 7:39, and chap. v, passim; Lactant. *Inst.* 4:10).

2. The fact that they had been worshippers of Apis (<06244>Joshua 24:14), and their extreme familiarity with his cultus (<111140>1 Kings 11:40).

3. The resemblance of the feast described in <023205>Exodus 32:5, to the festival in honor of Apis (Suidas, s.v. Ἄπιδες). Of the various sacred cows of Egypt, that of His, of Athor, and of the three kinds of sacred bulls, Apis, Basis, and Mnevis, Sir G. Wilkinson fixes on the latter as the prototype of the golden calf; "the offerings, dancings, and rejoicings practiced on that occasion were doubtless in imitation of a ceremony they had witnessed in honor of Mnevis" *(Anc. Egyp.* v. 197, see pl. 35, 36). The ox was worshipped from its utility in agriculture (Plut. *De Isaiah* 74), and was a symbol of the sun, and consecrated to him (Hom. *Od.* i, xii, etc.; Warburton, *Div. Leg.* 4:3, 5). Hence it is almost universally found in Oriental and other mythologies.

4. The expression, "an ox that eateth hay," etc. (<19620>Psalm 106:20, etc.), where some see an allusion to the Egyptian custom of bringing a bottle of hay when they consulted Apis (Godwyn's *Mos. and Aar.* 4:5). Yet these terms of scorn are rather due to the intense hatred of the Jews both to this idolatry and that of Jeroboam. Thus, in Tob. 1:5, we have one of Jeroboam's calves called "the heifer Baal" (ἡ δάμαλις Βάαλ), which is an unquestionable calumny; just as in the Sept. version of <244615>Jeremiah 46:15, "Apis, the chosen calf" (Ἄπις ὁ μοσχος σου ὁ ἐκλεκτός), is either a mistake or a corruption of the text (Bochart, *Hieroz. 2:*28, 6, and Schleusner, s.v. Awrtc). *SEE APIS.*

b. According to others, the Jews in these cases simply adopted a well-known cherubic emblem, merely applying it as a symbol of Jehovah. *SEE CHERUB.* In support of this position it may be urged,

1. That it is obvious they were aware of this symbol, since Moses finds it unnecessary to describe it (Exodus 25:18-22).

2. Josephus seems to imply that the calf symbolized God *(Ant.* 8:8, 4).

3. Aaron, in proclaiming the feast (Exodus 32:5), distinctly calls it a feast to Jehovah, and speaks of the god as the visible representation of Him who had led them out of Egypt.

4. It was extremely unlikely that they would so soon adopt a deity whom they had so. recently seen humiliated by the judgments of Moses (Numbers 33:4).

5. There was only *one* Apis, whereas Jeroboam erected *two* calves (but see Jahn, *Bibl. Arch.§* 464).

6. Jeroboam's well-understood political purpose was, not to introduce a new religion, but to provide a different form of the old, and this alone explains the fact that *this* was the only form of idolatry into which Judah never fell, since she already possessed the archetypal emblems in the Temple.

7. It appears from 1 Kings 22:6, etc., that the prophets of Israel, though sanctioning the calf-worship, still regarded themselves, and were regarded, as "prophets *of Jehovah."* *SEE GOLDEN CALF.*

Calhoun, Thomas P.,

a Cumberland Presbyterian minister, was born in Wilson county, Tenn., in 1823, studied theology in the seminary at Princeton, N. J., and was ordained in 1852. He was secretary for several years of the Board of Foreign and Domestic Missions of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church, and editor of the *Missionary,* a periodical of the Church. In the winter of 1858, while riding out, his horse became unmanageable, and running off a bridge, Mr. Calhoun was killed instantly. — Wilson's *Presbyt. Alm. for* 1860.

Caligula

Picture for Caligula

(so called from *caligce,* the foot-dress of a common soldier, which he wore while his father was in the camp in Germany), properly CAIUS CAESAR, the third of the series of Roman emperors, was the youngest son of Germanicus, the nephew of Tiberius, by Agrippina. He was born Aug. 31, A.D. 12 (Suetonius, *Claud.* 8), and, after spending his youth among the soldiers in Germany (Tacitus, *Ann. 1:*41, 69; Dio Cass. 57:5), he was received into favor by Tiberius after the fall of Sejanus (A.D. 32), although his mother and brothers had been disgraced by that tyrant, whom he succeeded as emperor in March, A.D. 37. *SEE TIBERIUS.* He is frequently mentioned (under the simple name "Caius") by Josephus, who speaks of his restoration of Agrippa I to his Jewish dominions *(Ant.* 18:7, 10) among the few acts of liberality that characterized the first months of his. reign. After his recovery from illness, however, which his excesses had brought upon him, he gave way to his naturally brutal temper in so violent and irrational a manner as to be evidence of downright insanity, and was at length assassinated Jan. 24, A.D. 41. It does not appear that he molested the Christians. He commanded Petronius, governor of Syria, to place his statue in the Temple at Jerusalem for the purpose of adoration; but the Jews so vigorously opposed it that, fearing a sedition, he suspended the order (Josephus, *Ant. 17:*8). See Smith's *Diet. of Class. Ant.* s.v.; Conybeare and Howson's *St. Paul,* 1:110, 111.

Cal'itas

(Καλιτάς and Καλίτας), given as the name of one of the Levites who had taken foreign wives after the restoration from Babylon (1 Esdr. 9:23, where he is also called COLIUS), and who assisted in expounding the law to the people (ver. 48); evidently the KELITA *SEE KELITA* (q.v.) of the genuine texts (<15023>Ezra 10:23; <16807>Nehemiah 8:7).

Calixtines

(1). In the year 1420, the Hussites divided into two great factions, the Taborites and the Calixtines. The latter, who derived their name from the chalice *(calix),* asserted that communion in both kinds was essential to the sacrament. They are not generally ranked by Romanists among heretics, for many of them were persuaded by the concessions of the Council of Basle,

in 1493, to be reconciled to the Roman pontiff.' The reformation they aimed at extended principally to four articles:

1. To restore the cup to the laity.

2. To subject criminal clergymen to the civil magistrate.

3. To strip the clergy of their lands, lordships, and all temporal jurisdictions.

4. To grant liberty to all priests to preach the Word of God. -Mosheim, *Ch. Hist. 2:*459; Farrar, *Ecclesiastes Dict.* s.v. *SEE BOHEMIA; SEE HUSSITES.*

(2.) Followers of George Calixtus. *SEE CALIXTUS, GEORGE.*

Calixtus I (Or Callistus), Pope

the son of Dionysius, and a Roman, succeeded Zephyrinus in 217 or 220. According to the *Acta Martyrum*, he was put to death by being drowned in a well, after suffering a long imprisonment, Oct. 14, 222, or Oct. 12, 223, but the story is doubtful. He was succeeded by Urban 1. The new MS. of Hippolytus calls him a "heretic," a "servile and deceitful profligate, and an embezzler." In doctrine, according to Hippolytus, Calixtus was a Noetian, or worse; in practice, a violator both of the ecclesiastical and the moral law. And yet he is a saint of the Romish calendar! He is said to have built the basilica of St. Mary *Trans Tiberim*, and the cemetery on the Appian Way now called the catacomb of St. Sebastian (where 174,000 martyrs are said to lie buried). Ughellus, *Italia Sacra*, vol. i; *Biog. Univ.; Meth. Qu. Rev.* 1851, p. 649; Schaff, *Hist. of Christian Church, 1:*291, 447. *SEE HIPPOLYTUS.*

Calixtus II

Pope, son of Guillaume, count of Burgundy, was made archbishop of Vienne in 1088, and elected pope Feb. 1, 1119, while in retirement at Cluny. He was judged likely to compose the troubles about investiture, which had agitated the Church for fifty years; and even Henry V appeared to join in the general satisfaction. At the council held at Rheims in 1119 nothing, however, could be concluded to effect a reconciliation between Henry and the pope, and the former was formally excommunicated. In 1122, at the Dietof Woims (Sept. 23), an accommodation it was agreed

upon between the parties, the emperor reserving to himself his right of giving to the elect the investiture of the regalia, while the pope, on his part, conferred the investiture by the cross and ring. In 1120 Calixtus returned to Rome, and re-established the papacy there. In 1123 he held a Lateran council, in which the edicts of the and-pope Gregory VIII were annulled. He died Dec. 12, 1124. — Mosheim, *Ch. Hist.* cent. xii, pt. ii, ch. ii, § 5, 6; Landon, *Eccl. Diet.* 2:494.

Calixtus III

Pope, Spaniard of Valencia, named Alphonso Borgia, who was elevated to the papacy April 8,1455. He granted a commission to review the proceedings on the trial of Joan of Arc, which decided that she died a martyr for her religion and country. Calixtus did not canonize her, but permitted the celebration of certain expiatory ceremonies at her tomb. Calixtus made base use of his pontificate for the aggrandizement of his own nephews (or sons?), the Borgias. He proclaimed a crusade, collected immense sums, and sent an expedition against the Turks, which failed. He died Aug. 6, :1458. — Landon, *Eccl. Diet.* 2:494.

Calixtus, George,

perhaps the most independent and influential of the Lutheran divines of his age, was born at Medelbye (or Flensborg?), Schleswig, 1586. His proper name was Kallison; his father was pastor at Medelbye. George was first taught by his father, then went to school at Flensborg, and finally studied at the University of Helmstidt, 1603-1607. After thorough culture, especially in the Aristotelian philosophy and in theology, he traveled into England and France on literary journeys (1609-13). On his return to Germany in 1614 he was appointed divinity professor at Helmstadt. The thesis of his in a mural was that kingdoms and states cannot safely coexist with the religion of Papists or Jesuits. For nearly half a century he led a life of unwearied literary activity at Helmstadt. Peaceful himself, the aim of his studies and efforts was to settle the disputes of the Christian parties, and it led him into endless controversies. Though a Lutheran all his life, his tendencies were Melancthonian, both by nature and education. “He had adopted the opinion of the peacemakers and Remonstrants that the essential doctrines of Christianity were held by all the churches, and desired to propagate this opinion, and to bring the adherents of all the churches to some nearer understanding.” He wrote against all *exclusive* claims in any of the

churches. Against Rome he wrote *De Pontif. Messice Sacrificio* (Francf. 1614); and numerous other publications to the same end followed it. In the Calvinistic doctrine he objected to predestination and the Calvinistic view of the Eucharist; but he did not hold these errors to be fundamental *(De Prcecipuis Christ. Relig. Capitibus* [Helmstadt, 1613]); nor did rigid Lutheranism find any more favor with him, and he especially rejected the doctrine of the ubiquity of the body of Christ. His first publications gave umbrage to the strict Lutherans, who regarded him as lax in theology. In 1619 he published his *Epitome Theologice,* which was warmly welcomed by his friends, but awakened new opponents among the rigidly orthodox. He applied Aristotle's philosophy to theology, dividing the science into three heads:

(1) the *object,* man's best good, including holiness, immortality, etc.;

(2) the *subject,* God, creation, apostasy, etc.;

(3) the *means,* grace, redemption, the sacraments, etc. He also, in his *Epit. Theologice Moralis* (1634), separated theology from ethics, giving the latter the form of an independent science.

On this Dr. Pusey remarks, in his *Theology of Germany,* p. 34, that "the separation by Calixtus of the system of Christian moral' from 'Christian doctrine,' with which it had been hitherto interwoven, though in itself greatly to the advantage of the unity of the latter science, seems to have produced at the time no effect but that of extinguishing even the sense of the necessity of presenting it in a form influential upon, the Christian life." The very titles of his writings and those of his opponents would fill pages. His liberal views were styled Crypto-Papism, Philippism, Crypto-Calvinism, Babelism, and many other hard names, ending with Atheism. Especially after the Colloquy of Thorn, 1645, where he showed a strong disposition to compromise all minor differences in order to bring about a reunion of Lutherans, Reformed, and Romanists, the opposition of the high orthodox party to him and to the Helmstadt theologians, who were more or less imbued with his Syncretism, increased.. *SEE THORN, COLLOQUY OF.* His followers were known both as *Syncretists* and *Calixtines. The* chief objection brought against him by the more candid of his opponents was that he maintained,

1. That the fundamental doctrines of Christianity, by which he meant those elementary principles whence all its truths flow, were preserved pure in all

three communions (Romish, Lutheran, and Calvinistic), and were contained in that ancient form of doctrine known by the name of the Apostles' Creed.

2. That the tenets and opinions which had been constantly received by the ancient doctors during the first five centuries were to be considered as of equal truth and authority with the express declarations and doctrines of Scripture.

3. That the churches which received these points, and "held the additional tenets of the particular churches as non-essential, should at once come into peaceful relations, and thus pave the way for a future union of the churches." His opponents were legion, but the most bitter and persevering was Calovius (q.v.). Calixtus died March 19, 1656. A full list of his writings is given in his *Consultatio de tolerantia leformatorum* (Helmst. 1697, 4to). An account of Calixtus, from the Puseyite stand-point, is given in the *Christian Renzembrancer*, 1855, art. 1:See also Gasz, *Georg Calixt u. d. Syncretismus* (Bresl. 1846); Gieseler, *Ch. History*, pt. 4, div. 1, ch. 4; Henke, *Calixtus u. s. Zeit* (1853-56, 2 vols. 8vo); *Bibliotheca Sacra*, April, 1865, art. vi; Mosheim, *Ch. History*, cent. xvii, sec. ii, pt. ii, ch. i; Dowding, *Life and Corr. of G. Calixtus* (Lond. 1863); Gass, *Prot. Dogmatik, 2:*68. *SEE SYNCRETISM.*

Calker

(qdB, qyzij}mi, *machazik' be'dek*, a *repairer of the breach*, as in <121208>2 Kings 12:8; 22:5; Sept. and Vulg. translate at random, οὖτοι ἐνίσχυον τὴν βουλήν, *habuerunt nautas ad ministerium varice supellectilis)*,a workman skilled in stopping the seams of the deck or sides of a vessel, which appears to be the correct idea of the passages (<262709>Ezekiel 27:9, 27) where the inhabitants of Gebal (or Byblus) are said to have been employed in this capacity on the Tyrian vessels. *SEE TYRE; SEE NAVIGATION.*

Call

(usually a r q; *kara'*, καλέω, both which words evidently contain the same root as their Engl. equivalent) signifies (besides its use in giving a name),

I. To cry to another for help, and hence to pray. he first passage in which we meet with this phrase is in <010426>Genesis 4:26, "Then began men to call upon the name of the Lord" (h/ħy]µvBi a r q]l i l j Wh za; Sept. and Vulg. understand the first word as a pronoun referring to Enos, ο υτος ἤλπισεν

ἐπικαλεῖσθαι τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Θεοῦ, *iste coepit invocare nomen Domini),* a phrase that has been understood by some as meaning thatJehovah's worshippers were then called *by His name,* but erroneously (comp. <01128>Genesis 12:8; <19916>Psalm 79:6; 105:1; <23646>Isaiah 64:6; <24025>Jeremiah 10:25; <36309>Zephaniah 3:9). In both the Old and New Test., to call upon the name of the Lord imports invoking the true God in prayer, with a confession that He is Jehovah; that is, with an acknowledgment of his essential and incommunicable attributes. In this view the phrase is applied to the worship of Christ (<44022>Acts 2:21; 7:59; 9:14; <45010>Romans 10:12; <46102>1 Corinthians 1:2). *SEE WORSHIP.*

II. DIVINE CALL.

(1.) The word "call" is used in Scripture with various significations, as applied to the Almighty with respect to men.

1. In its ordinary sense of "to name," to "designate" (of which examples are not necessary), and also in the sense of "to be," e.g. "He shall be called the Son of God" (<42035>Luke 1:35); "His name shall be called Wonderful" (<23906>Isaiah 9:6); that is, he shall be the Son of God, he shall be wonderful, and shall be thus acknowledged.

2. In the designation of individuals to some special office or function, e.g. the call of Bezaleel (<02302>Exodus 31:2); the calling of the judges, prophets, etc. (e.g. <23220>Isaiah 22:20; <44302>Acts 13:2).

3. In the designation of nations to certain functionsiprivileges, or punishments (<25122>Lamentations 2:22; <23506>Isaiah 5:6), especiall' y of Israel to be God's chosen people (<05706>Deuteronomy 7:6 8; <23409>Isaiah 41:9 42:6; 43:1; 48:12-15; 51:2; <28101>Hosea 11:1).

4. To denote the invitation to sinners to accept the grace of God in the gift of His Son (<40913>Matthew 9:13; 11:28; 22:4; <42446>Luke 14:16, 17).

5. To denote the extent of the divine invitation, to Gentiles as well as Jews, showing the universality of the call (<45924>Romans 9:24,.25). 6. To denote a condition in life (<46720>1 Corinthians 7:20, etc.).

(2.) Two questions arise as to the divine *call* to men,

(1.) Why do not all who receive it embrace it? and

(2) Why have not *all* mankind even yet had the invitation? In view of these questions, the old Lutheran divines speak of the *vocatio ordinaria directa* (the ordinary direct call) as being,

1. *Seria,* i.e. really meant as a call on God's part, as he desires and intends the salvation of all?. This is opposed to the Calvinistic view, which maintains that only such as are predestined to salvation are really called.

2. *Ejficax,* or better *Suffciens,* i.e. always adequate to the conversion, not only of those who heed the call, but of those who disregard it; and therefore,

3. *Resistibilis,* resistible, and not compulsory (Quenstedt, *Thed Did.* in); and also,

4. *Universalis,* universal. God called all the human race

(1.) in the promise of Christ to bruise the serpent's head (<010315>Genesis 3:15), given to the race through our first parents;

(2.) in Noah, the preacher of righteousness, a call to all *his* descendants (<010909>Genesis 9:9; <610205>2 Peter 2:5);

(3.) in the Gospel commission (<402819>Matthew 28:19; <411615>Mark 16:15; comp. <451018>Romans 10:18; <510106>Colossians 1:6; <441730>Acts 17:30).

The commission extended to "all the world," and its execution is declared to have been accomplished in <441730>Acts 17:30; <451018>Romans 10:18; <510106>Colossians 1:6, 23. The question whether even America was reached by the first preaching of Christianity is treated by Moebius'in his essay entitled *An ab Apostolis Evangelium etiam Americanisfuerit Annunciatum.* And where the ἀποστολή did not go, the ἐπιστολή did. As to the failure of men to receive and obey the divine call, it is not God's fault, but their own. He "calls," but they "will" not. In general, it may be assumed that wherever the Church of God is set up, men receive the divine call, and their responsibility is proportional to the degree of light which shines upon them (<401120>Matthew 11:20-24; 23:37; <421247>Luke 12:47, 48). The same *principle* applies to the case of heathen. Here also lies the dunt of the Church to send missions to the heathen.

(3.) The Calvinistic doctrine of *effectual calling* is Atlieu set forth in the *Westminster Confession:*

"**1.** All those whom God hath predestinated unto life, had those only, he is pleased, in his appointed and accepted time, effectually to call, by his Word and Spirit, out of that state of sin and death in which they are by nature, to grace and salvation by Jesus Christ; enlightening their minds spiritually and savingly to understand the things of God; taking away their heart of stone, and giving unto them a heart of flesh; renewing their wills, and by his *Almighty power determining them to that which is good;* and efectually drawing them to Jesus Christ, yet some as the same most freely, being made willing by his grace.

"**2.** This effectual call is of God's free and special grace alone, not from any thing at all foreseen in man, who is altogether passive therein, until, being quickened and renewed by the Holy Spirit, he is thereby enabled to answer this call, and to embrace the grace offered and conveyed in it.

"**3.** Elect infants, dying in infancy, are regenerated and saved by Christ through the Spirit, who worketh when, and where, and how he pleaseth. So also are all other elect persons, who are incapable of being outwardly called by the ministry of the Word.

"**4.** Others not elected, although they may be called by the ministry of the Word, and may have some *common operations* of the Spirit, yet they never truly come unto Christ, and therefore cannot be saved; *much less can men not professing the Christian religion be saved in any other manner whatsoever, be they ever so diligent to frame their lives according to the light of nature,* and the law of that religion they do profess; and to assert and maintain that they may is very pernicious, and to be detested."

The scriptural arguments for and against the doctrine are thus stated by Watson:

1. According to the Calvinistic view, "in the golden chain of spiritual blessings which the apostle enumerates in Romans 8:30, originating in the divine predestination, and terminating in the bestowment of eternal glory on the heirs of salvation, that of calling forms an important link. 'Moreover, whom he did predestinate, them he also called; and whom he called, them he also glorified.' Hence we readi of 'the called according to his purpose,' Romans 8:28. 'There is indeed a universal call of the Gospel to all men; for wherever it comes it is the voice of God to those

who hear it, calling them to repent and believe the divine testimony unto the salvation of their souls; and it leaves them inexcusable in rejecting it (<4003>John 3:14-19); but this universal call is not inseparably connected with salvation; for it is in reference to it that Christ says, ‘Many are called, but few are chosen’ (<4022>Matthew 22:14). But the Scripture also speaks of a calling which is effectual, and which consequently is more than the outward ministry of the Word; yea, more than some of its partial and temporary effects upon many who hear it, for it is always ascribed to God’s making his word effectual through the enlightening and sanctifying influences of his Holy Spirit. Thus it is said, ‘Paul may plant, and Apollos water, but God giveth the increase’ (<4603>1 Corinthians 3:6, *i).* Again, He is said to have ‘opened the heart of Lydia, that she attended to the doctrine of Paul’ (<4414>Acts 16:14). ‘No man can come unto Christ, except the Father draw him’ (<4006>John 6:44). Hence faith is said to be the gift of God (<4008>Ephesians 2:8; <5029>Philippians 1:29). The Spirit takes of the things of Christ and shows them to men (<4614>John 16:14), and thus opens their eyes, turning them from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God (<4618>Acts 26:18). And so God saves his people, not by works of righteousness which they have done, but according to his mercy, by the washing of regeneration and renewing of the ;Holy Spirit (<5305>Titus 3:5). Thus they are saved, and called with a holy calling, not according to their works, but according to the divine purpose and grace which was given them in Christ Jesus before the world began (<5009>2 Timothy 1:9).

“**2.** To this it is replied that this whole statement respecting a believer’s calling is without any support from the Scriptures. ‘To call’ signifies to invite to the blessings of the Gospel, to offer salvation through Christ, either by God himself, or, under his appointment, by his servants; and in the parable of the marriage of the king’s son (<4001>Matthew 22:1-14), which appears to have given rise, in many instances, to the use of this term in the epistles, we have three descriptions of ‘called’ or invited persons.

(1.) The disobedient, who would not come in at the call, but made light of it.,

(2.) The class of persons represented by the man who, when the king came in to see his guests, had not on the ‘wedding garment, and with respect to whom our Lord makes the general remark, ‘For many are called, but few are chosen;’ so that the persons thus represented by this individual culprit were not only ‘called,’ but actually came into the company.

(3.) The approved guests — those who were both called and chosen. As far as the simple calling or invitation is concerned, all stood upon equal ground — all were invited; and it depended upon their choice and conduct whether they embraced the invitation and were admitted as guests. We have nothing here to countenance the notion of what is termed ‘effectual calling.’ This implies an irresistible influence exerted upon all the approved guests, but withheld from the disobedient, who could not, therefore, be otherwise than disobedient, or, at most, could only come in without that wedding garment, which it was never put into their power to take out of the king’s wardrobe, and the want of which would necessarily exclude them, if not from the Church on earth, yet from the Church in heaven. The doctrine of Christ’s parables is in entire contradiction to this notion of irresistible influence; for they who refused and they who complied but partially with the calling are represented, not merely as being left without the benefit of the feast, but as incurring additional guilt and condemnation for refusing the invitation. It is to this offer of salvation by the Gospel, this invitation to spiritual and eternal benefits, that St. Peter appears to refer when he says, ‘For the *promise* is unto you and to your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall *call*’ (Acts 2:39); a passage which declares ‘the promise’ to be as extensive as the ‘calling,’ in other words, as the offer or invitation. To this also St. Paul refers (Romans 1:5, 6), ‘By whom we have received grace and apostleship, for obedience to the faith among all nations, for his name;’ that is, to publish his Gospel, in order to bring all nations to the obedience of faith; ‘among whom ye Ire also the *called* of Jesus Christ;’ you at Rome have heard the Gospel, and have been: invited to salvation in consequence of this design. This promulgation of the Gospel, by the personal ministry of the apostle, under the name of *calling*, is also referred to in Galatians 1:6, ‘I marvel that ye are so soon removed from him that *called you* into the grace of Christ,’ obviously meaning that it was he himself who had called them, by his preaching, to embrace the grace of Christ. So also in chap. 5:3, ‘For, brethren, ye have been *called* unto liberty.’ Again (1 Thessalonians 2:12), ‘That ye would walk worthy of God, who hath *called* you,’ invited you, ‘to his kingdom and glory.’

“**3.** In our Lord’s parable it will also be observed that the persons called are not invited as separate individuals to partake of solitary blessings; but they are called to ‘a feast,’ into a company or society, before whom the banquet is spread. The full revelation of the transfer of the visible Church of Christ

from Jews by birth to believers of all nations, was not, however, then made. When this branch of the evangelic system was fully revealed to the apostles, and taught by them to others, that part of the meaning of our Lord's parable which was not at first developed was more particularly discovered to his inspired followers. The calling of guests to the evangelical feast, we then more fully learn, was not the mere calling of mrren to partake of spiritual benefits, but calling them also to form a spiritual society composed of Jews and Gentiles, the believing men of all nations, to have a common fellowship in these blessings, and to be formed into this fellowship for the purpose of increasing their number, and diffusing the benefits of salvation among the people or nation to which they respectively belonged. The invitation, 'the calling,' of the first preachers was to all who heard them in Rome, in Ephesus, in Corinth, and other places; and those who embraced it, and joined themselves to the Church by faith, baptism, and continued public profession, were named, especially and eminently, 'the called,' because of their obedience to the invitation. They not only put in their claim to the blessings of Christianity individually, but became members of the new Church, that spiritual society of believers which God now visibly owned as his people. As they were thus called into a common fellowship by the Gospel, this is sometimes termed their 'vocation;' as the object of this Church state was to promote 'holiness,' it is termed a 'holy vocation;' as sanctity was required of the members, they were said to have been 'called to be saints;' as the final result was,' through the mercy of God, to be eternal life, we hear of 'the hope of their calling,' and of their being 'called to his eternal glory by Christ Jesus.'

"**4.** These views will abundantly explain the various passages in which the term *calling* occurs in the epistles: 'Even us whom he hath *called,* not of the Jews only, but also of the Gentiles' (⁴⁵0924 Romans 9:24); that is, whom he hath made members of his Church through faith. 'But unto them which are *called,* both Jews and Greeks, Christ the power of God and the wisdom of God;' the wisdom and efficacy of the Gospel being, of course, acknowledged in their very profession of Christ, in opposition to those to whom the preaching of 'Christ crucified' was 'a stumbling-block' and 'foolishness' (⁴⁶0124 1 Corinthians 1:24). 'Is any man *called'* (brought to acknowledge Christ, and to become a member of his Church), 'being circumcised? let him not become uncircumcised. Is any *called* in uncircumcision? let him not be circumcised' (⁴⁶0718 1 Corinthians 7:18). 'That ye walk worthy of the *vocation* wherewith ye are called. There is one body

and one Spirit, even as ye are *called in* one hope of your calling' (Ephesians 4:1, 4). 'That ye would walk worthy of God, who hath *called* you to his kingdom and glory' (1 Thessalonians 2:12). 'Through sanctification of the Spirit, and belief of the truth, whereunto he called you by our Gospel, to the obtaining of the glory of our Lord Jesus Christ' (2 Thessalonians 2:13, 14). 'Who hath saved us and *called* us with a holy calling; not according to our works, but according to his own purpose and grace, which was given us in Christ Jesus before the world began, but is now made manifest by the appearing of our Savior Jesus Christ' (2 Timothy 1:9, 10). On this passage we in by remark that the 'calling' and the 'purpose' mentioned in it must of necessity be interpreted to refer to the establishment of the Church on the principle of faith, so that it might include men of all nations; and not, as formerly, be restricted to natural descent. For *personal election* and a purpose *of effectual personal calling* could not have been hidden till manifested by the 'appearing of Christ,' since every instance of true conversion to God in any age prior to the appearing of Christ would be as much a manifestation of eternal election, and an instance of personal effectual calling, according to the Calvinistic scheme, as it was after the appearance of Christ. The apostle is speaking of a purpose of God, which was kept *secret* till revealed by the Christian system; and from various other parallel passages we learn that this secret, this 'mystery,' as he often calls it, was the union of the Jews and Gentiles in 'one body,' or Church, by faith.

"**5.** In none of these passages is the doctrine of the exclusive calling of a set number of men contained; and the Synod of Dort, as though they felt this, only attempt to *infer* the doctrine from a text already quoted, but which we will now more fully notice: 'Whom he did predestinate, them he also *called;* and whom he *called,* them he also justified; and whom he justified, them he also glorified' (Romans 8:30). This is the text on which the Calvinists chiefly rest their doctrine of effectual calling; and tracing it, as they say, through its steps and links, they conclude that a set and determinate number of persons having been predestinated unto salvation, this set number only are *called effectually,* then justified, and finally glorified. But this passage was evidently nothing to the purpose, unless it had spoken of a set and determinate number of men' as predestinated and called, independent of any consideration of their faith and obedience, which number, as being determinate, would, by consequence, exclude the rest. The context declares that those who are foreknown, and predestinated to

eternal glory, are true believers, those who 'love God,' as stated in a subsequent verse; for of such only the apostle speaks; and when he adds, 'Moreover, whom he did predestinate, them he also called, and whom he called, them he also justified, and whom he justified, them he also glorified,' he shows in particular how the divine purpose to glorify believers is carried into effect through all its stages. The great instrument of bringing men to 'love God' is the Gospel; they are, therefore, *called*, invited by it, to this state and benefit; the calling being obeyed, they are *justified;* and being justified, and continuing in that state of grace, they are *glorified.* Nothing, however, is here said to favor the conclusion that many others who were *called* by the Gospel, but refused, might not have been justified and glorified as well as they; nothing to distinguish this calling into common and effectual; and the very guilt which those are everywhere represented as contracting who despised the Gospel calling shows that they reject a grace which is sufficient, and sincerely intended, to save them." — Watson, *Institutes, 2:*352 sq.; Herzog, *Real Encyklopadiae, 2:*104; Nitzsch, *Christliche Lehre, §* 141; Warren, *Systenmt. Theologie,* p. 147.

III. A *call to the ministry* of the Gospel is regarded by Christians generally as proceeding from God; and the Church of England, the Protestant Episcopal Church, and the Methodist Episcopal Church, require of candidates for ordination an express profession that they trust they are so moved of the Holy Ghost. *SEE MINISTRY.*

IV. MINISTERIAL CALL is an invitation on the part of a congregation to a preacher to become their settled pastor. *SEE INSTALLATION.*

Callenberg, Johann Heinrich,

was born January 12, 1694, in Saxe-Gotha. He studied at Halle giving special attention to the Oriental languages, to which he was originally led by becoming a member of the *Collegium Orientale Theologicum,* which was established at Halle in 1702. He had for special tutor Solomon Negri, a learned Orientalist from Damascusi He was appointed professor *(extraord.)* of philosophy in 1727, and professor *(ordin.)* of theology in 1739. He became deeply interested in Protestant missions to the East, especially among the Jews and Mohammedans. In 1728 he organized a school for the education of missionaries; and he afterward established, at his own expense, a printing-office for the publication of works in German, Arabic, and Hebrew for the furtherance of the missionary cause. His students went

out over Europe as missionaries to the Jews, and some of them even to Asia and Africa. He printed in Arabic portions of the O.T., the whole of the N.T., Luther's *Shorter Catechism*, the *Imitation of Jesus Christ* ,(somewhat curtailed), portions of Grotius on the *Truth of the Christian Religion*, the *Rudiments of the Arabic Language*, and other works for the use of missionaries in the East. With a view to the conversion of the Jews, he wrote a *Kurze Anleitung zur Jiidisch-Teutschen Sprache* (Short Introduction to the Speech of the German Jews, 8vo, 1733), to which he added in 1736 a short dictionary of the corrupt Hebrew spoken among themselves by the Jews of Germany. In 1728-36 he published *Berichte von einem Versuch das Jiidische Volk zur Erkeisntniss des Christlichen anzuleiten* (3 vols. 8vo); in 1733, *De Conversione Muhammedanorum ad Christum expetita tentataque* (12mo). He continued writing, translating, and printing a variety of works useful for the missionaries till his death, which occurred at Halle, July 16, 1760. The mere list of his publications would fill a column, but they are not of sufficient scientific value to require enumeration here. But the name of Callenberg deserves always to be cherished in the Christian Church as that of one of the founders of Protestant missions, and of a devoted and self-sacrificing laborer in that cause. Doering, *Die Gelehrten Theologen Deutschlands, 1:*221 sq.; Hoefer, *Nouvelle Biographie Generale, 7:*202; Ersch und Gruber, *Allgemeine Encyclopddie, s.v.*

Callender, Elisha,

minister of the first Baptist church in Boston, was the son of Ellis Callender, who officiated as pastor of the First Baptist church in Boston for many years, dying about 1726, at about eighty years of age. The son, Elisha, was born in Boston, and graduated as bachelor of arts at Harvard College in 1710. He was baptized and admitted to church membership August 10, 1713, and was ordained as a Baptist minister May 21, 1718, and Drs. Increase and Cotton Mather and Mr. Webb, though of a different denomination, gave their assistance. It is said that Thomas Hollis (a Baptist) was so impressed by this catholic procedure when he heard of it in England, that he made his well-known benefactions to Harvard College in consequence. Mr. Callender abounded in labors not only in Boston, but throughout the commonwealth, till his death, March 31, 1738. He was the first American Baptist minister who had received a college education. — Sprague, *Annals, 6:*34; Allen, *Biographical Diet.* s.v.

Callender, John,

an eminent Baptist minister, nephew of Elisha Callender, was born about 1706, and graduated at Harvard College in 1723. He was ordained colleague with Mr. Peckham as pastor of the church at Newport, Oct. 13, 1731. Here he labored usefully for seventeen years, and died Jan. 26, 1748. He collected many papers relating to the history of the Baptists in this country, which were used by Backus. He published a *Historical Discourse on Rhode Island and Providence Plantations* (1739); also a *Sermon at the Ordination of Jeremiah Condy* (1739); and a *Sermon on the Death of Mr. Clap, of Neu-port* (1745). — Sprague, *Annals, 6:*37; Alien, *Biographical Dictionary,* s.v.

Calling

(κλῆσις, *vocatio),* a term used in theology to designate the divine invitation to man to share in the gift of salvation. *SEE CALL.*

Callirrhoë

(Καλλιῤῥόη, *beautftulstream),* the name given to certain warm springs on the eastern side of the Jordan, not far from, and flowing into, the Dead Sea, to which Herod the Great resorted during his last illness, by the advice of his physicians (Josephus, *Ant. 17:*6, 5). The same are probably meant by the *yemim’* (µwmyæ, Auth. Vers. “mules”) of <013624>Genesis 36:24. *SEE ANAH.* Pliny (<013616>Genesis 36:16) also describes them (“calidus fons medics salubritatis”) as possessing medicinal properties (Reland, *Palest.* p. 302, 678). In May, 1818, these springs were visited by Irby and Mangles. Of the valley of Callirrhoe they say *(Travels,* p. 467-469): “The whole bottom is filled, and in a manner choked up, with a crowded thicket of canes and aspens of different species, intermixed with the palm, which is also seen rising in tufts in the recesses of the mountain’s side in every place whence the springs issue. In one place a considerable stream of hot water is seen precipitating itself from a high and perpendicular shelf of rock, which is strongly tinted with the brilliant yellow of sulphur deposited upon it. On reaching the bottom, we found ourselves at what may be termed a hot river, so copious and rapid is it, and its heat so little abated. For some way the temperature is kept up by the constant supplies of water that flow into the river. In order to visit these sources in succession, we crossed over to the right bank, and, ascending by the mountain side, we passed four

abundant springs, all within the distance of half a mile, discharging themselves into the stream at right angles with its course. We judged the distance from the Dead Sea, by the ravine, to be about one hour and a half. Maclean says there was a city of the same name in the valley of Callirrhoe, in which we think he must be wrong, since there is not space for a town in the valley as far as we saw it. That Herod must have had some lodging when he visited these springs is true, and there are sufficient remains to prove that some sort of buildings have been erected." According to Josephus, the fortress of Machaerus, which was rebuilt by Herod, was upon this hot-water stream, and not far from the fountains. It is supposed that John the Baptist was imprisoned and beheaded in this fortress, and that the feast was also made at Machaerus, which, besides being a strong-hold, was also a palace, built by Herod the Great, and that Herod himself was now on his route toward the territory of Aretas, with whom he was at war. The ruins of this fortress still exist (Josephus, *Ant.* 17:6, 5; 18:5, 2; *War*, 1:33, 5). The Zurka Main, which empties itself into the Dead Sea, visited and described by Seetzen *(Reise, 2:*336 sq.), is described as a sweet and thermal stream, and is doubtless the outlet of the hot streams of Callirrhoe (Ritter, *Erdk.* 15:572, 573). Lieut. Lynch, who explored it in 1848, says: "The stream, twelve feet wide and ten inches deep, rushes in a southerly direction with great velocity into the sea. Temperature of the air, 700; of the sea, 78°; of the stream, 94°; one mile of the chasm, 95°. It was a little sulphureous to the taste. The stream has worn its bed through the rock, and flows between the perpendicular sides of the chasm, and through the delta, bending to the south, about two furlongs, to the sea. The banks of the stream along the delta are fringed with canes, tamarisks, and the castor-bean. The chasm is 122 feet wide at the mouth, and for one mile up, as far as we traced it, does not lessen in width. The sides of the chasm are about eighty feet high where it opens upon the delta, but within they rise in altitude to upward of 150 feet on each side, where the trap formation is exhibited. In the bed of the chasm there was one stream, on the south side, eight feet wide and two deep, and two small streams in the center, all rushing down at the rate of six knots per hour. There were no boulders in the bed of the ravine, which in the winter must, throughout its width and high up the sides, pour down an impetuous flood. The walls of the chasm are lofty and perpendicular, of red and yellow sandstone, equally majestic and imposing, but not worn in such fantastic shapes nor of so rich a hue as those of the Arnon. Waded up about a mile, and saw a few date-palm-trees growing in the chasm. The turns about 200 yards apart, at first gently

rounded, but subsequently sharp and anmular. There was a succession of rapids, and a cascade of four, and a perpendicular fall of five or six feet. A little above the rapid trap shows over sandstone. The current was so strong that, while bathing, I could not, with my feet against the rock; keep from being carried down the stream,; and, walking where it was but two feet deep, could with difficulty retain a foothold with my shoes off. At 7 P.M., bathed first in the sea and afterward in the stream — a most delicious transition from the dense, acrid water of the sea, which made our innumerable sores smart severely, to the soft, tepid, and refreshing waters of the Callirrhoe" *(Expedition*, p. 371). *SEE LASHA.*

Callis'thenes

(Καλλισθένης, a frequent Greek name), a partisan of Nicanor, who was burnt by the Jews on the defeat of that general in revenge for his guilt in setting fire to "the sacred portals" (2 Macc. 8:33). — Smith, s.v. *SEE NICANOR.*

Callistus.

SEE CALIXTUS I.

Calmet, Augustine,

a learned Benedictine, of the congregation of St. Vannes, born at Mesnil-la-Horgne Feb. 26, 1672. He studied at Breuil, and after having pronounced the vows in Oct., 1689, he proceeded to make his course of philosophy at the abbey of St. Ev;r, and afterward devoted himself to Hebrew, which he studied under Fabre, a Reformed divine. In 1704 he passed to the abbey of Munster, where he taught the young monks; and lectures which he there read to them formed the basis of his "Commentaries on the Old and New Testaments," which he wrote in Latin, but translated into French, and published in 1707 and 1716, in 23 volumes 4to. This work was followed by his *Histoire Sainte de 'Ancien et Nouveau Testament*History of the Old and New Testaments (Paris, 1718, 2 vols. 4to), and his celebrated *Dictionary of the Bible.* In 1718 he was made abbot of St. Leopold's at Nancy, and ten years after he was removed to the abbey of Senones, where he died (having refused a bishopric *in partibus)* Oct. 25, 1757. His *Life* was written by Fange, his nephew (1763, 8vo), where a complete list of his numerous works will be found. The best edition (French) of the *Diet 'onnaire historique et critique de la Bible* is

that of Paris, 1730 (4 vols. fol.). The best English editions are those of 1793 (4to, with additions) and of 1847 (edited by Taylor, 5 vols. 4to). His *Coqnmentc ire litteral sur tons les livres de l'A ncien et du Nouveau Testament* (reprinted at Paris, 1713, 26 vols. 4to, also 9 vols. fol.) was abridged, and published in 17 vols. 4to, at Avignon, 1767-1773; also translated into Latin, with the *Dissertatiozns,* by Manse (Wirceb. 1789, 19 vols. 4to). Calmet's *Dictionary of the Bible* has, until lately, formed the basis of all subsequent works of the same kind. The best abridgment is that of Robinson, whose additions are perhaps, to the modern student, of more value than the original work. — *Biog. Unziv.* 6:559; Landon, *Ecclesiastes Dict. 2:*497. *SEE DICTIONARIES (BIBLICAL).*

Cal'neh

(Hebrews *Kalneh',* הנלכ; Sept. Χαλάννη), the fourth of Nimrod's cities (Genesis 10:10), and probably not different from the CALNO (Hebrews *Kalzo',* ונלכ; Sept. Χαλάνη) of Isaiah 10:9, or the CANNEH (Hebrews *Kanneh',* הנכ; Sept. Χανάα) of Ezekiel 27:23. The word is thought to mean "the fort of the god *Ana* or *Ann,"* who was one of the chief objects of Babylonian worship. According to the Chaldee translation, with which Eusebius and Jerome agree, this is the same place that was subsequently called *Ctesiphon.* It lay on the Tigris, opposite Seleucia, and was for a time the capital of the Parthians, and the winter residence of the Parthian kings (Strabo, xvi, p. 312; Cellarii *Notit. 2:*774; see Bochart, *Phaleg, 4:*18; Michaelis, *Spicil(g. 1:*228). This opinion respecting Calneh derives some support from the circumstance that the district named Ctesiphon was called by the Greeks *Chalonitis* (Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* 6:26, 27; Polyb. 5:44); but, on the other hand, this province does not appear to have extended so far west as Calneh must have lain. Ammianus Marcellinus (23:6, 23) states that it was the Persian king Pacorus (who reigned from A.D. 71 to 107) who changed the name of the city to Ctesiphon; but that name must have been more ancient, as it is mentioned by Polybius. In the time of the prophet Amos Calnch appears to have constituted an independent principality (Amos 6:2; Sept. omits, v. r. Καλάνη or Χαλάννη); but not long after it became, with the rest of Western Asia, a prey to the Assyrians (Isaiah 10:9). About 150 years later, Calneh was still a considerable town, as may be inferred from its being mentioned by Ezekiel (Ezekiel 27:23) among the places which traded with Tyre. We may gather from Scripture that in the eighth century B.C. Calneh was

taken by one of the Assyrian kings, and never recovered its prosperity. Hence it is compared with Carchemish, Hamath, and Gath (Isaiah 10:9; Aimos 6:2), and regarded as a proof of the resistless might of Assyria. The site of Ctesiphon was afterward occupied by *Jl-Madain,* i.e. *the (two) cities,* of which the only remains are the ruins of a remarkable palace called *Tauk-kesra,* or "Arch of Khosroes," some mounds of rubbish, and a considerable extent of massive wall toward the river. (See Smith's *Dict. of Class. Geog.* s.v. Ctesiphon.)

More recent explorers have rendered it probable that the site of Calneh is the modern *NiAer,* which was certainly one of the early capitals, and which, under the name of *Nopher,* the Talmud identities with Calneh (see the *Yoma).* Arab traditions made Niffer the original Babylon, and said that it was the place where Nimrod endeavored to mount on eagles' wings to heaven. Similarly the Sept. speak of Calneh or Calno as "the place where the tower was built" (Isaiah 10:9). Niffer is situated about sixty miles E.S.E. of Babylon, in the marshes on the left bank of the Euphrates. It has been visited and explored by Mr. Layard (Min. *and Bab.* p. 468 sq.), and is thus described by Mr. Loftus *(Chaldcea,* p. 101): 'The present aspect of Niffer is that of a lofty platform of earth and rubbish, divided into two nearly equal parts by a deep channel — apparently the bed of a river — about 120 feet wide. Nearly in the center of the eastern portion of this platform are the remains of a brick tower of early construction, the *debris* of which constitutes a conical mound rising seventy feet above the plain. This is a conspicuous object in the distance, and exhibits, when the brick-work is exposed; oblong perforations similar to those seen at BirsNimrud and other edifices of the Babylonian age. The western division of the platform has no remarkable feature, except that it is strewed with fragments of pottery, and other relics of a later period than the tower just alluded to. At the distance of a few hundred yards on the east of the ruins may be distinctly traced a low continuous mound, the remains probably of the external wall of the ancient city. As to the obelisk, the particular object of my visit, the Arabs positively declared that there was one, but none of them had seen it or could indicate its position on the mounds." *SEE CANNEH.*

Cal'no

(Isaiah 10:9). *SEE CALNEH.*

Calogeri.

SEE CALOYERS.

Caloviu (Or Calov), Abrahiam,

a celebrated Lutheran divine and controversialist, was born in 1612 at Mohrungen in Prussia. He studied at Konigsber and Rostock, and became Professor of Theology at Wittemberg, where he obtained great distinction as a lecturer and controversial theologian. He died Feb. 25, 1686. He was a violent opponent of George Calixtus, whose gentleness he by no means shared. Indeed, so bitter was Calov's zeal, that it has been said of him that "he was born for an inquisitor." He wrote with great ability against the Socinians. His most important work was his *Biblia Illustrata* (Dresden, 1719, 4 vols. fol.), which contains the whole of Grotius's *Annotations,* with severe criticisms on them. In dogmatic theology he prepared a vast *Systema Locorum Theologicorum* (1655-1677, 12 tom.). In the Syncretistic controversy (q.v.) he took the most conspicuous part. His writings are very voluminous, nearly all bitterly controversial, and now little read. — Mosheim, *Ch. Hist. 2:*241; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* s.v.

Caloyers Or Calogeri.

The word *Calogeri* is from the Greek (καλόγεροι), and means *good old men.* The name *Caloyers* is of similar signification, and is generally given to the monks of the Greek Church. They are of the order of St. Basil, and consider it to be a sin to follow any other order than his. They are divided into three degrees: the novices, who are called *Archari;* the ordinary professed, called *Microchemi;* and the more perfect, called *Megalochemi.* They are likewise divided into Coenobites, Anchorites, and Recluses. The Ccenobites are employed in reciting their offices from midnight to sunset; and as it is impossible, in so long an exercise, that they should not be overtaken with sleep, there is one monk appointed to awake them; and they are obliged to make three genufiexions at the door of the choir, and, returning, to bow to the right and left to their brethren. The Anchorites retire from the world, and live in hermitages in the neighborhood of the monasteries; they cultivate a little spot of ground, and never go out but on Sundays and holidays, to perform their devotions at the next monastery. The Recluses shut themselves up in grottoes and caverns on the tops of mountains, which they never leave, abandoning themselves entirely to Providence. They live on the alms sent them by the neighboring

monasteries. The Caloyers have four Lents. The first and greatest is that of the resurrection or Easter: it lasts eight weeks, and is called the Grand Quarantain. During this Lent the monks drink no wine; and such is their abstinence that, if they are obliged, in speaking, to name milk, butter, or cheese, they always add this parenthesis, “Saving the respect due to the holy Lent.” The second Lent is that of the holy apostles, which begins eight days after Whitsunday: it generally continues three weeks, sometimes longer. During this Lent the monks are allowed to drink wine. The third Lent is that of the assumption of the Virgin: it lasts fourteen days, during which they abstain from fish, except on Sundays and on the transfiguration of our Lord. ‘he fourth Lent is that of the Advent. The Caloyers, in addition to the usual monkish habit, wear over their shoulders a square piece of stuff, on which are represented the cross and the other marks of Christ’s passion, with these letters: IC. XC. NC. Ἰησοῦς Χριστος νικῷ, *Jesus Clrist conquers.* The inscription was sometimes written thus: IC. XC. NI KA; and we find it occasionally arranged, especially on coins, in the form of a cross, thus, H.A. Visitors or exarchs are placed over them, who visit the convents only to draw from them sums of money which the patriarch demands. Yet, notwithstanding these monks are compelled to pay both to their patriarch and to the Turks, their convents are very rich. They have many monasteries in Asia, on Mount Sinai, and in Palestine; in Europe, n ar Athens, in Chios, and in Amourgo, one of the Sporades, also on Mount Athos. Those on Mount Athos are the most celebrated, and are twenty-three in number. There are female Caloyers, or Greek nuns, who follow the rule of St. Basil. Their nunneries are always dependent on some monastery. *SEE ATHOS; SEE GREEK CHURCH.*

Cal’phi

(ὁ Χαλφί, v. r. Χαλφεί, perhaps for *A lpheus* [q.v.], Josephus Χαψαῖος, *Ant.* 13:5, 7), father of Judas, which latter was one of the two captains (ἄρχοντες) of Jonathan’s army who remained firm at the battle of Gennesar (1 Macc. 11:70).

Calvarists, Or Missionary Priests Of Calvary,

a monastic congregation, established in 1630 by Hubert Charpentier, licentiate of the Sorbonne, on Mount Bethasam, in France, for propagating Romanism by missions. In 1638 they united with the Association for the Propagation of Faith, from which they separated again in 650. In 1664 they

were re-formed, and united with the congregation of St. Sulpice. The congregation disappeared in 1790, but arose again in 18 6.

Cal´vary,

Picture for Cal'vary

a word occurring in the Auth. Vers. only in Luke 23:33, and there not as a proper name, but arising from the translators having literally adopted the word *czlvaria*, i.e. a bare *skull*, the Latin word by which the κρανίον of the evangelists is rendered in the Vulgate, κρανίον, again, being nothing but the Greek interpretation of the Hebrew GOLGOTHA *SEE GOLGOTHA* (q.v.).

1. *Import of the Name.* — Many have held that Golgotha was the place of public execution, the Tyburn of Jerusalem, and that hence it was termed the "place of a skull." Another opinion is that the place took its name from its shape, being a hillock of a form like a human skull. It is true, there is no express mention of a mount in either of the narratives. *SEE CRUCIFIXION.* That the place, however, was of some such shape seems to be generally agreed, and the traditional term *mount*, applied to Calvary, appears to confirm this idea. Such a shape, too, it must be allowed, is in entire agreement with the name, that is, "skull." To these considerations there are added certain difficulties which arise from the other explanation. So far as we know, there is no historical evidence to show that there was a place of public execution where Golgotha is commonly fixed, nor that any such place, in or near Jerusalem, bore the name Golgotha. Nor is the term Golgotha descriptive of such a place; to make it so, to any extent, the name should have been "skulls," or "the place of skulls." Equally unapt is the manner in which the writers of the Gospel speak of the place: Matthew calls it "a place called Golgotha; that is to say, a place of a skull;" Mark, "the place Golgotha, which is, being interpreted, the place of a skull;" Luke, "the place which is called Calvary;" John, "a place called of a skull, which is called in the Hebrew Golgotha." In truth, the context seems to show that the Roman guard hurried Jesus away and put him to death at the first convenient spot; and that the rather because there was no small fear of a popular insurrection, especially as he was attended by a crowd of people. This place, we may suppose, was not far from the judgment-hall, which was doubtless either near Fort Antonia or in the former palace of Herod. *SEE PRAETORIUM.* In either case, the crucifixion would most naturally

have occurred at the *north-west* of the city. Somewhere in the north, it is clear, they would execute him, as thus they would most easily effect their object. But if they chose the north, then the road to Joppa or Damascus would be most convenient, and no spot in the vicinity would probably be so suitable as the slight rounded elevation which bore the name of Calvary. That some hillock would be preferred it is easy to see, as thus the exposure of the criminal and the alleged cause of his crucifixion would be most effectually secured. Dr. Barclay is at great pains to show *(City of the Great King,* p. 78 sq.) that the vicinity of the garden of Gethsemane is the more probable location of Calvary, but his arguments are made up of a series of the most uncritical conjectures. Indeed, the very fact that of the arbitrary positions assigned by all those who (chiefly from an ultra Protestant prejudice apparently) reject the traditionary site, no two agree, while all are alike destitute of any historical basis, is an important evidence in favor of the current identification. *SEE JERUSALEM.*

2. *Scriptural Notices of the Locality.* — The account in the evangelists touching the place of the crucifixion and burial of our Lord is as follows: Having been delivered by Pilate to be crucified, Jesus was led away, followed by a great company of people and women, who bewailed his fate. On the way the soldiers met one Simeon, a Cyrenian, *coming out of the country,* who was compelled to bear Jesus's cross. When they were come to the place which is called Calvary, there they crucified him. This place was nigh to the city; and, sitting down, they watched him there. They that passed by reviled him, wagging their heads and scoffing. Likewise also the chief priests mocked him, with the scribes and elders, and the people stood beholding. The soldiers, too, mocked him. There stood by the cross of Jesus his mother, and his mother's sister, and Mary Magdalene; and all his acquaintance, and the women that followed him from Galilee, stood afar off, beholding these things. *In the place where he was crucified there* was a garden, and in the garden a new sepulcher hewn out in the rock; *there* laid they Jesus, and rolled a great stone to the door of the sepulcher. The writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews adds that Jesus suffered *without the gate,* subjoining, "Let us therefore go forth to him without the camp (or the city), bearing his reproach" (Hebrews 13:11, 13). We thus learn that the crucifixion and burial took place out of the city, and yet nigh to the city, apparently at the north-west, and probably just on the outer side of the second wall. It is also clear that the place was one around which many persons could assemble, near which wayfarers were passing, and the

sufferers in which could be seen or addressed by persons who were both near and remote; all which concurs in showing that the spot was one of some elevation, and equally proves that “this thing was not done in a corner,” but at a place and under circumstances likely to make Calvary well known and well remembered alike by the foes and the friends of our Lord.

3. *Line of Tradition respecting the Spot.* — Was it likely that this recollection would perish? Surely, of all spots, Calvary would become the most sacred, the most endearing in the primitive Church. Nor did the Jew, with his warm gushing affections, feel on such a point less vividly than his fellow-men. “The tombs of the prophets,” “the sepulcher of David,” were we read (<40 23 29>Matthew 23:29; <44 2 29>Acts 2:29), reverentially regarded and religiously preserved from age to age. That of “David’s Lord” would assuredly not be neglected. It was a season of public religious festivity when our Lord suffered. Jerusalem was then crowded with visitors from foreign parts. Such, too, was the fact at the time of the effusion of the Holy Spirit. These pilgrims, however, soon returned home, and wherever they went many carried with them the news of the crucifixion of Jesus, and told of the place where he had been executed. Perhaps no one spot on earth had ever so many to remember it and know its precise locality as the place where Jesus died and rose again. First in Jerusalem, and soon in all parts of the earth, were there hearts that held the recollection among their most valued treasures. Accordingly, we learn from the passage in Hebrews that, far on in the first century, the tradition was preserved in so living a form as to be made the subject of a figurative illustration of Christian doctrine. The memory of distinguished places is among the least perishable of earthly-things. Fathers would convey their knowledge and their impressions to sons; one generation and one Church to another. The passage in the Hebrews would tend to keep alive the recollection. Moreover, it was the fate of Jerusalem, after its capture by the Romans, to become a heathen city; even its name was changed into Colonia AElia Capitolina. In the excess of their triumphant joy, the conquerors made Jupiter its patron god, and erected statues of Jupiter and Venus on the place where Jesus had been crucified (Solomon, 11:1). This was done perhaps not so much to insult as to conciliate. New-comers in religion have always availed themselves of established feelings, and therefore erected their sacred edifices on places already consecrated in the minds of the people. The mere fact of a temple to Venus standing on Calvary suffices to show that Calvary was the place where Jesus suffered. The temple thus takes up the tradition, and transmits

it in stone and marble to coming ages. This continuation of the tradition is the more important, because it begins to operate at a time when the Christians were driven from Jerusalem. but the absence of the Christians from the Holy City was not of long duration, and even early in the third century we find pilgrimages from distant places to the Holy Land had already begun for the express purpose of viewing the spots which the presence and sufferings of the Savior had rendered sacred and memorable *(Hist. zierosol.* p. 591; Euseb. *Hist. Fccies. 6:*11). A century later, Eusebius (A.D. 315) informs us that Christians visited Jerusalem from all regions of the earth for the same object. Early in the fourth century, Eusebius and Jerome write down the tradition and fix the locality of Calvary in their writings. Eusetius was born at Caesarea in Palestine about A.D. 270. In 315 he became a bishop in his native country, and died in 340. He was a learned man, and wrote a history of the Christian Church. About 330 he composed his *Onomasticon,* which was expressly devoted ‘to the business of determining and recording the sites of holy and other places in Palestine. This work of Eusebius, written in Greek, Jerome afterward translated into Latin, and thus added his authority to that of Eusebius. Jerome took up his residence in the Holy Land in the latter part of the fourth century, and remained there till his death. (For an estimate of the value of these geographical authorities, see Reland, *Palcest.* p. 467 sq.) Pilgrims now streamed to Jerusalem from all parts of the world, and that site was fixed for Golgotha which has remained to the present hour.

4. *Erection of the “Church of the Holy Sepulchre” over the Site.* — The acts of the Emperor Constantine and his mother Helena gave a permanent and public expression to this tradition. This empress, when very far advanced in life, visited Jerusalem for the express purpose of erecting a church on the spot where the Lord Jesus had been crucified. The preceding details show that the preservation of the memory of the locality was any thing but impossible. Helena would naturally be solicitous to discover the true spot, whence ensues the likelihood that she was not mistaken. She had previously heard that the holy places had been heaped up and concealed by the heathen, and resolved to attempt to bring them to light, εἰς φῶς ἀγαγεῖν (Theoph. in *Chron.* p. 18). “On her arrival at Jerusalem, she inquired diligently of the inhabitants. Yet the search was uncertain and difficult, in consequence of the obstructions by which the heathen had sought to render the spot unknown. These being all removed, the sacred sepulcher was discovered, and by its side three crosses, with the tablet

bearing the inscription written by Pilate" (Robinson, *Bibl. Res. 2:*14; Theodoret, 1:17). This account of her proceedings, taken from one who labors to bring into discredit the whole of Helena's proceedings, and who is far too indiscriminate and sweeping in his hostility to the *primitive* traditions of the Church, shows sufficiently that Helena was cautious in her proceedings; that there did exist a tradition on the subject; that by that tradition the empress was guided; and that she found reason to fix the site of Calvary on the spot where the heathen had erected their temple and set up their profane rites. That no small portion of the marvelous, not to say legendary and incredible, is mixed up in the accounts which the ecclesiastical historians have given, we by no means deny; but we see no reason whatever, and we think such a course very unphilosophical, to throw doubt unsparingly over the whole, as (by no means in the best taste) does Dr. Robinson. However, on the site thus ascertained, was erected, whether by Constantine or Helena, certainly by Roman influence and treasure, a splendid and extensive Christian temple. Socrates *(Ecclesiastes Hist. 1:*17) says, 'The emperor's mother erected over the place where the sepulcher was a most magnificent church, and called it New Jerusalem, building *it opposite to that old* deserted Jerusalem" (comp. Eusebo *Vit. Const.* in, 33). This church was completed and dedicated A.D. 335. It was a great occasion for the Christian world. In order to give it importance and add to its splendor, a council of bishops was convened, by order of the emperor, from all the provinces of the empire, which assembled first at Tyre and then at Jerusalem. Among them was Eusebius, who took part in the solemnities, and held several public discourses in the Holy City (Euseb. *Vit. Const.;* Robinson, 2:13). The Church of the Holy Sepulchre was burnt by the Persians in A.D. 614. It was shortly after rebuilt by Modestus with resources supplied by John Eleemor, patriarch of Alexandria. The basilica or martyrion erected under Constantine remained as before. The Mohammedans next became masters of Jerusalem. At length Harfin er-Rashid made over to Charlemagne the jurisdiction of the holy sepulcher. Palestine again became the scene of battles and bloodshed. Muez, of the race of the Fatimites, transferred the seat of his empire to Cairo when Jerusalem fell into the hands of new masters, and the holy sepulcher is said to have been again set on fire. It was fully destroyed at the command of the third of the Fatimite caliphs in Egypt, the building being razed to the foundations. In the reign of his successor it was rebuilt, being completed A.D. 1048; but instead of the former magnificent basilica over the place of Golgotha, a small chapel only now graced the spot. The Crusades soon

began. The Crusaders regarded the edifices connected with the sepulcher as too contracted, and erected a stately temple, the walls and general form of which are admitted to remain to the present day (Robinson, 2:61). So recently, however, as A.D. 1808, the church of the holy sepulcher was partly consumed by fire; but, being rebuilt by the Greeks; it now offers no traces of its: recent desolation.

5. *Objections to the Identification. The* sole evidence of any weight in the opposite balance is that urged by lobinson, that the place of the crucifixion and the sepulcher are now found in the midst of the modern city. But, to render this argument decisive, it should be proved that the city, occupies now the same ground that it occupied in the days of Christ. It is, at least, as likely that the city should have undergone changes as that the site of the crucifixion should have been mistaken. The identity of such a spot is more likely to be preserved than the size and relative proportions of a city which has undergone more violent changes than probably any other place on earth. The present walls of Jerusalem were erected so late as A.D. 1542; and Robinson himself remarks that a part of Zion is now left out (p. 67). If, then, the city has been contracted on the south, and if, also, it was after the death of Christ expanded on the north, what should we expect but to find Golgotha in the midst of the modern city?

Jerusalem, in the days of Christ, had two walls, termed the “first” and the “second.” It is with the second wall that we are here chiefly concerned. It began at a tower, named Gennath, of the first wall, curved outward to the north, and ended at the castle of Antonia. The third wall embraced a wide suburb on the north and north-west. This comprehended a sort of new city, and was built in consequence of the large population which by degrees fixed their abode in the space which falls between the second and third walls. This wall was begun under Claudius, at least forty-one years after Christ (Josephus, *War,* 5:4, 2; comp. Tacit. *Hist.* 5:12). This third wall, then, did not exist in the time of our Lord; and Robinson allows that if the present site of the sepulcher fell without the second wall, all the conditions of the general question would be satisfied. Many travelers and antiquarians have decided that this was the case, while others, more numerous perhaps, but not better qualified to judge, have come to the opposite conclusion. *SEE JERUSALEM (Topography).* (It is worthy of remark that Dr. Kiepert, of Berlin, the most experienced cartographer probably, especially on this and kindred subjects, has vacillated on this point in the maps of his own construction, some of them including and others excluding the contested

site along the course of the wall in question.) The whole question turns upon the position of the gate Gennath: if this was at the extreme northwest angle of Zion, then the second wall, in order to be at all "circling" (κυκλούμενον), could not well have excluded the site in question; but if, as is more probable, it was some distance east of the tower Hippicus (fo$_r$ while Josephus, *ut sup.*, expressly begins the first and third walls from this *tower*, he begins the second from this *gate*, situated along the northern part of the first wall), then the second wall could hardly have bent sufficiently to the west to include it. *SEE GENNATH.* The city bulred out on the north, as it contracted on the south, thus bringing Golgotha into its central parts. Robinson, however, asserts that the second wall must either have excluded the Pool of Hezekiah, which (as he thinks) was in the city, or included the site of the sepulcher, which was out of the city. This alternative, however, although by no means a fatal objection, is not absolutely necessary, as may be seen on reference to various plans of the city that have been constructed, in which the second wall leaves both where the Scriptures place them. *SEE HEZEKIAH'S POOL.* But the distance from the western point of the Temple to the present site of the sepulcher Robinson considers insufficient, it being only about a quarter of a mile. We know not that there is any thing in scriptural account which gives support to this notion. A distance of a quarter of a mile appears quite enough for the recorded events, to say nothing of the essential weakness of such a position; for how can Robinson know that his measures extended along the same ground as our Lord was hurried over? But reason has already, been given why the Jews should have taken no very protracted course.

Two or three additional facts in confirmation of the identity of the present place may finally be adduced. Buckingham *(Palest.* p. 283) says, "The present rock called Calvary, and enclosed within the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, bears marks in every part that is naked of its having been a round nodule of rock standing above the common level of the surface." Scholz *(De Golgotha situ,* p. 9) states that he traced the remains of a wall, which ran as the second wall on the plan runs, excluding Golgotha, and taking in the Pool of Hezekiah (Raumer, p. 352). It may also be remarked that, since the publication of Robinson's work, Raumer has put forth a piece *(Beitrige zur Bib. Geog.* 1843), in which he revises his *Pa;istisca* so far as Rolinson's ascertained results render necessary; but lie remains of the same opinion in regard to the possibility of the present Church of the Sepulchre being out of the city. At most, a very few hundred yards only

can the original Golgotha have lain from the present site, and the evidence in favor of its identity, if not decisive, is far stronger than any that has been adduced against it. At the best, then, very small is the reason for disturbing the convictions and distressing the hearts of the sincere believers who visit the Holy Sepulchre in order to give vent to their tearful gratitude and cherish their pious faith. A similar conclusion is warmly contended for by Dr. Olin *(Travels in the East,* 2:276 sq.), and still more at length by Mr. Williams *(Holy, City,* vol. 2, ch. 1 and 2). It is also ably examined and maintained by Thrupp *(Ancient Jerusalem,* Lond. 1855). It has, however, been either stoutly denied or lightly sneered at by many other writers, who may be styled as belonging to the modern and traditionary school. At the head of these is Dr. Robinson, who takes every occasion to impugn the authenticity of scriptural localities in general, ‘as now pointed out. *SEE GOLGOTHA; SEE SEPULCHRE OF CHRIST.*

Calvary, The,

a name given in Roman Catholic countries to “a representation of the various scenes of the passion and crucifixion of our Lord, either in a chapel, or external to the church, as at St. Jacques, at Antwerp. It consists of three crosses with the figures of Christ and the thieves, usually as large as life, surrounded by a number of figures, representing the various personages who took part in the crucifixion. At Aix-la-Chapelle, the Calvary is a church on the top of a hill, surrounded by twelve sculptured stones, each marking an event which took place on the journey of the Savior to Mount Calvary. The approach to the Calvary is called the. *Via, - Dolorosa,* each of the stones marking what is called a station, at which the pious say a prayer in passing.”

Calvary, Congregation Of Our Lady Of,

an order of Benedictine nuns, originally founded at Poitiers by Antoinette of Orleans, of the house of Longueville. Pope Paul V confirmed this order in 1617; and in the same year the foundress took possession of a; convent newly built at Poitiers, with twenty-four nuns of the order of Fontevrault. In 1620 Mary de Medicis removed these nuns to Paris, and established then near the Luxembourg Palace. The design of their establishment was to honor the mystery of the sorrows of the Virgin for the sufferings of Christ, and some or other of the nuns were compelled to be day and night before the cross. Toward the close of the last century the order counted about

twenty convents, all of which were destroyed by the French Revolution. Since that time, a convent in Paris, and several more in other parts of France, have been restored.

Calvert, John P.,

a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Belmont county, Ohio, October 23, 1833; studied at the Ohio University, and was admitted on trial as a preacher in the Ohio Conference in 1858. When the American civil war broke out in 1861, no less than six of his brothers entered the army, and he soon after felt it his duty to follow them. At the battle of Shiloh, Aug. 7, 1862, he was wounded, and on the following Sunday he died. He had been very useful in the army, preaching and holding prayer-meetings whenever opportunity afforded. — *Minutes of Conferences*, 1862, p. 138.

Calves.

SEE CALF.

Calvin, John,

one of the most eminent of the Reformers.

1. *Sketch of his Life.* — He was born at Noyon, July 10th, 1509, his father, Gerard Chauvin, being a notary. He was from the first educated for the Church, and before he was twelve years old was presented to a benefice in the Cathedral of Noyon. Six years after this he was appointed to a cure of souls at Montiille, and thus, although not yet twenty, and not even in the minor orders, he was enjoying the title and revenues of a cure. His father now changed his mind as to the destination of his son, and desired him to turn his attention to the law as the road to wealth. This change was not unacceptable to Calvin, who, from his perusal of the Scripturess — a copy of which was furnished him by Robert Olivetan, who was his fellowscholar at Paris, and likewise a native of Nyovn — had already been convinced of many of the errors of the KRonish Church. He accordingly repaired to Olleans, where he studied under Peter Stella, and then to Bruges, where Andrew Alciat filled tie chair of law, and where also *AMelchior Wolnar;* the l'eforil;er, taught him Greek. Here Calvin was confirmed in the doctrines of the Reformation, and began indeed to preach them in the villages. His father, however, dying, he returned to Noyosn, but after a

short period went to Paris, where, in 1532, he published commentaries on Seneca's two books, *De Clementia.*

"He now resigned his benefices, and devoted himself to divinity. In 1533, Cop, the rector of the University of Paris, having occasion to read a discourse on the festival of All Saints, Calvin persuaded him to declare his opinion on the new doctrines. This brought upon them both the indignation of the Sorbonne, and they were forced to leave the city. Calvin /went to several places, and at length to Angouleme, where he got shelter in the house of Louis du Tallet, a canon of Angoul(me, and supported himself sometime by teaching Greek. There he composed the greater part of his *Institutes of the Christiana Religion, which* were published in 15;,6. The Queen of Navarre, sister to Francis I, having shown him some countenance in respect for his learning and abilities, he returned to Paris in 1534 under her protection, but quitted France the same year, having first published *Psychopannychia,* to confute the error of those who held that the soul remained in a state of sleep between death and the resurrection. He retired to Baslc, where he published the *Institutes* (1536), dedicated to Francis I in an elegant Latin epistle. The design of the *Institutes* was to exhibit a full view of the doctrines of the Reformers; and as no similar work had appeared since the Reformation, and the peculiarities of the Romish Church were attacked in it with great force, it immediately became popular. It soon went through several editions, was translated by Calvin himself into French, and has since been translated into all the principal modern languages. Its effect upon the Christian world has been so remarkable as to entitle it to be looked upon as one of those books that have changed the face of society. After this publication Calvin went to Italy, and was received with distinction 1 y the Duchess of Ferrara, daughter of Louis XII. But, notwithstanding her protection, he was obliged to return to France, but soon left it again, and in the month of August, 1536, arrived at Geneva, where the Reformed religion had been the same year publicly established. There, at the request of Farel, Viret, and other eminent Reformers, by whom that revolution had been achieved, lie became a preacher of the Gospel, and professor, or rather lecturer on divinity. Farel was then twenty years older than Calvin, but their objects were the same, and their learning, virtue, and zeal alike, and these were now combined for the complete reformation of Geneva, and the diffusion of their principles throughout Europe. In the month of November a plan of Church government and a confession of faith were laid before the public

authorities for their approval. Beza makes Calvin the author of these productions; but others, with perhaps greater reason, attribute them to Farel. There is little doubt, however, that Calvin was consulted in their composition, and still less that he lent his powerful aid to secure their sanction and approval by the people in the month of July, 1537. The same year the Council of Geneva conferred on Farel the honor of a burgess of the city, in token of their respect and gratitude. But the popular will was not prepared for' the severe discipline of the Reformers, and in a short time the people, under the direction of a faction, met in a public assembly and expelled Farel and Calvin from the place. Calvin retired to Bern, and then to Strasburg, where he was appointed professor of divinity and minister of a French church, into which he introduced his own form of 'church government and discipline. In his absence great efforts were made to get the Genevese to return to the commlinion of the Church of Rome, particularly by Cardinal Sadolet, who wrote to them earnestly to that effect; 'but Calvin, ever alive to the maintenance of the principles of the Reformation, disappointed all the expectations of his enemies, and confirmed the Genevese in the new faith, addressing to them two powerful and affectionate letters, and replying to that written by Sadolet. While at Strasburg Calvin also published a treatise on the Lord's Supper *(Traite de la Sainte Cesse),* in which he combated the opinions both of the Roman Catholics and Lutherans, and at the same time explained his own views of that ordinance. Here, too, he published his *Commentary on the Epistle to the Romus.* Calvin became acquainted with Castalio during his residence at Strasburg, and procured for him the situation' of a regent at Geneva; and it was during his stay in this city that, by the advice of his friend Bucer, he married Idellet, the widow of a converted Analaptist.

"In November of the same year he and Farel were solicited by the Council of Geneva to return to their former charge in that city; in May, 1541, their bailment was revoked, and in September following Calvin was received into the city amid the congratulations of his flock, Farel remaining at Neufchatel. Ice immlediately laid before the council his scheme of church otxernment, and after it was adopted and published by authority (20th of November, 1541), he was unhesitating in its enforcement. His promptitude and firmness were now conspicuous; he was the ruling ,lsirit in Geneva; and the Church which he had established there he wished to make the mother and seminary of all the Reformed churches. His personal labors were unceasing. Geneva, however, was the common center of all his

exertions, and its prosperity peculiarly interested him, though less for its own sake than to make it a fountain for the supply of the world. He established an academy there, the hi h character of which was long maintained; he made the city a literary mart, and encouraged the French refugees and others who sought his advice to apply themselves to the occupation of a printer or librarian; and having finished the ecclesiastical regimen, he directed his attention to the improvement of ;the municipal government of the place. That Calvin should, in the circumstances in which he was now placed, show marks of intolerance toward others, is not surprising; and to seek a palliation of his guilt, we need not go back to the time when he belonged to the Church of Rome, nor yet to the notions of civil and religious liberty prevalent in his age. We have only to reflect on the constitution of the human mind, and the constant care necessary to prevent power in any hands from degenerating into tyranny. His conduct toward Servetus, *SEE SERVETES*, has been justly condemned, yet the punishment of Servetus was approved of by men of undoubted worth, and even by the mild Melancthon. Nor was his treatment of Bolsec (q.v.) without reproach. — In 1554 Calvin published a work in defense of the doctrine of the Trinity against Servetus *(Fidelis Expositio Errorum M. Serveti)*, and to prove the right of the civil magistrate to punish heresy; Beza the same year published a work on the like subject, in reply to the treatise of Castalio. The state of Calvin's health prevented him going in 1561 to the Conference of Poissy (q.v.), an assembly which in his view promised to be of great consequence, and which was indeed remarkable in this respect, that from that time the followers of Calvin became known as a distinct sect, bearing the name of their leader. To the last he maintained the; same firmness of character which had distinguished him through life. On his death-bed he took God to witness that he had preached the Gospel purely, and exhorted all about him to walk worthy of the divine goodness: his slender frame gradually became quite emaciated, and on the 27th of May, 1564, he died without a struggle, in the fifty-fifth year of his age. The person of Calvin was middlesized and naturally delicate; his habits were frugal and unostentatious; and he was so sparing in his food that for many years he took only one meal in the day. He had a clear understanding, an extraordinary memory, and a firmness and inflexibility of purpose which no opposition could overcome, no variety of objects defeat$_i$ no vicissitude shake. In his principles he was devout and sincere, and the purity of his character in private life was without a stain." — *English Cyclopedia.*

It is impossible to contemplate without astonishment the labors of Calvin during the last twenty years of his life. He presided over the ecclesiastical and _political affairs of Geneva; he preached every day, lectured thrice a week, was present at every meeting of the Consistory, and yet found time for a vast correspondence, and to continue his voluminous literary labors. Besides his printed works, there are now in the library of Geneva 2025 sermons in MS. His health during all this period was feeble, yet he continued his various toils almost up to the very day of his death. He chose to be poor, refusing on several occasions proposed additions; to his very moderate salary, and is said uniformly to have declined receiving presents, unless for the sake of giving them to the poor. From his numerous publications it is believed that he derived no pecuniary profit; and yet, as was the case with Wesley, he was assailed on all sides as having amassed great wealth. “I see,” said he, “what incites my enemies to urge these falsehoods. They measure me according to their own dispositions, believing that I must be heaping up money on all sides because I enjoy such favorable opportunities for doing so. But assuredly, if I have not been able! to avoid the reputation of being rich during my life, death will at last free me from this stain.” And so it was. By his last will Calvin disposes of his entire property, amounting to about two hundred and twenty-five dollars, and on the 27th day of May, 1564, being within a few weeks of fifty-five years of age, he calmly breathed his last in the arms of his friend Beza. He was buried, according to his own request, without pomp, and no monument marks his last resting-place. Calvin’s intellect was of the very first class, at once acute, penetrating, profound, and comprehensive. His cultivation was in harmony with it. Scaliger declares that at twenty-two Calvin was the most learned ‘man in Europe.

“The first edition of his great work, *The Institutes of the Christian Religion*, was published when he was twenty-seven years of age; and it is a most extraordinary proof of the maturity and vigor of his mind, of the care with which he had studied the Word of God, and of the depth and comprehensiveness of his meditations upon divine things, that, though the work was afterward greatly enlarged, and though some alterations were even made in the arrangement of the topics discussed, yet no change of any importance was made in the actual doctrines which it set forth. The first edition, produced at that early age, contained the substance of the whole system of doctrine which has since been commonly associated with his name, the development and exposition of which has been regarded by many

as constituting a strong claim upon the esteem and gratitude of the Church of Christ, and by many others as rendering him worthy of execration and every opprobrium. He lived twenty-seven years more after the publication of the first edition of the *Institutes,* and a large portion of his time during the remainder of his life was devoted to the examination of the Word of God and the investigation of divine truth. But he saw no reason to make any material change in the views which he had put forth; and a large proportion of the most pious, able, and learned men and most careful students of the sacred Scriptures, who have since adorned the Church of Christ, have received all his leading doctrines as accordant with the teaching of God's Word." — *Brit. and For Evang. Review, No.* 33.

As an expositor of the Scriptures and as a writer of systematic theology Calvin has had few rivals in the Christian Church. His Latin style is better than that of any Christian writer since Tertullian. Even the Roman Catholic Audin says, "Never does the proper word fail him; he calls it, and it comes." In brevity, clearness, and good sense, his commentaries are unsurpassed. As a civilian, "he had few equals among his contemporaries. In short, he exhibited, in strong and decided development, moral and intellectual qualities which marked him out for one who was competent to guide the opinions and control the commotions of inquiring and agitated: nations. Through the most trying and hazardous period of the Reformation he exhibited invariably a wisdom in counsel, a prudence of zeal, and. at the same time, a decision and intrepidity of character which were truly astonishing. In the full import of the phrase, he may be styled a benefactor of the world. Most intensely and effectually, too, did he labor for the highest temporal, and especially for the eternal interests of his fellowmen. He evidently brought to the great enterprise of the age a larger amount of moral and intellectual power than did any other of the Reformers." In the just language of the archbishop of Cashel (Dr. Lawrence), 'Calvin himself was both a wise and a good man; inferior to none of his contemporaries in general ability, and superior to almost all in the art, as well as elegance of composition, in the perspicuity and arrangement of his ideas, the structure of his periods, and the Latinity of his diction. Although attached to a theory which he found it difficult in the extreme to free from the suspicion of blasphemy against God as the author of sin, he certainly was no blasphemer, but, on the contrary, adopted that very theory from an anxiety not to commit, but, as he conceived, to avoid blasphemy — that of ascribing to human what he deemed alone imputable to Divine agency."

2. *Calvin's theological Views.* — The following, statements of Calvin's theology, which are believed to be impartial, are taken from Neander, *History of Dogmas,* vol. 2.

(1) As to the *Church,* he says, "*By* the Church we understand not merely the *ecclesia visibilis,* but the elect of God, to whom even the dead belong." Hence he distinguishes the idea of the outward Church as the peculiar Christian community through which alone we can obtain entrance to eternal life; out of its pale there is no forgiveness of sins, no salvation. The marks of this Church are, that it publishes the Word of God in its purity, and administers the sacraments purely according to their institution. The universal Church is so called inasmuch as it includes believers of all nations. Here the important point is not agreement in all things, but only in essential doctrines *(Instit.* lib. 4).

(2) As to the *Sacraments* Calvin occupied a middle position. "On the one hand he protested against the notion of a magical influence, and on the other he held firmly to the objective. The sacraments are not mere signs, but signs instituted by God, which notify to men the Divine promise. They are the outward symbols by which God seals the promises of his grace to our conscience; they attest the weakness of our faith, and at the same time our love to Him. The sacraments effect this, not by any secret magical power, but because they are instituted for this end by the Lord; and they can only attain it when the inward agency of the Holy Spirit is added, whereby alone the sacraments find their way to the heart; they are therefore efficacious only for the predestinated." "*Baptism* is a seal of a covenant. Christ blessed children, commended them to their heavenly Father, and said that of such was the kingdom of heaven. If children ought to be brought to Christ, why should they not receive the symbol of communion with Christ? Also in the New Testament mention is made of the baptism of whole families, and the early use of infant baptism allows the conclusion that it had come down from the time of the apostles. Infant baptism is also important for the parents, as a seal of the Divine promise which is continued from them to their children; another reason is, that by baptism children are incorporated in the Church, and are so much the more commended to the other members. He believed in a certain influence in infant baptism, and answers the objection to it by saying that, although we cannot understand this effect, it does not follow that it does not take place. He appealed to the fact that John was filled with the Holy Spirit from his birth, and Christ from the beginning with the Divine nature. From his

humanity the principle of sanctification must overflow to men, and this would hold good of children" *(Institutes,* bk. 4, ch. 16). On the doctrine of the *Lord's Supper,* "he opposed those who explained the words 'eating the flesh of Christ and drinking his blood,' only of faith in Christ, and the right knowledge of him *(Institutes,* bk. 4, ch. 17). Whoever received the Supper in faith was truly and perfectly a partaker of Christ. This communion was not merely a communion of spirit; the body of Christ, by its connection with the Divine nature, received a fullness of life which flowed over to believers. Calvin therefore admitted something supernatural, but thought that the event took place, not by virtue of the body of Christ, which, as such, could not be in several places, but by virtue of the power of the Holy Ghost — a supernatural communication which no human understanding could ex. plain. This communion with Christ, by which he communicates himself and all his blessings, the Supper symbolically represents. The outward is indeed merely a sign, but not an empty sign; it really presents that which is signified by it, namely, the actual participation of the body of Christ by the power of the Holy Spirit. She explains the words of the institutions metonymically, in the sense that the sign is used for the thing signified; he denied any bodily presence of Christ; Christ does not descend to earth, but believers by the power of the Holy Spirit are raised to communion with him in heaven. Christ also descends to them not only by virtue of his Spirit, but also by the outward symbol; the organ by which communion is attained is faith the is presented to all, but received only by believers. The mere symbolical view depreciates the sign too much, and separates it from the sacrament; but by the other view the sign is exalted too much, and thereby the nature of the mystery itself is obscured."

(3) Calvin's views on *Grace and Predestination* were so strongly pronounced that his name is now used to designate an entire system. He maintained the "doctrine of absolute predestination, which in him was connected with a one-sided tendency of Christian feeling and a rigid logical consequence, [f1] Like Zuingle, he regarded prescience and predestination as of equal extent, and even established the former by the latter; God in no other way foresees the future but as he has decreed. Hence Calvin allowed no contingency even in the fall; le says, How could God, who effects all things, have formed the noblest of his creatures for an uncertain end? What then would become of his omnipotence? The Infralapsarians must still allow such a predestination in the case of Adam's descendants. It cannot have been in a ,natural way that all lost salvation through the guilt of one.

Yet he himself feels shocked at the thought; *decretum quidem horribile fateor,* [f2] he says. Consequently, God created the greatest part of mankind in order to glorify himself in them by his punitive justice, and the smaller by the revelation of his love. [f3] His opponents might give a reason why God, who could have made them dogs, created them in his own image. Ought irrational brutes also to argue with God? All doubts may be silenced by the thought that God's will is the highest law and cause. Yet he did not rest here. The idea of an absolute omnipotence of God, not conditioned by holiness, he looked upon as profane, and appealed to the incomprehensibility of this mystery. It is to be acknowledged that Calvin sought to evade the practically injurious consequences of the doctrine of absolute predestination, and especially exalted the revealed grace of God in. the work of redemption. 'Men ought to keep to the Word of God alone; and, instead of inquiring respecting their own election, look to Christ, and seek in him God's fatherly grace.' Calvin labored very much to procure the universal acknowledgment of this doctrine in Switzerland, but met with 'serious opposition, among others, from the learned Sebastian Castalio (q.v.). In Geneva Calvin at last obtained the victory, and then soon came to an understanding respecting it with other Swiss theologians. He attempted, but in vain, to get Melancthon on his side. Melancthon called him the modern Zeno, who wanted to introduce a stoical necessity into the Church, and expressed himself very warmly against him *(Corpus Reformat. 7:*932). When Calvin sent Melancthon his Confession of Faith, the latter was so excited that he struck his pen through the whole passage on predestination. Calvin remarked that this was very unlike his *ingenita mansuetudo;* that he could not imagine how a man of Melancthon's acuteness could reject this doctrine, and said, reproachfully, that he could not believe that he held the doctrines he professed with a sincere heart. On account of a doctrine to which speculation had by no means led him, he reproached him with judging *nimisphilosophice* concerning free will."

Calvin professes to be only a *borrower* from St. Augustine *(Inst.* bk. in, ch. xxiii, § 13); and he repudiates the consequences that have been charged upon his doctrine. For instance, he strenuously maintains that God is not the author of sin, that men act freely and accountably, and that election is a stimulus to good works rather than an opiate to inaction *(Inst.* bk. 3, ch. 23, § 3, 9, 12). *SEE CALVINISMI; SEE PREDESTINATION.*

3. *Literature.* — The best edition of the Latin works of Calvin is that of Amsterdam (1671, 9 vols. fol.). A new edition is now going on in the

Corpus Reformatfrum, under the title *Calvini Oplera quce supersunt omnia* (vols. 1-5, Brunswick, 1864, 1867). An excellent and very cheap edition of the *Commentarii in N.T.,* edited by Tholuck, was published at Halle (1833-38, 7 vols. 8vo); one of the *Comm. in Psalmos* (1836, 2 vols.) and of the *Institutiones Religionis Christiance* was likewise edited by Tholuck (Halle, 1834, 1835, 2 vols. 8vo); one of the *Comm. in lib. Geneseos* (1838, 8vo) by Hengstenberg. Most of Calvin's writings have been translated into English; and a new and revised edition has been issued under the auspices of the "Calvin Translation Society," in very handsome style, yet cheap (Edinb. 51 vols. 8vo). Its contents are as follows: *Institutes of the Christian Religion,* 3 vols.; *Tracts on the Reformation,* 3 vols.; *Commentary on Genesis,* 2 vols. ; *Harmony of the last Four Books of the Pentateuch,* 4 vols.; *Commentary on Joshua,* 1 vol.; *Commentary on the Psalms,* 5 vols.; *Commentary on Isaiah,* 4 vols.; *Connmentary on Jeremiah and Lamentations,* 5 vols.; *Commentary on Ezekiel,* 2 vols.; *Commentary on Daniel,* 2 vols.; *Commentary on Hosea,* 1 vol.; *Commentary on Joel, Amos, and Obadiah,* vol.; *Commentary on Jonah, Micah, and Nahum,* 1 vol.; *Commentary on Habakkuk, Zephaniah, and haggai.* 1 vol.; *Commentary on Zechariah and Malachi.* 1 vol.; *Harmony of the Synoptical Evangelists,* 3 vols.; *Commentary on John's Gospel,* 2 vols.; *Commentary on Acts of the Apostles,* 2 vols.; *Commentary on Romans,* 1 vol.; *Commentary on Corinthians,* 2 vols.; *Commentary on Galatians and Ephesians,* I vol.; *Commentary on Philippians, Colossians, and Thessalonians,* 1 vol.; *Commentary on Timothy, Titus, and Philemon,* 1 vol.; *Commentary on Hebrews,* 1 vol.; *Commentary on Peter, John, James, and Jude,* 1 vol. There are English translations of his *Institutiones* by John Allen (Lond. 1813, reprinted in several editions by the Philadelphia Presbyterian Board of Publication), and by Beveridge (Edinb. 1863, 8vo). Calvin's life was written in brief by Beza (Eng. ed. 1844, Edinb. Trans. Soc.; also Phila. 1836,12mo) and Farel; but within the last few years several biographies have appeared. The most copious and elaborate is *Leben J. Calvin's,* von Paul ,Henry, D.D. (Hamb. 1835-1844, 3 vols. 8vo). The author procured for his work the inedited letters of Calyin, which are preserved in Geneva, and gives the most important of them in the appendices. A poor translation has been published, entitled *The Life of Calvin, translated from the German of Dr. Henry,* by H. Stebbing, D.D. '(Lond. 1849, 2 vols. 8vo); it omits most of the notes and appendices which make up great part of Henry's work. A Roman Catholic biography by Audin (His*toire, etc., de J. Calvin, par* J. M. V. Audin, Paris, 2 vols.

1841) has the sole merit of a lively and piquant style. An English translation has been published in Baltimore *(history, etc., of John Calvin, translated from Audin,* by John Gill, evo); and it has also been translated into German (Augsb. 1843-44, 2 vols.), into Italian (in Pirotta's *Bibliot. Ecclesiastes* vols. ix and x, Milan, 1843), and into other languages. A graphic but superficial biography has been published by Thomas H. Dver (Lond. 1850; N. Y., Harpers, 1851). A Biography together with select writings of Calvin, was published by Stilhelin *(J. Calvin. Leb. ui. ausgewdalle Schriften,* Elberfeld, 2 vols. 1860, 1863). There is a good sketch of Calvin's life, by Robbins, in the *Bibliotheca 'acra,* vol. ii, for 1845. On the theology of Calvin, see Gass, *Prot. Dotgmatik,* vol. i, bk. i; art. CALVINISM *SEE CALVINISM*; and *Revue Chritienne,* 1863, p. 720; Cunningham, *The Reformers and Theology of the Reformation,* Essays, 6-10. See also Tulloch, *Leaders of the Reformation* (new ed. Lond. 1861); Bungener, *Calvin, his Life and Works* (Edinb. 1862, 8vo). *The Letters of Calvin,* from original MSS., were first edited by Bonnet and translated by Constable (Edinb. 1855, 4 vols. 8vo, repub. by Presbyterian Board [Philadelphia]). A new edition of the *Institutes* in French, *Institution de la Religion Chretienne, en quatre livres,* appeared in Paris, 1859 (2 vols. 8vo). It contains an introduction by the editors, with a history of previous editions. See *Meth. Quart. Review,* Oct. 1850, art. in; *Amer. Theol. Review,* Feb. 1860, p. 129; *North Brit. Review,* vol. xiii; *Brit. and Foreign Evang. Review,* No. xxxiii; *Biblioth. Sacra,* xiv, p. 125; Kostlin, in *Studien u. Kritiken,* 1868, 1, 2.

Calvinism,

properly, the whole system of theology taught by John Calvin, including his doctrine of the sacraments, etc. It is now, however, generally used to denote the theory of grace and predestination set forth in Calvin's *Institutes,* and adopted, with more or less modification, by several of the Protestant churches. *SEE CALVINISTS.*

1. *Calvin's owin Views* (Supralapsarian). — These ere set forth (from Neander) under the article CALVIN *SEE CALVIN* (q.v.). We give here simply such farther extracts from Calvin's own writings as are necessary to show his system.

(1.) "Predestination, by which God adopts some to the hope of life, and adjudges others to eternal death, no one desirous of the credit of piety

dares absolutely to deny. But it is involved in many cavils, especially 1 y those who make foreknowledge the cause of it. We maintain that both belong to God; but it is preposterous to represent one as dependent on the other. Predestination we call the eternal decree (f God, 1,y which he hath determined in himself what he would have to become of every individual of mankind. For they are not all created with a similar destiny; but eternal life is foreordained for some, and eternal damnation for others. Every man, therefore, being created for one or the other of these ends, we say he is predestinated either to life or to death." After having spoken of the election of the race of Abraham, and then of particular branches of that race, he proceeds: "Though it is sufficiently clear that God, in his secret counsel, freely chooses whom he will, and rejects others, his gratuitous election is but half displayed till we come to particular individuals, to whom God not only offers salvation, but *assigns* it in such a manner that the certainty of the effect is liable to no suspense or doubt." He sums up the chapter in which he thus generally states the doctrine in these words: "In conformity, therefore, to the clear doctrine of the Scripture, we assert that, by an eternal and immutable counsel, God hath once for all determined both whom he would admit to salvation, and whom he would condemn to destruction. We affirm that this counsel, as far as concerns the elect, is founded on his gratuitous mercy, totally irrespective of human merit; but that to those whom he devotes to condemnation, the gate of life is closed by a just and irreprehensible, but *incomprehensible* judgment. In the elect, we consider calling as an evidence of election; and justification as another token of its manifestation, till they arrive in glory, which constitutes its completion. As God seals his elect by vocation and justification, so, by *excluding* the reprobate from the knowledge of his name and sanctification of his Spirit, he affords another indication of the judgment that awaits them." — *Institutes*, bk. 3, ch. 21.

(2) As to the theory that predestination depends on foreknowledge of holiness, Calvin says: "It is a notion commonly entertained that God, foreseeing what would be the respective merits of every individual, makes a correspondent distinction between different persons: that he adopts as his children such as he foreknows will be deserving of his grace, and devotes to the damnation of death others whose dispositions he sees will be inclined to wickedness and impiety. Thus they not only obscure election by covering it with the veil of foreknowledge, but pretend that it originates in another cause" (bk. 3, ch. 22). Consistently with this, he a little further on

asserts that election does not flow from holiness, but holiness from election: “For when it is said that the faithful are elected that they should be holy, it is fully implied that the holiness they were in future to possess had its origin in election.” He proceeds to quote the example of Jacob and Esau, as loved and hated before they had done good or evil, to show that the only reason of election and reprobation is to be placed in God’s “secret counsel.” (Bk. 3, ch. 23.)

(3.) So, as to the ground of reprobation: ‘God hath mercy on whom he will have mercy, and whom he will he hardeneth.’ You see how he (the apostle) attributes *both* to the *mere will* of God. If, therefore, we can assign no reason why he grants mercy to his people but because such is his pleasure, neither shall we find any other cause but *his will* for the reprobation of others. For when God is said to harden, or show mercy to whom he pleases, men are taught by this declaration to seek no *cause beside his will.”* (Ibid.) “Many, indeed, as if they wished to avert odium from God, admit election in such a way as to deny that any one is reprobated. But this is puerile and absurd, because election itself could not exist without being opposed to reprobation: whom *God passes by he therefore reprobates;* and *from no other cause* than his determination to exclude them from the inheritance which he predestines for his children.” (Bk. 3, ch. 23.)

(4.) Calvin denies that his doctrine makes God the author of sin, asserting that the ruin of sinners is their I own work: “Their perdition depends on the divine predestination in such a manner that the *cause* and *matter* of it are found *in themselves. For the first man fell because the Lord had determined it should so happen.* The reason of this determination is unknown to us. Man, therefore, falls according to the *appointment* of Divine Providence, but he falls by *his own fault.* The Lord had a little before pronounced every thing that he had made to be ‘very good.’ Whence, then, comes the depravity of man to revolt from his God? Lest it should be thought to come from creation, God approved and commended what had proceeded from himself. By his own wickedness, therefore, man corrupted the nature he had received pure from the Lord, and by his fall he drew all his posterity with him to destruction.”

(5.) In much the same manner he contends that the necessity of sinning is laid upon the reprobate by the ordination of God, and yet denies God to be the author of their sinful acts, since the corruption of men was derived from Adam, by his own fault, and not from God. He exhorts us “rather to

contemplate the evident cause of condemnation, which is nearer to us, in the corrupt nature of mankind, than search after a hidden and altogether incomprehensible one, in the predestination of God." "For though, by the eternal providence of God, man was *created* to that misery to which he is subject, yet the *ground* of it he has derived from himself, not God, since he is thus ruined solely in consequence of his having degenerated from the pure creation of God to vicious and impure depravity,". See especially *Institutes,* bk. 3, ch. 23, § 27, and ch. 24, § 8.

From the above passages it will be seen that Calvin went beyond the Augustinian theory of predestination, and held to the supralapsarian view. Supralapsarianism regards man, *before* the fall, as the object of the unconditional decree of salvation or damnation; Sublapsarianism, on the other hand, makes the decree subordinate to the creation and fall of man. According to Dr. Shedd's definition, "supralapsarianism holds that the decree to eternal bliss or woe precedes, in the order of nature, the decree to apostasy; infralapsarianism holds that it succeeds it" *(History of Doc. trines, 2:*192). The Supralapsarians hold that God *decreed* the fall of Adam; the Sublapsarians, that he *permitted* it. Some writers have maintained that Calvin was not a supralapsarian, but that view of his teaching is hardly tenable. Calvin terms "the exclusion of the fall of the first man from the divine pre. destination *afrigidum commentum"* (3, ch. 23, § 7). So also, § 4, he says, "Quum ergo in sua corruptione pereunt (homines), nihil aliud quam poenas luunt ejusdem calamitatis, in quam *ipsius prcedestinationem lapsus est A dam,* ac posteros suos praecipites secum traxit. It is on this particular point that Calvin goes farther than Augustine, who did not include the fall of Adam in the divine decree" (Smith's Hagenbach's *History of Doctrines, §* 249). Amyraldus (q.v.) sought to reduce Calvin's system to sublapsarianism, but was effectually answered by Curcellaeus in his tractate de *jure Dei in Creaturas.* But Fisher *(New Englander,* April, 1868, p. 305) holds that Calvin was *not* a supralapsarian. (See *Christ. Remembrancer,* Jan. 1856, art. iv; Warren, in *Methodist Quarterly Review,* July, 1857, art. i; Mohler, *Symbolism, §* 4.)

2. *Doctrines of Dort* (Infralapsariah). — The controversy with the Remonstrants on the five points (*SEE ARMINIANISM; SEE REMONSTRANTS)* led to the clearer definition of the doctrines in question' by the Synod of Dort, which refused to accept the supralapsarian view, at least in terms. See the *Confessions and Canons of the Synod of Dort* for the full statement. The following summing up is given by Watson,

from Scott's *Synod of Dort*, of the five articles which constitute the standard of what is now generally called strict Calvinism:

(1.) "*Of Predestination.* — As all men have sinned in Adam, and have become exposed to the curse and eternal death, God would have done no injustice to any one if he had determined to leave the whole human race under sin and the curse, and to condemn them on account of sin; according to those words of the apostle, 'All the world is become guilty before God' (<450319>Romans 3:19, 23; 6:2.). That some, *in time*, have faith given them by God, and others have it not given, proceeds from his eternal decree; for 'known unto God are all his works from the beginning,' etc. (<441518>Acts 15:18; <490111>Ephesians 1:11). According to which decree he graciously softens the hearts of the elect, however hard, and he bends them to believe; but the non-elect he leaves, in his judgment, to their own perversity and hardness. And here, especially, a deep discrimination, at the same time both merciful and just; a discrimination of men equally lost, opens itself to us; or that decree of election and reprobation which is revealed in the word of God, which, as perverse, impure, and unstable persons do wrest to their own destruction, so it affords ineffable consolation to holy and pious souls. But election' is the immutable purpose of God. by which, before the foundations of the world were laid, he chose, out of the whole human race, fallen by their own fault from their primeval integrity into sin and destruction, according to the most free *good pleasure* of his own will, and of *mere grace*, a certain number of men, neither better nor worthier than others, but lying in the same misery with the rest, to salvation in Christ, whom he had, even from eternity, constituted Mediator and head of all the elect, and the foundation of salvation; and therefore he decreed to give them unto him to be saved, and effectually to call and draw them into communion with him by his word and Spirit; or he decreed himself to give unto them true faith, to justify, to sanctify, and at length powerfully to glorify them, etc. (<490104>Ephesians 1:4-6; <450830>Romans 8:30). This same election is not made from *any foreseen* faith, obedience of faith, holiness, or any other good quality and disposition, as a *prerequisite* cause or condition in the man who should be elected, etc. 'He hath chosen us,' not because we *were*, but 'that we *might* be holy,' (<490104>Ephesians 1:4; <450911>Romans 9:11-13; <441348>Acts 13:48). Moreover, holy Scripture doth illustrate and commend to us this eternal and free grace of our election, in this more especially, that it doth testify all men not to be elected; but that some are non-elect, or *passed by*, in the eternal election of God, whom

truly God, from most free, just, irreprehensible, and immutable good pleasure, decreed to leave in the *common misery* into which they had, by *their own fault*, cast themselves; and not to bestow on them living faith, and the grace of conversion; but having been left in their own ways, and under just judgment, at length, not only on account of their unbelief, but also of all their other sins, to condemn and eternally punish them, to the manifestation of his own justice. And this is the decree of *reprobation*, which determines that God is in no wise the author of sin (which, to be thought of, is blasphemy), but a tremendous, incomprehensible, just judge and avenger."

(2.) "*Of the Death of Christ."* — Passing over, for brevity's sake, what is said of the necessity of atonement in order to pardon, and of Christ having offered that atonement and satisfaction, it is added, "This death of the Son of God is a single and most perfect sacrifice and satisfaction for sins, of infinite value and price, abundantly sufficient to expiate the sins of the whole world; but because many who are called by the Gospel do not repent, nor believe in Christ, but perish in unbelief; this doth not arise from defect or insufficiency of the sacrifice offered by Christ upon the cross, but from their own fault. God willed that Christ, through the blood of the cross, should out of every people, tribe, nation, and language, *efficaciously* redeem all those, and those *only*, who were from eternity chosen to salvation, and given to him by the Father; that he should confer on them the gift of faith," etc.

(3.) "*Of Man's Corruption, etc.* — All men are conceived in sin, and born the children of wrath, indisposed *(inepti)* to all saving good, propense to evil, dead in sin, and the slaves of sin; and without the regenerating grace of the Holy Spirit, they neither are willing nor able to return to God, to correct their depraved nature, or to dispose themselves to the correction of it."

(4.) "*Of Grace and Free-will.* — But in like manner as, by the fall, man does not cease to be man, endowed with intellect and will, neither hath sin, which hath pervaded the whole human race, taken away the nature of the human species, but it hath depraved and spiritually stained it; so that even this divine grace of regeneration does not act upon men like stocks and trees, nor take away the properties of his will, or violently compel it while unwilling; but it spiritually quickens, heals, corrects, and sweetly, and at the same time powerfully, inclines it; so that whereas before it was wholly

governed by the rebellion and resistance of the *flesh*, now prompt and sincere obedience of the Spirit may begin to reign; in which the renewal of our spiritual will, and our liberty, truly consist; in which manner (or for which reason), unless the admirable Author of all good should work in us, there could be no hope to man of rising from the fall by that *free will* by which, when standing, he fell into ruin."

(5.) *"On Perseverance.* — God, who is rich in mercy, from his immutable purpose of election, does not wholly take away his Holy Spirit from his own, even in lamentable falls; nor does he so permit them to glide down *(prolabi)* that they should fall from the grace of adoption and the state of justification; or commit the 'sin unto death,' or against the Holy Spirit; that, being deserted by him, they should cast themselves headlong into eternal destruction. So that not by their own merits or strength, but by the gratuitous mercy of God, they obtain it, that they neither *totally fall* from faith and grace, *nor finally continue* in their falls and perish."

The Confessions of the Reformed Church agree more or less closely with the statements of Dort, whether they preceded or followed it in date. See the *Confessio Gallica,* art. 12; *Confessio Belgica,* art. 16; *Form. Convensus Helvet.* arts. 4 and 19; *Cosif. Helvet. 2:*10. (See Winer, *Comp. Darstcllung, 9:*1; Hagenbach, *History of Doctrines, §* 249.) The *Westminster Confession* is the standard of the Church of Scotland, and of the various Presbyterian Churches in Europe and America. Its 3d article states *God's Eternal Decree* as follows:

"Of God's Eternal Decree. — God from all eternity did, by the most wise and holy counsel of his own will, freely and unchangeably ordain whatsoever comes to pass; yet so as thereby neither is God the author of I sin, nor is violence offered to the will of the creatures, nor is the liberty or contingency of second causes taken I away, but rather established. Although God knows whatsoever may or can come to pass upon ,all sup, posed conditions, yet hath he not decreed anything because he foresaw its future, or as that which would come to pass upon such conditions. By the decree of God, for the manifestation of his glory, some men and angels are predestinated unto everlasting life, and others foreordained to everlasting death. These angels and men, thus predestinated and foreordained, are particularly and unchangeably designed, and their numb er is so certain and definite that it cannot be either increased or diminished. Those of mankind that are predestinated unto life, God, before the foundation of the world

was laid, according to his eternal and immutable purpose, and the secret counsel and good pleasure of his will, hath chosen, in Christ, unto everlasting glory, out of his mere free grace and love, without any foresight of faith, or good works, or perseverance in either of them, or any other thing in the creature, as conditions, or causes moving him thereunto; and all to the praise of his glorious grace. As God hath appointed the elect unto glory, so hath he, by the eternal and most free purpose of his will, foreordained all the means thereunto. Wherefore they who are elected, being fallen in Adam, are redeemed by Christ, are effectually called unto faith in Christ, by his Spirit working in due season; are justified, adopted, sanctified, and kept by his power through faith unto salvation. Neither are any other redeemed by Christ, effectually called, justified, adopted, sanctified, and saved, but the elect only. The rest of mankind God was pleased, according to the unsearchable counsel of his own will, whereby he extendeth or withholdeth mercy, as he pleaseth, for the glory of his sovereign power over his creatures, to pass by, and to ordain them to dishonor and wrath for their sin, to the praise of his glorious justice."

The 17th article of the *Church of England* is as follows:

"Of Predestination and Election. — Predestination to life is the everlasting purpose of God, whereby (before the foundations of the world were laid) he hath constantly decreed, by his counsel, secret to us, to deliver from curse and damnation those whom he hath chosen in Christ out of mankind, and to bring them by Christ to everlasting salvation, as vessels made to honor. Wherefore they which he endued with so excellent a benefit of God be called according to God's purpose, by his Spirit working in due season: they, through grace, obey the calling: they be justified freely: they be made sons of God by adoption: they be made like the image of his only-begotten Son Jesus Christ: they walk religiously in good works; and at length, by God's grace, they attain to everlasting felicity. As the godly consideration of predestination and our election in Christ is full of sweet, pleasant, and unspeakable comfort to godly persons, and such as feel in themselves the working of the Spirit of Christ, mortifying the works of the flesh and their earthly members, and drawing up their mind to high and heavenly things, as well because it doth greatly establish and confirm their faith of eternal salvation to be enjoyed through Christ, as because it doth fervently kindle their love toward God; so, for curious and carnal persons, lacking the Spirit of Christ, to have continually before their eyes the sentence of God's predestination is a most dangerous' downfall, whereby the devil doth thrust

them either into desperation, or into Wretchedness of most unclean living, no less perilous than desperation. Furthermore, we must receive God's promises in such wise as they be generally set forth to us in holy Scripture. And in our doings, that will of God is to be followed which we have expressly declined unto us in the Word of God."

It has always been a question in the Church of England whether the Articles are or are not Calvinistic. On this question, see Toplady, *Doctrinal Calvinism of the Church of England* (Works, vol. i and ii); Overton, *True Churchman* (2d ed. York, 1801); Laurence, *Bamptn Lecture* for 1804 (Oxford, 1805, 8vo); Cunningham, *The Reformers,* Essay iv (Edinb. 1862, 8vo); printed also in the *Brit. and For. Evang. Rev.* (No. 35); reptinted in the *Am. Theol. Review* (October, 1861, art. v); Hardwick, *History of RJformation,* ch. iv, p. 260.

The Lutheran Church never adopted the Calvinistic system. In the beginning, both Luther and Melancthon received the Augustinian theology; but as early as' 1523 Melancthon expunged the passages supporting it from his *Loci Theologici.* Luther bestowed the highest praise on the last editions of the *Loci* (Luther's *Works,* 1546, vol. i, preface; see Laurence, *Bampton Lect.* Sermon ii, note 21). The Augsburg *Confessio Variata* (20) says: "Non est hic opus disputationibus de predestinatione et similibus. Nam promissio est universalis et nihil detrahit operibus, sed exsuscitat ad fidem et vere bona opera" (see Gieseler; *Church-History, 4,* §§ 36, 37). In the German Reformed Church the strictly Calvinistic doctrine "never, as such, received any symbolical authority; and it was significantly left out of the Heidelberg Catechism, and handed over to the schools and scientific theology. At the same time, it was never rejected by the German Church, nor regarded with any thing like hostility." Appel, in the *Tercentenary Monument of the Heidelberg Catechism,* p. 327; Hase, *Church History, §* 354.

3. The Calvinistic system was still farther modified by the Federal Theology, or the THEOLOGY OF THE COVENANTS. Under the too exclusive influence of the doctrine of Predestination, it had assumed a scholastic character, from which it was in part relieved by the introduction of the idea of the *Covenant,* as a constructive principle of the system. John Cocceius, trained in the German Reformed theology (born at Bremen 1603, died 1699), first developed the system under this point of view, the effect of which was to introduce historical facts and elements, and a

distinctive ethical idea (a covenant implying mutual rights), into the heart of the system, and to banish the idea of the divine sovereignty as mere will. Cocceius distinguished between, 1. The covenant before the Fall, the covenant of works; and, 2. The covenant after the Fall, the covenant of grace. The latter covenant embraces a threefold economy: (1) The economy before the law; (2) The economy under the law; (3) The economy of the Gospel. See his *Summa Doctrine de Feedere et Testamentis Dei.* 1648. Heppe says: "The fruit of his influence was to lead the Reformed theologians back to the freedom of the Word of God, delivering it from the bondage of a traditional scholasticism." This type of Calvinism was still farther developed in the writings of Braun, *Doctrina Fwderumn* 1698; of Burmann of Utrecht (t 1679), *Synopsis Theologica et (Economice Faderum Dei, 1671;* Heidanus of Leyden (t 1678), *Corpus Theol. Christ.* 1687; and especially of Witsius of Leyden (t 1708), whose *Economy of the Covenants* (1694) was translated into English (Lond. 1763; revised ed. Edinb. 1771, 1803; NewYork, 3 vols. 1798). This theology of the covenants also shaped, to a considerable extent, the Reformed system as it was adopted in England, Scotland, and America. It is clearly recognized in the Westminster Confession of Faith and Catechisms, Later writers divide the covenant of grace into two parts, viz. the covenant of redemption between the Father and the Son, and the covenant of grace between God and his people in Christ. On this important phase of the Calvinistic theology, see Ebrard, *Dogmatik,* 1:60 sq.; Gass, *Geschichte der Protest. Dogmatik,* Bd. 2, 1857; Schweizer, *Glaubenslehre der evang. reformire ireirche,* 2 Bde. 1844, and also his *Protestantische Centraldogmen,* 2 Bde. 1854; Schneckenburger, *Vergleichende Darstellung der lutherischen uni refornirten Lehrbegriffe,* 1855; G. Frank, *Geschichte der Protest. Theol.* 2 Bde. 1865; also Heppe, *D gnatik d. deutschen Protestantismus, 1:*204; *Dogmatik der evang. ref. Kirche, 1:*278; and the article FEDERAL THEOLOGY *SEE FEDERAL THEOLOGY* .

4. *Moderate Calvinists. — This* phrase designates those, especially in England and America, who, while adhering to the Calvinistic as contrasted with the Arminian system, have yet receded from some of the extreme statements of the former, especially upon the two articles of Reprobation and the Extent of the Atonement. See Dr. E. *Williams, Defence of Modern Calvinism,* 1812; *Sermon and Charges,* p. 128, and Appendix, p. 399. Dr. Williams says: "Reprobation, or predestination to death or misery as the end, and to sin as the means,' I call an *'impure mixture'* with Calvinism, as

having no foundation either in the real meaning of Holy Writ, or in the nature of things; except, indeed, we mean by it, what no one questions, a determination to punish the guilty." He calls this a "'*mixture,'* because its connection with predestination to life is arbitrary and forced; *'impure,'* because the supposition itself is a foul aspersion upon the divine character."

The other point on which the moderate Calvinists modified the system is the nature and extent of the atoning work of Christ. Strict Calvinism asserts that the Lord Jesus Christ made atonement to God by his death only for the sins of those to whom, in the sovereign good pleasure of the Almighty, the benefits of his death shall be finally applied. By this definition, the extent of Christ's atonement, as a provision, is limited to those who ultimately enjoy its fruits; it is restricted to the elect of God. Both Strict and Moderate Calvinists agree as to the intrinsic worth of the atonement, and as to its final application. It has been asserted (e.g. by Amyraut, q.v.) that Calvin himself held to general redemption; and certainly his language in his *Comm. in Job,* 3:15, 16, and in 1 Timothy 2:5, seems fairly to assert the doctrine. Comp. Fletcher, *Works* (N. Y. ed. 2:71); but see also Cunningham, *The Reformers* (Essay 7). As to the variations of the Calvinistic confessions, see Smith's Hagenbach, *History of Doctrines, §* 249. In the French Reformed Church, the divines of Saumur, Camero, Amyraldus, and Placeus maintained universal grace (see articles on these names). The English divines who attended the Synod of Dort (Hall, Hale, Davenant) all advocated general atonement, in which they were followed by Baxter *(Universal Redemption; Methodus Theologica;* Orme, *Life of Baxter,* 2:64). The "moderate" doctrine as to the nature of the atonement is, in brief, that it consists in "that satisfaction for sin which was rendered to God as moral governor of the world by the obedience unto death of his son Jesus Christ. This satisfaction preserves the authority of the moral government of God, and yet enables him to forgive sinners. That this forgiveness could not be given by God without atonement constitutes its necessity." *SEE ATONEMENT.* That Christ's atonement was sufficient for all, that it is actually applied only to the elect, and that it enhances the guilt of those who reject it, is now almost universally conceded by the different schools. But its universality, as a provision, is also asserted by the moderate Calvinists, with some modifications in the statement of its nature. The English views as to the nature of the atonement are presented in the following extracts: Dr. Magee *(On the*

Atonement) says, “The sacrifice of Christ was never deemed by any, who did not wish to calumniate the doctrine of atonement, to have *made God placable*, but merely viewed as the *means* appointed by divine wisdom by which to bestow’ forgiveness. But still it is demanded, in what way can the death of Christ, considered as a sacrifice of expiation, be conceived to operate to the remission of sin, unless by the appeasing of a Being who otherwise would not have forgiven us’? To this the answer of the Christian is, I know not, nor does it concern me to know, *in what manner* the sacrifice of Christ is connected with the forgiveness of sins; it is enough that this is declared by God to be the *medium* through which my salvation is effected: I pretend not to dive into the councils of the Almighty. I submit to his wisdom, and I will not reject his grace because his mode of vouchsafing it is not within my comprehension.” Andrew Fuller, in his *Calvinistic and Socinian Systems compared* (Letter 7), strongly reprobates the idea of placating the Divine Being by an atonement, “contending that the atonement is the *effect*, and not the *cause* of divine love” to men; and insists “that the contrary is a gross misrepresentation of the Calvinists in general,” though it must be confessed some Calvinists have given too much countenance to such an idea. Mr. Fuller adds, “If we say a way was opened I y the death of Christ for the free and consistent exercise of mercy in all the methods which sovereign wisdom saw fit to adopt, perhaps we shall include every material idea which the Scriptures give us of that important event.”

5. Farther modifications in the Calvinistic system have been made in this country through the influence of the so-called NEW-ENGLAND THEOLOGY, especially as set forth in the writings of Jonathan Edwards and his successors. In respect to original sin, the elder Edwards, in his work on that subject, advocated the mediate rather than the immediate imputation of Adam’s first sin to his posterity. On the nature of virtue he introduced an important modification, in making *love to being* (in the two forms of love of benevolence and love of complacency) to constitute the essence of virtue. On the nature of the atonement he made no modification. He also distinguished more carefully than had previously been done between natural ability and moral inability, and this distinction was farther elaborated by the younger Edwards, who also represented the atonement as consisting in a satisfaction to the general rather than the distributive justice of God. Hopkins and Emmons carried out these views still farther, but under the influence (especially in the case of Emmons) of the

supralapsarian scheme. These discussions extended from New England into the Presbyterian Church. The parties there known as Old and New School differ chiefly on the following articles:

1. Imputation of sin, whether it be immediate or mediate;
2. The nature and extent of the atonement;
3. Ability and inability.

For the history of the development of Calvinism, *SEE REFORMED CHURCH.* For the Antinomian and extreme supralapsarian developments of Calvinism, *SEE ANTINOMIANISM; SEE CRISP; SEE HOPKINSIANS.* For certain mitigated schemes of Calvinism, *SEE AMYRALDISM; SEE BAXTER; SEE CAMERO.* On two of the principles which distinguish the so-called Moderate Calvinism, viz.

(1.) the universality of the atonement, *SEE ATONEMENT; SEE REDEMPTION*;

(2.) The natural ability of all men to repent, *SEE INABILITY; SEE THEOLOGY.*

6. *Literature.* — The literature of the Calvinistic controversy is enormous. I he principal books only can be named here: Calvin, *Instiluiones;* Zwinglius, *Brevis Isagoge; Ccmm. de vera etfalsa relgione;* the Confessions of the Reformed Chuiches, given in Augusti, *Corpus Librorum Symbolicorum* (1828). or in icmeyer, *Collectio Conjissonum* (1840); the Westminster Confession (1868); the Decrees of the Synod of Dort (1619). The chief Calvinistic writers of the 16th and 17th centuries were Beza, Bullinger, Alstedt, Whitgift, Cartwright, CriFp, Perkins, Leighton, Baxter (moderate), Owen, Howe, Ridgely, Gomar, Alting, Rivetus, Heidegger, Turretin, Pictet. Of the 18th and 19th centuries the following are selected: Stapfer, Wyttenbach, Gill, Toplady, Erskine, Dick, Hill, Breckinridge, Krummacher. Of the new American school: Edwards, Bellamy, Emmons, Dwight, West, Snmtlley etc., whose influence was seen in England in the writings of Fuller, Ryland, Hall, Jay, Pye Smith, and Chalmers. The so-called Old Calvinism has produced fewwriters of late in England. It is ally defended in America by the Princeton theologians. For the historical treatment of the subject, see Gill, *Cause of God and Truth,* pt. iv; Neander, *History of Dlgmas* (I. c.); Hagenbach, *Hist. of Doctrines* (ed. by Smith, § 219222); Ebrard' *Christ. Dogmatik, §* 17-51, ard § *556*565; Womack, *Calvinistic Cabinet Unlocked;* Watson, *Theolog. Institutes,* pt. ii, ch. 28;

Herrmann, *Geschichte der Prot. Dicgatlik* (Leips. 1842); Gass, *Geschichte der Prot. Dcgmactik* (Berlin, 1854); Heppe, *Dogmatik der evang reform. Kirche* (Elherfeld, 1861); Mozley, *Augustinian Doctrine of Praedestination* (Londo 1855); *Christian Renembrancer,* Jan. 1856, 170 sq.; Nicholls, *Calvinism ard Armininism compared* (Land. 1824, 2 vc, ls. 8vo) is very full as to English writers, and abounds in valuable citations, but is destitute of scientific arrangement; Cunningham, *Historical Theology* (1862); Ditto, *Thohlogy of the Information* (1862); Hill, *Lectures on Divinity,* chap. 11. For the later forms of Calvinism, especially in America, see Tyler, *History of the New Heaven Theology* (1837); Beecher, *Views in Theology ;* ice, *Old and New Schools* (1853); Bangs, *Errors of Hopkinsianism,* 1815); Hodgson, *New Divinity* (1839)); Fisk, *The Calvinistic Controversy;* and especially, on the whole subject, Warren, *Systematische Theologie, §* 24 (Bremen, 1865, 8vo). Polemical works against Calvinism: (a) *Lutheran,* Chemnitz, in his *Loci Theologoci;* Dannhauer, *Hodomoria Spiritus Calvin* (1654); FeuerLorn, *Epit me Error. Calv.* (1651); (1) *Arminan and Methodist* (besides those above named): Arminius, Episcopius, Limborch, Curcelleus (writings generally); Wesley (*oio ks,* see Index); Fletcher, *Cheakls to Anfinomianism,* etc.; Watson, *Theol. Institutes,* vol. 2; Goodwin, *Redemption Redeemed;* Foster, *Calvinism as it is;* (c) *Later German writers* ‘Ebrard, in his *Dogmatik* (Königsberg, 1851, 2 vols. 8vo); Lange, *Die Lehre. der heil. Schriften von derfreien und allgemeinen Gnade Gottes* (Elberf. 1631, 8vo). Writers on special topics, e. *a.* Election, Redemption, Predestination, etc., will be named under those heads respectively. *SEE ARMINIANISM; SEE ELECTION; SEE FEDERAL THEOLOGY; SEE GRACE; SEE PREDESTINTATION; SEE SACRAMENTS.*

Calvinists,

(1.) a name formerly used on the Continent of Europe to designate all members of the so-called *Reformed* churches, as distinguished from the *Lutheran* Church. It is still so used to a certain extent, especially in France and Austria.

(2.) It is now generally in use to designate those who receive the theological tenets of Calvin, without regard to Church or sect. *SEE CALVIN; SEE CALVINISM.* In the early part of the 16th century the *Reformed* churches of Switzerland, Hungary, France, Germany,: and Holland were all Calvinistic in this sense; now the proportion of Calvinists

in some of them is small. The Presbyterian churches of England, Scotland, Ireland, and America are, with few exceptions, Calvinistic. So also are many of the Independent and Congregational churches, both in England and America. In the Church of England, and the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States, Calvinism prevails to a certain extent, but statistics are wanting. Bishop Burgess remarks that "although the Church of England had been represented at the Synod of Dort, its clergy acquiesced not at all in the determination of that assembly, and the bishops who were there were among the last of their order who have written upon the side which was there triumphant. The Calvinism of the Church grew fainter till it scarcely struggled. It was not so much overcomely direct assaults as supplanted through the more ecclesiastical spirit which predominated at the Restoration. For a century after, its voice was almost unheard, except along with the irregularities of Whitefield, and then it was much more than overbalanced by the Arminianirm of Wesley. Within the last century it has Leen revived in the writings of many pious men, but can scarcely be viewed as having very largely affected the prevalent teaching of Episcopalians, either in Great Britain or in America" *(Bibliotheca Sacra*, 1863, p. 863). The Dutch Reformed Church, the larger part of the Baptists and of the Welsh Methodists, are also Calvinists.

Calvisius, Seth, Or Kalwitz,

a celebrated chronologist, was born at Gorschleben, Thuringia, Feb. 20, 1556. He studied at Frankenhausen and Magdeburg, where he gained his bread by singing in the streets, and laid by enough to support him at the Academy of IIelmstaidt, whither he went in 1579, and thence to Leipsic. He gained a profound knowledge of music, chronology, astronomy, and Hebrew. He died at Leipsic Nov. 23, 1615, leaving, besides other works, *Enodatio duarum qucestionum circa annum Nativitatis et temnpus Ministerii Christi* (Erfurdt, 1610, 4to); also, *Elenchus Calendarii Giegoriani* (Heidelberg, 1612). But his principal work is entitled *Opus Chronologicum, "ex* auctoritate potissimum Sanct. Scripturme et historicorum fide dignissimorum, ad motum luminarium coelestium tempora et annos distinguentium" (Frankfort, folio, 1604 and 1684). In this work he 'endeavored to supply the defects and correct the errors of Scaliger and other chronologists, by having recourse to astronomical calculations, in order to fix the precise time of different events. For this purpose he calculated more than one hundred and fifty eclipses. John Kepler, David Pareus, and others warmly attacked his work on its

appearance, but Scaliger spoke of it in the highest terms, declaring it, in a letter to Isaac Casau- bon, to be *accuratissimum chronicon.* Calvisius's works are inserted in the Roman Index. — Hoefer, *Biog. Generale, 8:*278; Landon, *Ecclesiastes Dictionary,* 2:505.

Camaldules

(Camaldulani, Camaldulenses, Ordo Camaldulanus), a religious order founded about 1009 by Romualdus, who built a monastery at Campo Maldloti, or Camaldoli, a village thirty miles east of Florence, and belonging to a lord named Maldoli, whence the order, some time after the death of Romualdus, took its name. Up to the end of the eleventh century they bore the name of their founder, and were called Romualdines. The monks observe the rule of St. Benedict, with some alterations and additions, and combine the ccenobitic and eremitical life. At first they wore a black dress; but Rornualdus, having seen a vision of his monks mounting a ladder toward heaven, and all clothed in white, changed their habit from black to white. In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, the order was divided into five congregations, under so many generals or "majors," with about 2000 members. The life of these hermits was originally very severe; but, like most other orders, as it grew rich, it became corrupt. They were reformed in 1431 by Eugene IV, and again in 1513. A new order, with a stricter rule, was formed by Gustiniani in 1520, and since that time Loth divisions exist independently. They appear never to have had an establishment in England. In France there was but one convent of Camaldules or Camaldoli, viz., at Grosbois, near Paris. They were of the congregation of "Our Lady of Consolation." The Camaldule ccenobites, to whom Pope Gregory XVI belonged, have their principal convent at Rome, and a few more houses in Italy, with about one hundred members. The hermits are a little more numerous, counting upward of two hundred members, with two majors at Calnaldoli and Monte Corona, near Perugia. Their convents are likewise all in Italy, with the exception of one in Poland. There was also a congregation of Camaldule nuns, founded by the fourth general of Camaldules, Rudolphus, in 1086, at Mucellano, in Tuscany. They had in the seventeenth century twenty-four convents, of which, in 1860, only two were left, at Rome and at Florence. — Fehr, *Gesch. der Monchsorden,* 1:68 sq.; Helyot, *Ord. Raelit.* 1:577; Landcn, *Eccl. Dict.* 2:506.

Cambridge Manuscript

(Codex Cantabrigiensis, from its present place of deposit), called also Codex Bezae:

Picture for Cambridge Manuscript

(from its depositor), usually designated as D of the Gospels and Acts, is one of the most important uncial MSS. of the N.T. It contains the Greek text, with a Latin translation on the opposite page, of the entire four Gospels (in the order Matthew, John, Mark, Luke) and Acts, with several gaps (<4001>Matthew 1:1-20; 6:20-9:2; 27:2-12; <4801>John 1:16-3:26; <4401>Acts 8:29-10:14; 21:2-10, 15-18 [which passage seems to have been extant in Wetstein's time]; 22:10-20, 29-28:31, in all which the *Greek* is wholly absent; and <4001>Matthew 3:7-16; <4116>Mark 16:15-20; <4814>John 18:14-20:13, where the Greek has been supplied by a scribe not earlier than the tenth century; besides about as numerous omissions and similar restorations of the *Latin*, but mostly at different places from the foregoing), and a few verses of the catholic Epistles (<4801>John 3:11-15, in the Latin only), which once stood entire between the Gospels and Acts. The MS. is a quarto volume, 10 inches high by 8 broad, consisting of 414 leaves (11 of them more or less mutilated, and 9 others by later hands), with but one column on each page, the Greek being on the left page and the Latin on the right. The vellum is not very fine. There are 33 lines on each page, and these are of unequal length, the MS. being arranged in clauses or στίχοι, and the corresponding ones in the Lat. and Gr. as nearly as possible opposite each other. It has not the large κεφάλαια or Eusebian canons, but only the Ammonian sections, and these often incorrectly placed, obviously by a later hand. The leaves are arranged in quires of 4 sheets (8 leaves) each, the numeral "signatures" of which are set by the first hand low in the margin at the foot of the last page of each. It originally consisted of upward of 64 quires, and one of the gaps, which omits 67, ending with 3 John, 11,r would be too great a space for all the canonical Epistles merely. The first three lines of each book were written in bright red ink, which was also occasionally employed elsewhere by way of ornament. The characters betray a later age than Codices Alexandrinus, Vaticanus, and Ephraemi (A, B, and C), and capitals, occur as in Codex Sinaiticus (ℵ). Its Alexandrine forms would argue an Egyptian origin, but the fact of: the Latin translation shows that it is a Western copy. It is assigned with great probability to the sixth century. It is chiefly remarkable for its bold and extensive

interpolations, amounting to some six hundred in the Acts alone, on which account it has been cautiously employed by critics, notwithstanding its great antiquity. *SEE CRITICISM (BIBLICAL).*

This MS. was presented to Cambridge University in 1581 by Theodore Beza, who says he obtained it during the French wars in 1562, when it was found in the monastery of St. Irenseus at Lyons, and doubtless rescued by some Huguenot soldier. It seems to have been the same noted as β in the margin of Stephens's third edition. It was first completely examined by PatrickYoung, the librarian of Charles I, and next collated by Usher for Walton's *Polyglot.* Dr. Kipling published it in full from fac-simile types, but with the uncritical insertion of many of the marginal readings by the second hand into the text *(Codex Theodori Bezce Cantabrigiensis,* 1793, 2 vols. fol.). Scrivener has since reprinted it more carefully in ordinary types, with introduction, annotations, and exact fac-similes *(Codex Bezce,* etc., Lond. 1864, 8vo). -Scrivener, *Introd.* p. 96 sq.; Tregelles in Home's *Introd.* (new ed.), — 4, p. 169 sq. *SEE MANUSCRIPTS (BIBLICAL).*

Cambridge Platform,

a system of Church discipline agreed upon by the elders and messengers of the New England churches, assembled in synod at Cambridge, 1648. The object of the synod was to define accurately the ecclesiastical position of the New England churches. In matters of faith they were agreed, but there were differences in regard to Church government, some being inclined to a more strict Presbyterianism, some to a more loose Independency, while the great majority were Congregationalists.

As regards *doctrine,* the synod declared their adhesion to the Westminster Confession; but they did not accept that confession in regard to discipline, but proceeded to construct a platform, of which we give the following abstract: It declares that the form of Church government is one, immutable, and prescribed in the Word of God. The Church in general consists of the whole company of the redeemed, but the state of the visible Church militant, walking in order, was before the law economical, or in families; under the law, national; since Christ, only congregational. "The matter of the visible Church in quality consists of saints by calling;" and in quantity "a church ought not to be of greater number than may ordinarily meet together conveniently in one place, nor fewer than can conveniently carry on church work." The saints must have a visible political union among themselves, and this form is the visible covenant whereby they give

themselves up to the Lord, to the observing of the ordinances of Christ together in the same society. The *supreme power* in the Church belongs to Jesus Christ; subordinate power, as extraordinary, to apostles, etc.; as ordinary, to every particular church. The *officers in* a church are necessary to its well-being, but not to its existence. The extraordinary, as apostles, are temporary; the ordinary, which are elders (or bishops) and deacons, are perpetual. There is a difference between teaching and ruling *elders.* The ruling elder is to assist the teaching elder in ruling. The *deacon's* office is confined to temporalities. Church *officers* are elected by the church in which they are to minister, and the church may depose, as well as elect them, though the advice of neighboring churches in such case should be sought. Church officers are to be ordained *after* their election by the church; ordination is the solemn putting a man into his place, but does not constitute an officer. As the people may elect, they may also ordain; though, where there are elders, these, as representing the church, are to perform the service of imposition of hands. In respect to Christ, the head, the Church is a monarchy; in respect to the brotherhood, the body, it resembles a democracy; in respect to the Presbytery, it is an aristocracy. Church government or rule is placed by Christ in the officers of the church, who are subject to the power of the church, and who pronounce sentence with consent of the church.

In a right administration, all church acts proceed after the manner of a mixed administration. There are rules also for the support of church officers, admission and dismission of members, excommunication, etc., all based on the preceding principles; and it is declared that churches, though distinct and equal, ought to preserve church communion with each other, 1st, by way of mutual care; 2d, by way of consultation; 3d, by way of admonition; 4th, by way of participation in acts of worship, etc.; 5th, by way of recommendation; 6th, by way of relief and succor. In gathering a church, this communion should always be attended to.

Synods according to the pattern of Acts xv, though not necessary to the being, are useful for the well-being of the churches. They are constituted by the churches sending forth elders and other messengers to meet together in the name of Christ. A magistrate has power to call a synod, but the constituting of a synod is a church act. Synods are not to exercise church censures by way of discipline, but to debate and determine the principles on which such acts are based, and, so far as consonant with God's Word, they are to be received with reverence and submission. , Synods are not

permanent ecclesiastical bodies. An article on the power of civil magistrates in matters ecclesiastical completes the platform. — Savage's *Winthrop,* vol. 2; Boston ed. *Cambridge and Saybrcok Platforms,;* Shedd, *Hist. of Doctrines, 2:*482. *SEE CONGREGATIONALISTS.*

Cambyses

Picture for Cambyses

(Καμβύσης, a Gracized form of the old Persic *Kabujiya,* a "bard," Rawlinson, *Hercdotms,* in, 455), the second Persian monarch of the name, was the son of Cyrus the Great (but by what mother is disputed), whom he succeeded, B.C. 530. In the fifth year of his reign he invaded Egypt, taking offense, according to Herodotus (3:1), at the refusal of Amasis, the father of Psammenitus, the then reigning Egyptian king, to give him his daughter in marriage; but the real cause of the campaign (comp. Herodotus, 1:77) was the ambition of Cambyses (see Dahlmann, *Herod.* p. 148) to accomplish the design of his father in recovering this portion of Nebuchadnezzar's conquests (see Jeremiah 43; 46; Ezekiel 29-32; comp. Newton, *On the Prophecies,* 1:357). *SEE CYRUS.* Egypt was subdued, according to Ctesias, through treachery; according to Panteenus (7:9), by intrigue; but according to Herodotus, in a pitched battle, after which the whole country, as also the Cyrenians and Barcans, submitted to him. He proceeded to execute his design of reducing Ethiopia also, but was compelled to retreat for want of provisions, his attack on Carthage having likewise failed through the refusal of his Phoenician allies to co-operate with him against their own colony. He was thus defeated in his plans, which doubtless contemplated the securing to Persia the caravan trade of the Desert (Herod. 2:1; 3:1-26; Ctesias, *Pers.* 9; Justin. 1:9; comp. Heeren's *African Nations,* 1:6). Diodorus says, indeed, that he penetrated as far as Merob, and even founded that city, naming it after his mother; but this statement is equally incorrect (see Strabo, p. 790) with that of Josephus, who says he changed its name to Meroe in honor of his sister *(Ant.* 2:10, 2). The conduct of Cambyses after this exhibited the darkest character of tyranny to such an extent that the Egyptians, whom he ruled with an iron sway (comp. Isaiah 19:4), attributed to him madness as the punishment of his impiety, and even the Persians ever after styled him the "despot" (δεσπότης, Herod. 3:89). Indeed, he appears to have been subject to epileptic fits from his birth (Herod, 3:8), and his behavior'evinced a violence of temper bordering upon frenzy.' He is said

to have married his own sisters, and to have brutally killed one of them for bewailing the execution of his own brother Smerdis by his order. His atrocities provoked an insurrection, headed by one of the Magian priests, who assumed the name of the murdered prince "Smerdis" (q.v.); and, as Cambyses was marching to put down the pretender, he died at Ecbatana of an accidental wound in the thigh, B.C. 521, leaving no heir (Herod. 3:61 sq. Ctesias, *Excerpt. Pers.*, gives a somewhat different account of his end, and also makes his reign eighteen years; but Clemens Alexandrinus, *Strom.* 1:895, says he reigned ten years). *SEE PERSIA*. He is named *Kabujiya* on the Persian tablet of the Behistun inscription (Rawlinson, *Herod.* 2:492,493). *SEE CUNEIFORM INSCRIPTIONS*. His name also appears on the Egyptian monuments in a royal cartouch. *SEE HIEROGLYPHICS*.

Cambyses is probably the "Ahasuerus" mentioned in Ezra 4:6, as the Persian king addressed by the enemies of the Jews for the purpose of frustrating the rebuilding of the Temple, B.C. 529. Josephus also calls this monarch *Cambyses, the son of Cyrus,* and he gives the correspondence between the king and his Syrian viceroys in detail *(Ant.* 11:2:1 and 2), which he has evidently blended with that which took place with his successor, the pseudo-Smerdis ("Artaxerxes," Ezra 4:7 sq.), since he does not name the latter, but only alludes to the usurpation of the Magians in the interval before the accession of Darius Hystaspis *(ib.* in, 1). *SEE AHASUERUS*.

Camel

(a word found in essentially the same form in all the Shemitic languages [Hebrews גָּמָל; *gamal';* Syriac, the same; Chald. *gamala;* ancient Arabic, *jemel,* modern, *jammel];* in the Greek [κάμηλος] and Latin *rcamelus],* whence it has passed into the languages of Western Europe; also in the Coptic *kamoul.* In Sanscrit it occurs as *kramela* and *kram'laka;* and hence Schlegel traces the word to the root *kram- to step.'* Bochart derives it from the root גָּמַל, *to revenge,* because the camel is vindictive and retains the memory of injuries *[animal* μνησίκακον]; but Gesenius considers it more likely that גָּמַל should have assumed the force of the cognate Arabic root *jamal, to carry),* an animal of the order *Ruminantia,* and genus *Camelus.* As constituted by most modern naturalists, it comprises two species positively distinct, but still possessing the common characters of being ruminants without horns, without muzzle, with nostrils forming oblique

slits, the upper lip divided, and separately movable and extensile, the soles of the feet horny, with two toes covered by unguiculated claws, the limbs long, the abdomen drawn up, while the neck, long and slender, is bent down and up, the reverse of that of a horse, which is arched. According to other naturalists, however, the two-humped camel, sometimes called the Bactrian camel, is a variety only, not a distinct species (Patterson, *Introd. to Zoology*, p. 417). Camels have thirty-six teeth in all, of which three cuspidate on each side above, six incisors, and two cuspidate on each side below, though differently named; still have all more or less the character of tushes'. They have callosities on the breast-bone and on the fixtures of the joints. Of the four stomachs, which they have in common with other animals chewing the cud, the ventriculus, or paunch, is provided with membranous cells to contain an extra provision of water, enabling the species to subsist for four or more days without drinking. But when in the desert, the camel has the faculty of smelling it afar off, and then, breaking through all control, he rushes onward to drink, stirring the element previously with a fore-foot until quite muddy. Camels are temperate animals, being fed on a march only once in twenty-four hours, with about a pound weight of dates, beans, or barley, and are enabled in the wilderness, by means of their long flexible necks and strong cuspidate teeth, to snsp as they pass at thistles and thorny plants, mimosas and caper-trees. They are emphatically called "the ships of the desert;" having to cross regions where no vegetation whatever is met with, and where they could not be enabled to continue their march but for the aid of the double or single hunch on the back, which, being composed of muscular fiber, and cellular substance highly adapted for the accumulation of fat, swells in proportion as the animal is healthy and well fed, or sinks by absorption as it supplies the want of sustenance under fatigue and scarcity; thus giving an extra stock of food without eating, till by exhaustion the skin of the prominences, instead of standing up, falls over, and hangs like empty bags on the side of the dorsal ridge. Now when to these endowments are added a lofty stature and great agility; eyes that discover minute objects at a distance; a sense of smelling of prodigious acuteness, ever kept in a state of sensibility by the animal's power of closing the nostrils to exclude the acrid particles of the sandy deserts; a spirit, moreover, of patience, not the result of fear, but of forbearance, carried to the length of self-sacrifice in the practice of obedience, so often exemplified by the camel's bones in great numbers strewing the surface of the desert; when we perceive it furnished with a dense wool to avert the solar heat and nightly cold while on the animal, and

to clothe and lodge his master when manufactured, and know that the female carries milk to feed him, we have one of the most incontrovertible examples of Almighty power and beneficence in the adaptation of means to a direct purpose that can well be submitted to the ‘apprehension of man; for, without the existence of the camel, immense portions of the surface of the earth would be uninhabitable, and even impassable. Surely the Arabs are right: “Job’s beast is a monument of God’s mercy!”

Picture for Camel 1

1. The Bactrian camel *(camelus Bactrianus* of authors) is large and robust; naturally with two hunches, and originally a native of the highest table-lands of Central Asia, where even now wild individuals may be found. The species extends through China, Tartary, and Russia, and is principally imported across the mountains into Asia Minor, Syria, and Persia. It is seldom seen at Aleppo (Russel, *N. H. Aleppo,* 2:170). One appears figured in the processions of the ancient Persian satrapies among the bas-reliefs of Chehel Minar, where the Arabian species is not seen. It is also this species which, according to the researches of Burckhardt, constitutes the brown Taous variety of single-hunched Turkish or Turki camels commonly seen at Constantinople, there being a very ancient practice among breeders, not, it appears, attended with danger, of extirpating with a knife the foremost hunch of the animal soon after birth, thereby procuring more space for the pack-saddle and load. It seems that this mode of rendering the Bactrian cross-breed similar to the Arabian camel or dromedary (for Burckhardt misapplies the last name) is one of the principal causes of the confusion and contradictions which occur in the descriptions of the two species, and that the various other intermixtures of races in Asia Minor and Syria, having for their object either to create greater powers of endurance of cold or of heat, of body to carry weight, or to move with speed, have still more perplexed the question. From these causes a variety of names has arisen, which, when added to the Arabian distinctions for each sex, and for the young during every year of its growth, and even for the camels nursing horsefoals, has made the appellatives exceedingly numerous. We notice only —

Picture for Camel 2

2. The Arabian camel or *dromedary (camelus dronmedarius* or *Arabicus* of naturalists, rkB, *be’ker;* and female and young hrkB; *bikrah’,* both “dromedary,” Isaiah 60:6; Jeremiah 2:23) is properly the species

having naturally'but one hunch, and considered as of Western Asiatic or of African origin, although no kind of camel is figured on any monument of Egypt (Wilkinson, *Anc. Elq.* 1:234), not even where there are representations of live-stock such as that found in a most ancient tomb beneath the pyramid of Gizeh, which' shows herdsmen bringing their cattle and domesticated animals to be numbered before a steward and his scribe, and in which we see oxen, goats, sheep, asses, geese, and ducks, but neither horses nor camels. That they were not indigenous in the early history of Egypt is countenanced by the mythical tale of the priests describing "the flight of Typhon, seven days' journey upon an ass." We find, however, camels mentioned in Genesis 12; but being placed last among the cattle liven by Pharaoh to Abraham, the fact seems to show that they were not considered as the most important part of his donation. This can be true only upon the supposition that but a few of these animals were delivered to him, and therefore that they were still rare in the valley of the Nile, though soon after there is abundant evidence of the nations of Syria and Palestine having whole herds of them fully domesticated. These seem to imply that the genus Camelus was originally an inhabitant of the elevated deserts of Central Asia, its dense fur showing that a cold but dry atmosphere was to be encountered, and that it came already domesticated, toward the south and west, with the oldest colonies of mountaineers, who are to be distinguished from earlier tribes that subdued the ass, and perhaps from others still more ancient, who, taking to the rivers, descended by water, and afterward coasted and crossed narrow seas. Of the Arabian species two very distinct races are noticed; those of stronger frame but slower pace used to carry burdens varying from 500 to 700 weight, and travelling little more than twenty-four miles per day; and those of lighter form, bred for the saddle with single riders, the fleetest serving to convey intelligence, etc., and travelling at the rate of 100 miles in twenty-four hours. They are designated by several appellations, such as *Deloul*, the best coming from Oman, or from the Bishareens in Upper Egypt; also *Hejin* by the Turks, and still other names (e.g. *Ashaary, Maherry, Reches, Badees* at Herat, Rawahel, and Racambel) in India, all names more or less implying swiftness, the same as δρομάς, *swift;* the difference between them and a common camel being as great as that between a high-bred Arab mare and an English cart-horse (Layard, *Nineveh and Bab.* p. 292). Caravans of loaded camels have always scouts and flankers mounted on these light animals, and in earlier ages Cyrus and others employed them in the line of battle, each carrying two archers. The Romans of the third and fourth

centuries of our era, as appears from the "*Notitia,"* maintained in Egypt and Palestine several *ake* or squadrons mounted on dromedaries; probably the wars of Belisarius with the northern Africans had shown their importance in protecting the provinces bordering on the desert; such was the *ala dromedariorum Antana* at Ammata in the tribe of Judah, and three others in the Thebais (comp. <09017>1 Samuel 30:17). Bonaparte formed a similar corps, and in China and India the native princes and the East India Company have them also.

It is likely the word µynir;Tjvja} *achashteranim'* (<17810>Esther 8:10, 14), rendered "camels," more properly signifies *mules* (being explained by the addition "sons of mares," mistranslated "young dromedaries"), and implies the swift postage or conveyance of orders, the whole verse showing that all the means of dispatch were set in motion at the disposal of government (see the dissertation on this word by Schelhorn, in the *Misc. Lips.* 10:231-44). On the other hand, vk,r, *re'kesh* (translated "mules" in the above passage, and rendered "dromedary" in <11028>1 Kings 4:28; "swift beast" in <33101>Micah 1:13), we take to be one of the many names for running camels (as above), used to carry expresses; or post-horses, anciently *Asiandi* or *Astandi*, now *Chupper* or *Chuppezw*, which, according to Xenophon, existed in Persia in the time of Cyrus, and are still in use under different appellations over all Asia. The *kirkaroth'* (t/rK;rKa, rendered "swift beasts") of <23660>Isaiah 66:20, were probably also a kind of dromedary.

Picture for Camel 3

Picture for Camel 4

All camels, from their very birth, are taught to bend their limbs and lie down to receive a load or a rider. They are often placed circularly in a recumbent posture, and, together with their loads, form a sufficient rampart of defense against robbers on horseback. The milk of she-camels is still considered a very nutritive cooling drink (Aristot. *Hist. Anim.* 6:25, 1; Pliny, *NV. H.* 11:41; 28:9), and when turned it becomes intoxicating (such, according to the Rabbins [Rosenmüller, *Not.* ad *Hieroz.* 1:10], was the drink offered [<07019>Judges 4:19] by Jael to Sisera [comp. Josephus, *Ant.* 5:5, 4]). Their dung supplies fuel in the desert and in sandy regions where wood is scarce; and occasionally it is a kind of resource for horses when other food is wanting in the wilderness. Their flesh, particularly the hunch, is in request among the Arabs (comp. Prosp. Alp. *H. N. AEg.* 1:226), although

forbidden to the Hebrews, more perhaps from motives of economy, and to keep the people from again becoming wanderers, than from any real uncleanness. Camels were early a source of riches to the patriarchs, and from that period became an increasing object of rural importance to the several tribes of Israel, who inhabited the grazing and border districts, but still they never equalled the numbers possessed by the Arabs of the desert. In what manner the Hebrews derived the valuable remunerations obtainable from them does not directly appear, but it may be surmised that by means of their camels they were in possession of the whole trade that passed by land from Asia Minor and Syria to the Red Sea and Egypt, and from the Red Sea and Arabia toward the north and to the Phoenician sea-ports. On swift dromedaries the trotting motion is so hard that to endure it the rider requires a severe apprenticeship; but riding upon slow camels is not disagreeable, on account of the measured step of their walk; ladies and women in general are conveyed upon them in a kind of wicker-work sedan, known as the takht-ravan of India and Persia. In some cases this piece of female equipage presents almost a formidable appearance! The camels which carried the king's servants or guests, according to Philostratus, were always distinguished by a gilded boss on the forehead. The camel, being a native of Asia, from the earliest ages to the present day has been the chief means of communication between the different regions of the East, and from its wonderful powers of endurance in the desert has enabled routes to be opened which would otherwise have been impracticable. "Their home is the desert; and they were made, in the wisdom of the Creator, to be the carriers of the desert. The coarse and prickly shrubs of the wastes are to them the most delicious food, and even of these they eat but little. So few are the wants of their nature, that their power of going without food, as well as without water, is wonderful. Their well-known habit of lying down upon the breast to receive their burdens is not, as is often supposed, merely the result of training; it is an admirable adaptation of their nature to their destiny as carriers. This is their natural position of repose, as is shown, too, by the callosities upon the joints of the legs, and especially by that upon the breast. Hardly less wonderful is the adaptation of their broad cushioned foot to the and sands and gravelly soil which it is their lot chiefly to traverse... As the carriers of the East, the 'ships of the desert,' another important quality of the camel is their sure-footedness" (Robininson, *Researches, 2:*632-635). The present geographical distribution of the camel extends over Arabia, Syria, Asia Minor to the foot of the Caucasus, the south of Tartary, and part of India. In Africa it is found in the countries

extending from the Mediterranean to the Senegal, and from Egypt and Abyssinia to Algiers and Morocco. A number of camels have lately been imported into the United States, designed for transportation in the and plains of the extreme southwestern territories; but the result of the experiment is yet doubtful (Marsh, *The Canel,* etc. Bost. 1856). (For a farther view of the natural history of the camel, see *the Penny Cyclopcedia*, s.v.) *SEE DROMEDARY.*

Picture for Camel 5

The camel is frequently mentioned in Holy Scripture. It was used not only in Palestine, but also in Arabia (Judges 7:12), in Egypt (Exodus 9:3), in Syria (2 Kings 8:9), and in Assyria, as appears from the sculptures of Nineveh (see Layard, *Nineveh and Bab.* p, 582). It was used at an early date both as a riding animal and as a beast of burden (Genesis 24:64; 37:25). It was likewise used in war (1 Samuel 30:17; Isaiah 21:7; comp. Pliny, *N. H. 8:*18; Xenoph. *Cyrop.* 7:1, 27; Herod. 1:80; 7:86; Livy, 37:40). Of its hair coarse garments were manufactured (Matthew 3:4; Mark 1:6). The Jews were not allowed to eat its flesh (Leviticus 11:4; Deuteronomy 14:7). The prophet Isaiah foretells the great increase and flourishing state of the Messiah's kingdom, by the conversion and accession of the Gentile nations, by comparing the happy and glorious concourse to a vast assemblage of camels (Isaiah 60:6). He also predicts the march of the army of Cyrus to the conquest and destruction of Babylon by an allusion to a chariot of camels (Isaiah 221:7); and the folly and presumption of those is remarked upon (Isaiah 30:6) who, in the time of their trouble, carried treasures on camels into Egypt to purchase the assistance of that people, and acknowledged not the Lord their God, who alone could save and deliver them.

In the history of the Hebrews, however, the camel was used only by nomad tribes. This is because the desert is the home of the Arabian species, and it cannot thrive in even so fine a climate as that of the valley of the Nile in Egypt. The Hebrews in the patriarchal age had camels as late as Jacob's journey from Padan-aram, until which time they mainly led a very wandering life. With Jacob's sojourn in Palestine, and, still more, his settlement in Egypt, they became a fixed population, and thenceforward their beast of burden was the ass rather than the camel. The camel is first mentioned in a passage which seems rather to tell of Abraham's wealth

(<01216>Genesis 12:16, as 24:35), to which Pharaoh doubtless added, than to recount the king's gifts. If the meaning, however, is that Pharaoh gave camels, it must be remembered that this king was probably one of the shepherds who partly lived at Avaris, the Zoan of Scripture; so that the passage would not prove that the Egyptians then kept camels, nor that they were kept beyond a tract, at this time, and long after, inhabited by strangers. The narrative of the journey of Abraham's servant to fetch a wife for Isaac portrays the habits of a nomad people, perhaps most of all when Rebekah, like an Arab damsel, lights off her camel to meet Isaac (Genesis 24).; Jacob, like Abraham, had camels (<01304>Genesis 30:43): when he left Padan-aram he "set his sons and his wives upon camels" (<01317>Genesis 31:17); in the present he made to Esau there were "thirty milch camels with their colts" (<01215>Genesis 32:15). In Palestine, after his return, he seems no longer to have kept them. When his sons went down to Egypt to buy corn, they took asses. Joseph sent wagons for his father and the women and children of his house (<01459>Genesis 45:19, 27; 46:5). After the conquest of Canaan, this beast seems to have been but little used by the Israelites, and it was probably kept only by the tribes bordering on the desert. It is noticeable that an Ishmaelite was overseer of David's camels (<132730>1 Chronicles 27:30). On the return from Babylon the people had camels, perhaps purchased for the journey to Palestine, but a far greater number of asses (<150267>Ezra 2:67; <160769>Nehemiah 7:69). There is one distinct notice of the camel being kept in Egypt. It should be observed, that when we read of Joseph's buying the cattle of Egypt, though horses, flocks, herds, and: asses are spoken of (<01477>Genesis 47:17), camels do not occur: they are mentioned as held by the Pharaoh of the exodus (<020903>Exodus 9:3), but this may only have been in the most eastern part of Lower Egypt, for the wonders were wrought in the field of Zoan, at which city this king then doubtless dwelt. It is in the notices of the marauding nomad tribes that wandered to the east and south of Palestine that we chiefly read of the camel in Scripture. In the time of Jacob there seems to have been. a regular traffic between Palestine, and perhaps Arabia, and Egypt, by camel caravans, like that of the Ishmaelites or Midianites who bought Joseph (<01325>Genesis 37:25, 28). In the terrible inroad of the Midianites, the Amalekites, and the Bene-Kedem, or children of the East, "both they and their camels were without number; and they entered into the land to destroy it" (<070605>Judges 6:5; comp. 7:12). When Gideon slew Zebah and Zalmunna, kings of Midian, he "took away the ornaments [or "little moons"] that [were] on their camels' necks" (8:21), afterward mentioned,

with neck-chains (see Kitto, *Phys. Hist. of Pal.* p. 391; comp. Stat. *Thebaid, 9:*687), both probably of gold (ver. 26). We also find other notices of the camels of the Amalekites (<09153>1 Samuel 15:3; 30:17), and of them and other and probably kindred peoples of the same region (<09270>1 Samuel 27:8, 9). In the account of the conquest by the Reubenites, the Gadites, and the half tribe of Manasseh, of the Hagarites beyond Jordan, we read that fifty thousand camels were taken (<13518>1 Chronicles 5:18-23). It is not surprising that Job, whose life resembles that of an Arab of the desert, though the modern Arab is not to be taken as the inheritor of his character, should have had a great number of camels (<18103>Job 1:3; 42:12; comp. Aristot. *Hist. Anim.* 9:37, 5). The Arabian Queen of Sheba came with a caravan of camels bearing the precious things of her native land (<11002>1 Kings 10:2; 2. Chronicles 9:1). We read also of Benhadad's sending a present to-Elisha "of every good thing of Damascus, forty camels' burden" (<12809>2 Kings 8:9). Damascus, be it remembered, is close to the desert. In the prophets, likewise, the few mentions of the camel seem to refer wholly to foreign nations, excepting where Isaiah speaks of their use, with asses, in a caravan bearing presents from the Israelites to the Egyptians (<23006>Isaiah 30:6). He alludes to the camels of Midian, Ephah, and Sheba, as in the future to, bring wealth to Zion (<23606>Isaiah 60:6). The "chariot of camels" may be symbolical (<23207>Isaiah 21:7), or it may refer ,to the mixed nature of the Persian army. Jeremiah makes mention of the camels of Kedar, Hazor, and the Bene-Kedem (<24928>Jeremiah 49:28-33). Ezekiel prophesies that the BerieKedem should take the land of the Ammonites, and Rabbah itself should be "a resting-place for camels" (<26501>Ezekiel 25:1-5; see Buckingham, *Tray.* p. 329). *SEE CARAVAN.*

Picture for Camel 6

The camel is classed by Moses among unclean animals (<03104>Leviticus 11:4), "because he cheweth the cud, but divideth not the hoof." Michael is justly remarks, that in the case of certain quadrupeds a doubt may arise whether they do fully divide the' hoof or ruminate. "In such cases," he says, "to prevent difficulties, a legislator must authoritatively decide; by which I do not mean that he should prescribe to naturalists what their belief should be, but only to determine, for the sake of expounders or judges of the law, what animals are to be regarded as ruminating or parting the hoof." This doubt arises in the case of the camel, which does ruminate, and does in some sort divide the-hoof; that is, the foot is divided into two toes, which are very disctintly marked above, but below the division is limited to the

anterior portion of the foot, the toes being cushioned upon and confined by the elastic pad upon which the camel goes. This peculiar conformation of the foot renders the division incomplete, and Moses, for the purposes of the law, therefore decides that it divides not the hoof. Perhaps in this nicely balanced question he determination against the use of the camel ‘for’ food was made with the view of keeping the Israelites distinct from the other descendants of Abraham, with whom their connection and coincidence in manners were otherwise so close. The interdiction of the camel, and, of course, its milk, was well calculated to’ prevent them from entertaining any desire to continue in Arabia, or from again devoting themselves to the favorite occupation of nomad herdsmen, from which it was obviously the intention of many of the laws to wean them. In Arabia a people would be in a very uncomfortable condition who could neither eat camel’s flesh nor drink its milk. Of the constant use of its milk by the Arabs travelers frequently speak; and if we wanted a medical reason for its interdiction, it might be found in the fact that to its constant use is attributed the obstructions and indurations of the stomach, which form one of the most common) complaints of the Arabs. They do not kill the camel, or any other animal, for ordinary food; but when a camel happens to be lamed in a caravan, it is killed, and a general feast is made on its flesh. Camels are also killed on great festival occasions, and sometimes to give a large entertainment in honor of a distinguished guest. Sometimes also a man vows to sacrifice a camel if he obtain this or that blessing, as, for instance, if his mare brings forth a female; and in that case he slaughters the animal, and feasts his friends on the flesh. Burckhardt *(Notes on the Bedouins)* mentions the rather remarkable fact that the Arabs know no remedy against the three most dangerous diseases to which camels are subject; but they believe that the Jews in their sacred books have remedies mentioned, which they withhold through hatred and malice. The flesh of the camel is coarse grained, but is rather juicy and palatable when the animal is young and not poorly fed. It is inferior to good beef, although at first it might readily be mistaken for beef; but it is at least equal, if not superior, to horse-flesh (Kitto, *Pict. Bible*, note in loc.).

To *pass a camel through the eye of a needle* was a proverbial expression which our Lord employed in his discourse to the disciples to show how extremely difficult it is for a rich man to forsake all for his cause and obtain the blessings of salvation (Matthew 19:24; Mark 10:25; Luke 18:25; see the treatises on this passage, in Latin, of Clodius [Viteb. 1665],

Pfeiffer [Regiom. 1679], Fetzlen [Viteb. 1673]). Many expositors are of opinion that the allusion is not to the camel, but to the cable by which an anchor is made fast to the ship, changing κάμηλος, *a camel,* to κάμιλος, *a cable;* but for this there is no critical foundation; and Lightfoot and others have shown that to speak of a camel, or any other large animal, as going through the eye of a needle was a proverbial expression, much used in the Jewish schools, to denote a thing very unusual or very difficult. There is a similar expression in the Koran: "The impious, who, in his arrogancy, shall accuse our doctrine of falsity, shall find the gates of heaven shut; nor shall he enter there till a camel shall pass through the eye of a needle. It is thus that we shall recompense the wicked." Roberts mentions a parallel proverb used in India to show the difficulty of accomplishing any thing: "Just as soon will the elephant pass through the spout of a kettle."

Another proverbial expression occurs in Matthew 23:24: "Strain at (διυλίζω) a gnat and swallow a camel." Dr. Adam Clarke proves that "at" has been substituted for "out," by a typographical error in the edition of 1611, in our version, "out" occurring in Archbishop Parker's of 1568. The reference is to a, custom the Jews had of filtering their wine, for fear of swallowing any insect forbidden by the law as unclean. 'The expression is, therefore, to be taken hyperbolically, and, to make the antithesis as strong as possible, two things are selected, the smallest insect and the largest animal. The proverb is applied to those who are superstitiously anxious to avoid small faults, and yet do not scruple to commit the greatest sins.

Camels' Hair

(τρίχες καμήλου), a material of clothing. John the Baptist was habited in raiment of camels' hair (Matthew 3:4; Mark 1:6), and Chardin states that such garments are worn by the modern dervishes. There is a coarse cloth made of camels' hair in the East, which is used for manufacturing the coats of shepherds and camel-drivers, and also for the covering of tents (Harmar, *Obs. 2:*487; comp. Elian, *Nat. Hist.* 17:34). It was doubtless this coarse kind which was adopted by John. By this he was distinguished from 'those residents in royal palaces who wore *soft* raiment. Elijah is said in the English Bible to have been "a hairy man" (2 Kings 1:8); but it may mean "a man dressed in hair" — that is, camels' hair. In Zechariah 13:4, "a rough garment" — that is, a garment of a hairy manufacture — is

characteristic of a prophet. (See *Manufactures of the Ancients,* N. Y. 1848, p. 312 sq.; Hackett's *Illustra. of Script.* p. 96.)

Cameleon.

SEE CHAMELEON.

Camerarius, Joachim,

one of the most scholarly men of the sixteenth century, was born at, Bamberg, April 12, 1500. The original name of his family was Liebhard, which was changed into the Latin Camerarius (Chamberlain) because his ancestors had been chamberlains at the court of the bishops of Bamberg. He was sent to the University of Leipzic, where he studied Greek under Richard Croke and Peter Mosellanus. He evinced an extraordinary passion for that language, and in 1524 put forth his first work, a Latin translation of one of the Orations of Demosthenes. He was at that period at Wittenberg, whither he had been drawn by the fame of Luther and Melancthon. In 1526 he went into Prussia, and in the year following was nominated by Melancthon to fill the office of Greek and Latin professor in the new college at Nuremberg. The senate of Nuremberg deputed him, in 1530, to attend the diet of Augsburg, where he aided Melancthon in the disputes, and in preparing the material afterward used in the *Apologia Confess ionis. SEE CONFESSIONS.* In 1535 the Duke of Wiirtemberg gave him the direction of the new University of Tubingen. In 1541 he was charged by Henry of Saxony with reforming the University of Leipzic, of which he was afterward appointed rector. Here he labored zealously for the Reformation, and at the same time was one of the most laborious classical and theological teachers of the age. With his friend Melancthon he took an active part in ,the negotiations concerning the Interim, and for his willingness to make concessions was severely censured by the opponents of the Interim. In 1554 he was a deputy to the Diet of Naumburg, and in 1555 to the Diet of Augsburg, from where he went to Nuremberg to aid in adjusting the Osiandrian controversy. In 1568 the Emperor Maximilian, who had called him to Vienna to consult him about some important state affairs, wished to retain' him as his councillor, but Camerarius declined the offer on account of his infirmities. He died at Leipzic in April, 1574. Camerarius was grave and reserved even toward his own children. He hated nothing so much as untruthfulness, and did not even tolerate it in jests. The extent of his knowledge, the purity of his morals, the energy of

his character, his sweet and persuasive eloquence, obtained for him the esteem of all those who knew him. He left five sons, all of whom distinguished themselves as scholars or in other high positions. A list of his numerous writings will be found in Niceron, *Memoires,* t. 19:Among his works in theology and exegesis are,

1. *Synodica, i.e.'de Niccena Synodo* (Leipz. 1543, 4to): —

2. *Disputatio depiis et catholicis atq. orthodoxis precibus et invocationibus Numinis Divini* (Argentor. 1560, 8vo): —

3. *Chronologia secundum Graeco-rumn rationem, temporibus expositis, autore Nicephoro Archiep. Constantino, conversa in linguam Lat.* (Basle, 1561, fol.; Leipz. 1574 and 1583, 4to): —

4. *Historia de Jesu Christi ad mortem pro genere humano accessione,* etc. (Leipz. 1563): —

5. *Narrat. de P. Melancthonis ortu, vita,* etc., which contains an entire history of the Reformation (1566; best ed. by Strobel, Halle, 1777, 8vo): —

6. *Notatiofigurarum sermonis in* iv *libris Evangeliorum,* etc.: *Notatio in Apostolicis scriptis et in librum Actuum et Apocalypseos* (these two works were published together at Cambridge in 1642, under the title *Commentarius in Novum Fdedus;* and at Frankfort in 1712, with the title *Exegesis Nov. Test.)*: —

7. *Homilies* (Leipz. 1573): —

8. *Historica narratio de Fratrum orthodoxorum ecclesiis in Bohemia, Moravia et Polonia* (Heidelb. 1605, 8vo). He also published a collection of the letters of Melancthon (Leipz. 1569), which contain much valuable information of the times of the Reformation. — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale, 8:*319; Landon, *Eccl. Dictionary,* 2:506.

Camero, Or Cameron, John,

one of the greatest Protestant divines of France in the seventeenth century, and founder of the "moderate" school of Calvinism, was born in Glasgow 1579 or 1580. Before he was twenty he began to lecture in Greek at the University of Glasgow; in 1600 he went to France; and in 1602 he was made professor of philosophy at Sedan. The Church of Bordeaux defrayed

his expenses for four years in studying theology at Paris, Geneva, and Heidelberg. In 1608 he became pastor at Bordeaux, where he preached with great success until 1618, when he became professor of theology at Saumur; but on the dispersion of the University in 1621 by the civil wars he returned to Glasgow, where he taught a short time, and in 1624 was chosen professor of theology at Montauban, France, where he was killed, in a political tumult, in 1625.

Camero's theology was modified Calvinism. He opposed "the imputation of the active righteousness of Christ," and "the non-concurrence of the human will with the grace of God in man's conversion." He "adopted from Arminius the doctrine of universal redemption, and the duty of presenting the offer of salvation, without restriction, to all men." His views were adopted and developed by Amyraut, Placaeus, and Cappellus (q.v.), especially the view that God does not "move the will physically, but only morally, in virtue of its relations to the judgment and intellect." His doctrine, however, is far removed from Arminianism, as is shown by his colloquy with Tilenus-Amica *Collatio de Gratice et Volunt. Humance concursu* (Leyden, 1621), *SEE TILENUS*, — and also by his *Defensio de Gratia et Libero Arbitrio* (Saumur, 1624, 8vo). His doctrine of universal grace may be thus summed up:

(1) "that God desires the happiness of all men, and that no mortal is excluded by *any divine decree* from the benefits that are procured by the death, sufferings, and gospel of Christ;

(2) that, however, none can be made a partaker of the blessings of the Gospel, and of eternal salvation, unless he *believe* in Jesus Christ;

(3) that such, indeed, is the immense and universal goodness of the Supreme Being, that He refuses to *none* the power of believing, though he does not grant unto *all* His assistance and succor, that they may wisely improve this power to the attainment of everlasting salvation; and that, in consequence of this, multitudes perish through their own fault, and not from any want of goodness in God." Those who embraced this doctrine were called *Universalists,* because they represented God as willing to show mercy to *all* mankind; and *Hypothetical Universalists,* because the *condition* of faith in Christ was necessary to render them the objects of this mercy. *SEE AMYRAUT*. His writings are collected under the title *Opera, partim ab auct. edita, partim post ej. obit. vulgata* (Genev. 1658, fol.). — Calder, *Life of Episcopius,* 456; Hook, *Eccl. Biog. 2:*407; Nichols,

*Calvinism and Arminianism, 1:*202 sq.; Watson, *Theol. Inst. 2:*215, 411; Smith's Hagenbach, *Hist. of Doctrines, §* 225, *a.*

Cameron, Archibald,

a Presbyterian minister, was born in Scotland in 1771 or 1772. When young, he migrated with his parents to America. Little is known of his early years but that he spent some time at the Transylvania University (Kentucky), and completed his studies at Bardstown, when he connected himself with the Prebyterian Church. In 1795 he was licensed, and, as a missionary, distributed his labors in the counties of Nelson, Shelby, and Jefferson. He was installed in 1796 over the churches of Akron and Fox Run, Shelby, and Big Spring in Nelson, and for several years the field of his labors embraced a circuit of from thirty to forty miles. Seven churches were organized by his instrumentality, and he was often obliged to swim the swollen streams to do his duty. During a revival in 1828 large additions were made to his churches, and from this time he supplied the congregations of Shelbvville and Mulberry. He died December 4, 1836. He published *The Faithful Steward* (1806)*: — The Monitor, on Religious Liberty,* etc. (1806)*: — An Appeal to the Scriptures,* etc. (1811): — A *Discourse between the Confession of Faith of the Presbyterian Church and a Preacher who holds the Doctrine of an Indefinite and Universal Atonement* (1814): — A *Defence of the Doctrines of Grace* (a series of Letters, 1816): — A *Reply to Questions on Predestination,* etc. (1822). — Sprague, *Annals, 4:*168.

Cameron, Richard,

founder of the "Cameronians" or "Covenanters," was born at Falkland, in the county of Fife. He first acquired notice by his bold opposition to the measures of Charles II for enforcing the Episcopal form of worship on the Scottish people. The measures adopted by the government roused the people, and among those who gave fullest expression to the popular sentiments was Richard Cameron. He belonged to the extreme party, who held by the perpetually binding obligations of the Solemn League and Covenant, *SEE COVENANTS,* which were set aside at the restoration of Charles II. Along with some others, he strenuously resisted the measures that reinstated ,the Episcopal Church in Scotland, and that proscribed the meetings for public worship of unauthorized religious bodies. Contrary to law, he persistedin preaching in the fields, and became obnoxious to

government, to which, indeed, he finally assumed an attitude of defiance. Not only were his doctrines obnoxious to the government, but many of his brethren of the clergy dreaded his zeal, which they considered extreme, and at a meeting held in Edinburgh in 1677 they formally reproved him. He retired to Holland, but soon returned; and on the 22d of June, 1680, in company with about twenty other persons, he entered the town of Sanquhar in Dumfriesshire, and at the marketcross proclaimed that Charles Stuart had, by his perjuries, his tyrannical government, and his usurpation, forfeited all right and title to the crown. The party kept together in arms for a month; but on the 20th of July, while lying at Airdsmoss in Kyle, they were surprised by a large body of horse and foot, and in the skirmish which followed Cameron was killed, and his followers were dispersed or taken prisoners. A neat monument has been recently placed on the spot where Cameron fell, replacing an old and plainer structure. — *English Cyclopcedia;* Chambers' *Encyclopcedia;* Hetherington, *Hist. of Church of Scotland*, 2:106 sq.; *Biog. Presbyteriana* (Edinb. 1835, vol. 1). *SEE COVENANTERS.*

Cameronians

(1.), the mitigated Calvinists, who followed the opinions of John Camero (q.v.).

(2.) The and prelatical party in Scotland, so called from Richard Cameron (q.v.). *SEE COVENANTERS.*

Cameronists

SEE CAMERONIANS.

Camisards

(from the French *camise*, a peasant's jacket), a sect of fanatics (made such by oppression) in France toward the end of the seventeenth century. The predictions of Brousson (q.v.) and Jurieu, as to the coming downfall of the papacy and the end of the world seem to have given a bent to the minds of the Protestants of Dauphine and Vivarais. "In 1688 five or six hundred Protestants of both sexes gave themselves out to be prophets, and inspired of the Holy Ghost. They had strange fits, which came upon them with faintings, as in a swoon, which made them stretch out their arms and legs, and stagger. They struck themselves with their hands; they fell on their

backs, shut their eyes, and heaved their breasts. The symptoms answer to those produced by inspiring nitrous oxide, and, were the fact then discovered, we should have been tempted to suspect imposture. They remained a while in trances, and, coming out of them, declared that they saw the heavens open, the angels, paradise, and hell. Those who were just on the point of receiving the spirit of prophecy dropped down, not only in the assemblies, but in the fields, and in their own houses, crying out *Mercy*. The least of their assemblies made up four or five hundred, and some of them amounted to even three or four thousand. The hills resounded with their loud cries for mercy, and with imprecations against the priests, the pope, and his and Christian dominion, with predictions of the approaching fall of popery. All they said at these times was heard and received with reverence and awe." The government finally interfered with a violence which naturally increased the disorder. In 1702 a number of the Camisards were put to death with torture. A war arose, in which Cavalier, a young baker, became prominent as an able leader. The Marshal de Montrevel was sent by the court to quell these disturbances, and, after him, Marshal Villars; and, after a long series of the most barbarous massacres and perfidious cruelties, these wretched people were finally, in 1705, put down. Cavalier submitted, and afterward went to England. Ravance, Catinat, and Franceze, three of their leaders, were burned alive, and Vilas and Jonquet, also commanders of their forces, together with two merchants who assisted them, broken on the wheel. Many of these Camisards fled to England. See Smedley, *Reformed Religion in France,* vol. in, ch. 25; *Theatre Sacre des Cevennes* (London, 1707, by Max Misson, the chief source of information); *The Wars of the Cevennes under Cavalier* (Dublin, 1726); Schulz, *Geschichie der Camisarden* (Weimar, 1790); Court, *Hist. des troubles des Cevennes* (Villefranche, 1760); *Histoire des Camisards* (Lond. 1744); Peyrat, *Hist. des Pasteurs du Desert* (Paris, 1842); Hoffmann, *Gesch. des A ufruhrs in den Cevennen* (Nordlingen, 1837). *SEE FRENCH PROPHETS.*

Cammerhof, John Frederick,

one of the first bishops of the Moravian Church in America, was born near Magdeburg, Germany, July 28, 1721. Entering the Moravian ministry, he was sent to America as assistant to the presiding bishop, and arrived at a time when the Church at Bethlehem was a center of missionary activity among the American Indians. "In all the mission stations in Pennsylvania and New York Cammerhof was active, proclaiming the crucified one with

great power to the wild warriors, and through the agency of faithful interpreters, among whom was the famous missionary David Zeisberger, inviting them in eloquent appeals to look up and see their salvation finished." He won the confidence of the Indians, especially of the Delawares and the Six Nations, and in 1748 he was formally adopted by the Oneidas as a member of their tribe. In 1750 he attended an Iroquois council at Onondago, N. Y., travelling by canoes up the Susquehanna for 13 days, and thence on foot through the wild mountain regions of Southern New York a fortnight more. The journey broke down his constitution, and he died at Bethlehem, April 28,1771. — The *Moravian*, Sept. 26, 1861.

Ca'mon

(Hebrews *Kamon'*, ˆ/mq; perhaps *full of stalks* or grain; Sept. Καμών v. r. ˚Ραμνών), the place in which Jair (q.v.) the Judge was buried (<07105>Judges 10:5). As the scriptural notices of him all refer to the country east of Jordan, there is no reason against accepting the statement of Josephus *(Ant.* v. 7, 6) that Camon (Καμῶν) was a city of Gilead. In support of this is the mention by Polybius (v. 70, 12) of a *Crmus* (Καμοῦς, for Καμοῦν) in company with Pella and other trans-Jordanic places taken by Antiochus (Reland, *Palcest.* p. 679; Ritter, *Erdk. 15:*1026). Eusebius and Jerome *(Onomast. s.v.* Καμών, Camon) evidently confound it with the *Cyamon* (Judith 7:3) in the plain of Esdraelon; and this has misled Schwarz *(Palest.* p. 233). It is possibly the modern *Reimun* (comp. the Sept. reading *Rhamon),* four and a half miles west-north-west of Jerash or Gerasa (Van de Velde's *Map).*

Camp

Picture for Camp

(hnjmi *machaneh'*, an *encampment,* whether of troops or nomades, especially of the Israelites in the desert; hence also put for *troops* or a *company* itself; once t/nhjmi *machanoth', camps,* i.e. place of encampment, <12068>2 Kings 6:8; παρεμβολή, <58311>Hebrews 13:11, 13; Revelation. 20:9; elsewhere "castle"). Of the Jewish system of encampment the Mosaic books have left a detailed description. From the period of the sojourn in the wilderness to the crossing of the Jordan the twelve tribes were formed into four great armies, encamping in as many fronts, or forming a square, with a great space in the rear, where the tabernacle of the

Lord was placed, surrounded by the tribe of Levi and the bodies of carriers, etc., by the stalls of the cattle and the baggage: the four fronts faced the cardinal points while the march was eastward, but, as Judah continued to lead the van, it follows that, when the Jordan was to be crossed, the direction became westward, and therefore the general arrangement, so far as the cardinal points were concerned, was reversed. It does not appear that, during this time, Israel ever had lines of defense thrown up; but in after ages, when only single armies came into the field, it is probable that the castral disposition was not invariably quadrangular; and, from the many position is indicated on the crests of steep mountains, the fronts were clearly adapted to the ground and to the space which it was necessary to occupy. The rear of such positions, or the square camps in the plain, appear from the marginal reading of (1972)1 Samuel 17:20, and 26:5, to have been enclosed with a line ‘of carts or chariots, which, from the remotest period, was a practice among all the nomad nations of the north. (D’Aquine, *Le Camp des Israelites,* Par. 1623, 1624.) For a more general treatment of the subject, from a military point of view, *SEE ENCAMPE.*

Campanarium Or Campanile

(Lat. *campana,* hell), a bell-tower. The most striking campaniles are found in Italy, and they are those generally detached from the church, e.g. those of Florence, Cremona, Bologna, and’ Pisa. That of Florence, built by Giotto (1334),’ is a square 45 feet on each side and 267 feet high, in Italian Gothic, simple in design, but richly ornamented. In some instances these towers, on account of their great elevation and the narrowness of their base, have considerably deviated from the original perpendicular. The Campanile of Pisa, called ‘*Torre Pendente* (“the leaning tower”), is the most remarkable of these, having a deviation of nearly 13 feet in a height of 150 feet. *SEE BELL.*

Campanella, Thomas,

was born in Calabria 1568, and entered the Dominican order 1594. He applied himself chiefly to metaphysics, and followed his countryman Telesio, who died in 1588 at Cosenza, in his .,opposition to what was then taught in the schools under the name of Aristotelian philosophy. Campanella published his first work at Naples in 1591, entitled *Philosophia Sensibus demonstrata.* The schoolmen, and the monks especially, raised such a storm against Campanella that he left his native country. He was

accused of sorcery, of being an adept of Raymond Lullus and of some cabalistic rabbins. His works were seized and submitted to the Inquisition at Rome, which, however, gave him little trouble; but some time afterward (in 1598), being at Naples, he incautiously spoke against the government of the Spaniards, and, being thrown into prison, was put to the rack, and condemned to perpetual confinement. In 1626 Pope Urban VIII obtained for him his liberty, whereupon he repaired to Rome, and continued there some years; but finding that, the Spaniards were preparing fresh troubles for him, he fled into France, and landed at Marseilles in 1634. He passed the latter part of his life in the Dominican monastery at Paris, and died March 21, 1639. The number of his works is immense. Echard has given several catalogues, one of which contains eighty-two distinct works. Campanella was a man in whom every thing seems to have been extraordinary: his conduct, adventures, genius, habits of thought, style of writing, every thing was out of the usual track; hence he has been extravagantly praised, and as extravagantly abused and found fault with. In his moral character he was altogether beyond reproach; in his literary pursuits he was unwearied, excessively curious, and' greedy of knowledge. He left many MSS. Among those that have been published, the following are deserving of notice: *Prodromus Philosophice Instaurandce, seu de Natura Rerum* (Frankf. *1617): — De Sensu Rerum et Magia Libri IV* (Frankf. 1620.) This work was composed, as well as several others, by Campanella during his Neapolitan captivity, and was published in Germany by Adami, but the author published a second edition of it at Paris in 1636, which he dedicated to Richelieu. Father Mersenne wrote to refute the book as heretical, and Athanasius of Constantinople wrote against it in his *Anti-Campanella* (Paris, 1655) — *Real is Philosophic Epilogisticce Partes IV* (Frankf. 1620): — The *Civitas Solis,* often reprinted separately, and translated into various *languages: — Apolgia pro Galileo* (Frankf. *1662): — De Prcedestinatione, Electione, Reprobatione, et auxil is Divince Gratise Cento Thomisticus* (Paris, 1636). The author discusses some of the opinions of Thomas Aquinas, and supports those of *Origen: — Unversalis Philosophice, Libri XVIII* (Paris, 1638). The following works of Campanella were published after his death, namely: *De Libris propriis 'et . recta Ratione Studendi* (Paris, 1642, in which the author speaks of himself, his studies, and his works. — 'It was edited by Naude, who knew Campanella, and who speaks of him and his imprisonment in his *Considerations Politiques sur les Coups d'Etats): — De Monarchia Hispanica Discursus* (Amsterd. 1640). This perhaps the most remarkable

work of Campanella; was writteri by him during his confinement at Nat aples. It is an able sketch of the political world of that time (translated, *A Discourse touching the Spanish Monarchy*, Lond. 1654). — Tennemann, *Man. Hist. Philippians §* 317 319.

Campanîle,

a name adopted from the Itlalian for a bell-tower. *SEE CAMPANARIUM.*

Campanites,

a Socinian sect in Hungary, so named from Johannes Campanus (q.v.).

Campanus, Johannes,

an anti-Trinitarian theologian of the 16th century. He was a native of the duchy of Julich, and in 1528 was appointed lecturer on theology at the University of Wittenberg. Here he seems to have imbibed Arian opinions, which he afterward developed openly. He avowed his opposition to Luther, and left Saxony for Julich. The Roman Catholic authorities imprisoned him at Cleves on a charge of having excited the peasantry by his preaching that the world was soon coming to an end, about 1535, and he is said to have remained in prison 25 years, and to have died between 1575 and 1580, out of his mind. He wrote a number of books, among which are *Wider alle Welt nach den Aposteln,* in which his peculiar views are set forth; reproduced in his *Gottliche und, Heil. Schrift.* He rejected the divinity of the Holy Spirit, and taught that the Son of God is of the same substance with the Father, but not coeternal. See Schelhorn, *Diss. de J. Campano,* in his *Aneonit. Litterarum,* t. 11:1; Mosheim, *Ch. History,* cent. 16, § 3, pt. 2, ch. 4; Herzog, *RealEncyklopadie,* 1:192; Dorner, *Person of Christ,* div. 2, vol. 2, p. 160.

Campbell, Alexander,

founder of the Campbellites, or Disciples of Christ (q.v.), was born in the, county of Antrim, Ireland, about the year 1788, and was educated, as was hisr father before him, at the University of Glasgow, Scotland — both of them as Presbyterian clergymen. Thomas Campbell, the poet, was a relative and classmate of his father. On the one side his ancestry was of Scotch origin, and on the other Huguenot French. He emigrated to America in 1809, two years after his father, and settled at first in Washington county, Penn., near the spot in West Virginia to which he soon afterward removed,

and on which he lived during the remainder of his life. That spot, now the village of Bethany, was then a wild and secluded locality amid the hills. He was at first a minister of the "Secession" branch of Presbyterians, but was early led to the belief that "Christian union can result from nothing short' of the destruction of creeds and confessions of faith, inasmuch as human creeds and confessions have destroyed Christian union;" and "that nothing ought to be received into the faith or worship of the Church, or be made a term of communion among Christians, that is not as old as the New Testament. Nor ought anything to be admitted as of divine obligation in the Church constitution or management save what is enjoined by the authority of our Lord Jesus Christ and his apostles upon the New Testament Church, either in express terms or by approved precedent." The promulgation of these opinions causing disturbance in the Presbyterian Church, he and his father abandoned it in 1810, and formed a new society at Brush Run, Penn. In 1812 he became convinced that immersion is the proper form of baptism, and he and his congregation were immersed. In connection with his father, the Rev. Thomas Campbell, he formed several congregations, which united with the Redstone Baptist Association, but protested against all human creeds as a bond of union, accepting the Bible alone as the rule of faith and practice. Being excluded from the fellowship of the Baptist churches in 1827, his followers began to organize into a separate body, which has since spread in all parts of the United' States, especially in Virginia, Tennessee, and Kentucky. The number of disciples was estimated in 1864, altogether, at about 350,000 members, of whom only a small number belonged to Great Britain. *SEE DISCIPLES OF CHRIST.* In 1823 Mr. Campbell began the publication of *The Christian Baptist,* afterward merged in the *Millennial Harbinger,* of which he remained editor. during his life. In 1840 he founded Bethany College, and he was its president to the day ,of his death. He was a member of the Virginia Constitutional Convention of 1829-30. It was in that body that he gave prophetic notice of what would ultimately be the course of Western Virginia, and of what he lived to see accomplished. In 1847 he visited Europe, receiving marked attentions from many of the political and religious leaders. On the slavery conflict he was conservative." "Mr. Campbell never was the champion of American slavery. He believed, however, that the relation of master and slave had existed in Biblical times under the divine sanction, or, at all events, tolerance; and while he did not desire to be regarded as the apologist of American slavery, he contended that it should not be a test

question of communion in the churches. His own slaves he had emancipated many years before."

His life was full of labors, well supported by a physical frame of athletic vigor. But in 1865 he began to fail and he died at Bethany, March 4, 1866. He had many of the great qualities of a reformer, and among them were personal energy and pugnacity. His career led him frequently into public "debates," — the most important of which were as follows: "With the Rev. John Walker, a minister of the Secession-Presbyterian church in the State of Ohio, held at Mt, Pleasant in the year 1820. This debate created a great local interest throughout all that section of country, and was attended by a vast concourse of people. Next followed his debate with the Rev. William MeCalla, on 'Christian Baptism,' held in Washington,. Ky., in the year 1823; next his debate with Robert Owen, at Cincinnati, in the year 1828, on the Truth of Christianity; next his debate, in the same city, in the year 1836, with Archbishop Purcell, on the infallibility of the Church of Rome; and finally, in the year 1843, his debate with the Rev. Dr. N. L. Rice, held in the city of Lexington, Ky., the specific points of which were 'the action, subject, design, and administration of Christian baptism;' also, the 'character of spiritual -influence in conversion and sanctification,' and the 'expediency and tendency of ecclesiastical creeds as terms of union and communion." "Dr. Campbell was highly endowed as an orator; a noble presence, and a sonorous and powerful voice, gave effect to his vigorous thought, and fluent, energetic speech. Vast audiences gathered, to hear him in his journeys through the West. He wrote largely, chiefly in his *Harbinger;* but he published also a summary of theology called the *Christian System* (often reprinted); a treatise on *Remission of Sin* (3d ed. 1846); *Memoirs of Thomas Campbell* (Cincinnati. 1861, 8vo). See also the article DISCIPLES OF CHRIST. — *Methodist* (N.Y.), No. 328; *A mer. Christ. Rec. 42* sq.; *Cincinnati Gaz.* March, 1866; Landis, *Rabbah Taken* (N. Y. 1844, 8vo); Richardson, *Mem. of A. Campbell* (Philippians 1868). *SEE CAMPBELL, THOMAS.*

Campbell, Alexander Augustus,

a Presbyterian minister, was born in Amherst county, Va., Dec. 30, 1789. He first studied medicine, and in 1811 graduated M.D. at Philadelphia. A violent attack of yellow fever was the means of his conversion, and he gave up the practice of medicine and applied himself to theology. He was licensed to preach by the Presbytery of North Alabama, April 2, 1822, and

ordained as an evangelist Sept. 29,1823. He was at first an itinerant, then for four years, from 1824, pastor at Tuscumbia and Russellsville, Ala.; declining a call from the Church of Florence, Ala., he however remained there two years with great success, removing to Haywood county, West Tenn., in 1829-80, where he preached as a missionary. Having received a call from the Church in Jackson, Tenn., he was installed pastor Oct. 3, 1833; there he preached, lectured, edited a newspaper, and practiced medicine, principally among the Cherokee and Creek missionaries, at the same time, laboring faithfully until his death, May 27th, 1846. Mr. Campbell published a treatise on *Scripture Baptism* (1844). — Sprague, *Annals*, 4:651.

Campbell, The HON. Archibald,

a bishop of the Scottish Episcopal Church, consecrated in 1711 at Dundee. On account of difficulties with his clergy as to "usages," he left Scotland in 1724 and returned to London, where he spent most of the remainder of his life. In his latter days he carried his nonjuring principles out by consecrating a bishop without any assistance. The date of his death is unknown. He is the author of several theological works, which are strongly Romanizing. Among them are, *The Doctrines of a Middle State between Death and the Resurrection, Of Prayers for the Dead,* etc. (Lond. 1713, fol.), and *The Necessity of Revelation* (Lond. 1739, 8vo). , In. his work on the Middle State, he teaches "that there *is,* an intermediate or middle state for departed souls to abide in, between death and the resurrection, far different from what they are afterward to be in when our bless ed Lord Jesus Christ shall appear at his second-coming; 'that there is no immediate judgment after death; that to pray and offer for, and to commemorate our deceased brethren, is not only lawful and useful, but also our bounden duty; that the intermediate state between death and the resurrection is a state of purification in its lower, as well as of fixed joy and enjoyment in its higher mansions; and that the full perfection of purity and holiness is not so to be attained in any mansion of Hades, higher or lower, as that any soul of mere man can be admitted to enter into the beatific vision, in the highest heavens, before the resurrection, and the trial by fire, which it must then go through." — Hook, *Eccl. Biography,* 2:414.

Campbell, George, D.D.,

was born at Aberdeen, Dec. 25, 1719, and was educated at the Marischal College at Aberdeen. After leaving college he studied law, and was apprenticed to a writer to the Signet at Edinburgh; but, having a strong bent to theology, he obtained a release from his master, and studied theology at Edinburgh. In 1748 he was appointed to the pastoral charge of the parish of Banchory Ternan, near Aberdeen, and in 1755 he obtained a parish in Aberdeen. In 1759 he was made principal of the MIarischal College. In 1763 he published his *Dissertation on Miracles,* in opposition to Hume, which was translated into several Continental languages (new ed. Edinb. 1823, 8vo). The book had an immense success, and procured for its author the degree of D.D. •After his death appeared his *Lectures on Ecclesiastical History* (new ed. Lond. 1840, 8vo), which was answered by Skinner, bishop of Aberdeen. His most important work was his *Translation of the Four Gospels, with a Commentary,* which appeared not long before his death, and has been repeatedly republished. The best edition is that of Aberdeen (1814, 4 vols. 8vo); but there is a very good and cheap American edition (1837, 2 vols.). He wrote also *Lectures on the Pastoral Character* (Lond. 1811, 8vo); *Phiosophy of Rhetoric* (1776, 8vo, numerous editions); *Lectures on Systematic Theology and Pulpit Eloquence* (Lond. 1807, 8vo, numerous editions). He retired from his college duties ‘some years before his death, and received a pension of £300 a year from George III. He died April 6, 1796. The life of Dr. Campbell has been written by the Rev. G. S. Keith. — Darling, *Cyclopedia Bibliographica, 1:*567; Jamieson, *Cyclop. of Modern Religious Biography, 1:*99; Jones, *Christian Biography,* s.v.

Campbell, John, Ll.D.,

was born in Edinburgh, March 8,1708. His life was devoted to literature, and his publications were very numerous. He edited the “Biographia Britannica,” and was one of the writers of the “Universal History.” His title to mention in this work rests on the publication of *A Discourse on Providence* (1748, 3d ed. 8vo); *Thoughts on Moral and Religious Subjects* (1749, 8vo); *A. new and complete :History of the Holy Bible* (1733, 2 vols. folio).— *General Biog. Dictionary,* 1:119; Darling, *Cyclopcedia Bibliographica,* 1:569.

Campbell, John,

an Independent minister, was born at Edinburgh in March, 1766, and apprenticed to a goldsmith. About 1789, at which time he was actively engaged in measures for the extension of Sunday-schools, he began to prepare himself for the Christian ministry. He subsequently visited London to take charge of twenty-four young natives of Africa, who were brought from Sierra Leone to be instructed in' Christianity, with a view to its introduction into their native land; and in 1804 he became pastor of the Independent Church in Kingsland, a charge which he retained until his death, April 4th, 1840. Mr. Campbell took an active part in the formation of the British and Foreign Bible Society, and several other important religious associations. In 1812 he made a journey to the stations of the London Missionary Society in South Africa, from which he returned in 1814. Of this journey he published an account (1815, 8vo). In 1818-21 he revisited Africa, and found some interesting changes produced by the civilization introduced by the missionaries. The journal of his second visit appeared in 1822 (2 vols. 8vo). Mr. Campbell published numerous works, chiefly for the instruction of youth, and he was the founder, and for eighteen years the editor of the *Youth's Magazine,* a religious periodical of great utility. — Jamieson, *Religious Biog.* p. 100.

Campbell, Thomas,

one of the founders of the religious denomination generally called "Disciples," was born Feb. 1, 1763, in Ireland, and descended from a family — the Campbells of Argyle — which makes a prominent figure in Scottish history. In 1798 he entered the ministry in connection with that branch of the Presbyterian Church which is known as Seceders or Seceding Presbyteries. *SEE PRESBYTERIANISM.* In 1807 he emigrated to the United States, and was received at Philadelphia into the communion of the Associate Synod of North America. For about two years he supplied with ministerial labor the destitute churches of this connection in Western Pennsylvania Shortly after, in 1809, he was joined by his son, Alexander Campbell (q.v.). Both father and son soon declared against the use of any human creed, confession of faith, or formularies of doctrine and church government; and when their views were rejected by the Seceders as a body, they drew up a "declaration and address," in which the pious of all the denominations in the vicinity were invited to form a union, with the word of the Bible as their only creed. A congregation on the basis of these

principles was organized at Brush Run. *SEE CAMPBELL, ALEXANDER.* Thomas Campbell retained at first infant baptism, although his son Alexander pressed upon his attention "the incongruity of demanding an express precept or precedent for any positive church ordinance, and yet practicing infant baptism, for which, neither the one nor the other could be produced." Gradually Thomas Campbell changed his views on the question of baptism; and on June 12, 1812, both he and his son Alexander, together with the members of their congregation, were immersed by Elder Luse, of the Baptist community. In 1813 they were received into Redstone Baptist Association, stipulating in writing that "no terms of union or communion other than the Holy Scriptures should be required." Henceforth Alexander Campbell took, instead of his father Thomas, the lead in the religious movement which at length eventuated in the formation of those who sympathized' with them into a separate denominational connection. Thomas Campbell labored with great zeal; as an itinerant minister, for the dissemination of his views, until 1846, when old age compelled him to rest. He spent the remainder of his life at Bethany with his son Alexander. In 1850 he was deprived of his sight, but his intellect remained unclouded. He died January 4, 1854. See Alexander Campbell, *Memoirs of Elder Thomas Campbell* (Cincinnati. 1861, 8vo); and the articles *SEE CAMPBELL, ALEXANDER*; *SEE DISCIPLES OF CHRIST.*

Campbellism.

SEE DISCIPLES OF CHRIST.

Campe, Joachim Heinrich,

a German clergyman and author, was born in 1746 at Deensen, in Brunswick: became, in 1773, military chaplain at Potsdam; in 1776, director of an educational institution in Dessau. In 1777 he established his own educational school at Trittow, near Hamburg, which he sold in 1783. In 1787 he was appointed school-councillor in Brunswick, and in 1805, canon. He died at Brunswick in 1818. He is one of the most famous German authors of juvenile works, especially works of travel. His work *Robinson der Jiungere* (Robinson the Younger) has been translated into all European languages, and its immense popularity in Germany may be inferred from the fact that a 60th edition of it was published in 1861. His writings, prepared in a rationalistic spirit, contributed largely to lead away the youth of Germany from simple faith in Christianity. The complete

edition of his juvenile works fills 37 volumes *(Sdmmtliche KinderundJugendschriften,* 4th ed. Brunswick, 1829-32). — Pierer, *Universal-Lexikon,* s.v.; Hurst, *History of Rationalism,* p. 188.

Campegio (Otherwise Campeggio, Campejus), Lorenzo,

Cardinal, was born in 1474, became professor of law at Padua, and, on the death of his wife, took orders as a priest. He became auditor of the Rota, bishop of Feltri, and nuncio in Germany. Leo X elevated him to the purple. In 1524 he was legate at the Nuremberg Diet, and there and elsewhere he exerted all his skill of intrigue against the Reformation with great success. In 1528 he was sent legate to Henry VIII (who, in a former mission, had made him bishop of Salisbury) to effect some settlement of the question of the divorce. Upon this occasion he was the bearer of a bull bestowing upon Wolsey the most ample powers to effect the divorce. These powers, however, were shortly withdrawn, and Campegio returned to Rome shorn of his bishopric of Salisbury. He was a man of great talents, and intimate knowledge of the ecclesiastical law. His letters are preserved in the collection entitled *Epistolarum miscellanearum Singularium Libri X* (Basle, 1555, folio). There were *seven* prelates of this family. — *Biog. Univ.* 6:633. See Burnet, *Hist. of Engl. Reformation,* vol. in, passim.

Campen, James Van,

one of the chiefs of the Anabaptists. After the expulsion of the sect from Germany he went to the Netherlands, and John Boccold.(q.v.) appointed him, in 1534, bishop of Amsterdam. He was executed in 1534.

Campen, John De,

was born at Campen, in Overyssel, about 1490. He studied Hebrew under Reuchlin, and filled the Hebrew professorship at Louvain from 1519 to 1531, after which he traveled into Italy, Germany, and Poland. At Rome he was enrolled among the Hebraeists of the pope. On his way back to Louvain he died of the plague, Sept. 7, 1538. He published *De naturE litterarum etpunctorum Hebraicorum ex variis Elice Levite opusculis libellus* (1520, 12mo); also *Psalmorumm omniumjuxta Hebraicam veritatem paraphrastica interpretatio* (1532, 16mo; trans. into English, Lond. 1535, 24mo)*: — Paraphrasis in Salmonis Ecclesiastem,* and *Commentarioli in Epist. Pauli ad Romans et Galatians* (Venice, 1534). — *Biog. Univ.* 6:637; Landon, *Eccl. Dictionary,* 1:525.

Campen, Thomas Van.

SEE KEMPIS, THOMAS A.

Camphire

Picture for Camphire 1

(כֹּפֶר *kopher;* Sept. κύπρος ; Lat. *cyprus,* the *cyprus-flower),* rendered in our margin *cypress* (Song of Solomon 1:14; 4:13).

Picture for Camphire 2

It is entirely different from the modern *gum camphor,* although the names appear to be etymologically connected. The latter is a product of a tree largely cultivated in the island of Formosa, the *Camphora officinarum,* of the Nat. order *Lauracece.* There is another tree, the *Dryobalancps aromatica* of Sumatra, which also yields camphor; but it is improbable that the substance secreted by either of these trees was known to the ancients. The plant in question is conceded to be the *el-Henna* of the Arabs *(Lawsonia inermis* and *spinosa* of Linnaeus, which Lamarck and some other naturalists regard as the same species, and name it *Lawsonia alba,* alleging that the thorny ends of the branches characteristic of the latter are due only to old age; but each seems to retain its peculiar traits under cultivation), described by Dioscordes (1:125) and Pliny (12:24) as growing in Egypt, and producing odoriferous flowers, from which was made the *oleum Cyprineum.* Mariti remarks that "the shrub known in the Hebrew language by the name of *kopher* is common in the island of Cyprus, and thence had its Latin came;" also, that "the *Botrus Cypri* has been supposed to be a kind of rare and exquisite grapes, tiansplanted from Cyprus to Engaddi; but the *Botrus* is known to the natives of Cyprus as an odoriferous shrub called *henna,* or *alkanna."* So R. Ben Melek *(ad Song of Solomon* 1:14), as quoted and translated by Celsius *(Hierobot.* 1:223). If we refer to the works of the Arabs, we find both in Serapion and Avicenna reference from their *Hinna* to the description by Dioscorides and Galen of *Kupros or Cypros.* Sprengel states *(Comment. on Dioscor.* 1:124, note) that the inhabitants of Nulbia call the henna-plant *Khojreh;* he refers to Delisle *(Flor. Egypt.* p. 12). If we examine the works of Oriental travelers and naturalists, we shall find that this plant is universally esteemed in Eastern countries, and appears to have been so from the earliest times, both on account of the fragrance of its flowers and the coloring properties

of its leaves (see Prosp. Alpin.100:13). It was especially abundant near Ashkelon (Pliny, 12:51; Josephus, *War,* 4:8, 3). Thus Rauwolff, when at Tripoli *(Travels,* iv), "found there another tree, not unlike unto our privet, by the Arabians called *A lcana* or *Henna,* and by the Grecians, in their vulgar tongue, *Schenna,* which they have from Egypt, where, but 'above all' in Cayre, they grow in abundance. The Turks and Moors nurse these up with great care and diligence because of their sweet-smelling flowers. They also, as I am informed, keep their leaves all winter, which leaves they powder and mix with the juice of citrons, and stain therewith against great holidays the hair and nails of their children of a red color; which color may perhaps be seen with us on the manes and tails of Turkish horses" (see also Belon, 2:74). The variety called *Lawsonia spinosa* is larger than the other, growing to a height of from four to six feet; its flowers are less abundant and less fragrant, but have a more powerfully coloring property. In appearance both plants resemble myrtle; the flowers (which grow in clusters) are small and beautifully white, and exhale an agreeable odor. The women take great pleasure in them. They hold them in their hand, carry them in their bosom, and keep them in their apartments to perfume the air (comp. 2013Song of Solomon 1:13). To prepare the leaves for the use to which the plant is so generally applied by the women of Egypt, they are gathered about the commencement of spring, and, having been exposed to the air. till thoroughly dry, are reduced to powder, which being afterward made into a paste, is then fit for use. This paste requires about five hours to dry upon whatever part it may be laid, and the red tinge it imparts is durable. It was anciently applied to the nails of the hands and feet, to the soles of the feet and the palms of the hands, and sometimes to the hair. Brides in Persia are still thus ornamented on the night before marriage (Sir Wm. Ouseley's *Travels in Persia,* 3:565). From the appearance of the nails of mummies, there can be no doubt that it was used in the same manner by the Egyptians as it is by their descendants in the present day. The expression rendered in 5212Deuteronomy 21:12, in directing the treatment of a female captive, "pare her nails," is supposed to mean "adorn her nails," and would imply the antiquity of this practice, although others are of opinion that the marginal reading, "suffer to grow," is the more correct sense, as an act of mourning. *SEE PAINT.*

For the scientific classification of this plant, see the *Penny Cyclopeadiads.v.* Lawsonia. The shrub is figured and described by Sonnini, *Travels,* 1:164; see also Oedmann, *Samlt. 1:*91; 6:102 sq.; Hasselquist,

Trav. p. 503; Shaw, *Trav.* p. 103; Hartmann, *Hebraer. 2:*356 sq.'; Russel, *Aleppo,* 1:134; Mariti, p. 541; Forskal, *Flor.* p. 55; Burckhardt, Arabia, p. 442; Lane, *Mod. Eg.* 1:52; Rosenmüller, *Bib. Bot.* p. 133; Wilkinson, *Anc. Eg* 2:345. *SEE BOTANY.*

Camphuysen, Theodor Raphelsz,

a Dutch theologian, was born in 1586 at Gorkum. He was first a landscape painter, and rose to eminence in his art. Afterward, having devoted himself to theological studies, he became one of the leaders of the Socinians. He was expelled from his parish, Vleuten, and died at Doccum in 1627. He published *Theologiseke Wercke* (Amst. 1657, 8vo; 1672, 4to), and a rhymed translation of the Psalms in Dutch, 1680. A biography of Camphuysen was published by Kropman (Amsterdam, 1804). — Hoefer, *Biog. Generale,* 8:399.

Campian, Edmund,

an English apostate and Jesuit, was born in London in 1540, and was educated at Christ's Hospital. He took his degrees at Oxford, where he made an oration before Queen Elizabeth on her visit to that University. Afterward he passed over into Ireland, and about 1571 proceeded to Douai, where he openly renounced the Reformed faith. He went to Rome, and was admitted a Jesuit in 1573. He was sent by Gregory XIII, along with the Jesuit Parsons, into England, in June, 1580. Here he performed all the duties of a zealous provincial, and diligently propagated his opinions. In 1581 he printed *Rationes* 10 *oblati certaminis in cause fidei reddita Academicis Anglie.* It was afterward printed in English, and ably refuted by Whitaker. His activity at length drew upon him the attention of Walsingham, the Secretary of State, and he was arrested, carried to the Tower, and put cruelly to the torture, which he bore courageously. On the 1st of December, 1581, he,' together with several other Romish priests, was hanged at Tyburn on the charge of high treason. Other works of Campian are *Narratio de Divortio Henrici VIII* (Douai. 1622); *Epistolce ad Mercurianum* (the general of the Jesuits; Antwerp, 1631); a *History of Ireland* (Dublin, 1633, fol.). A volume of *Orationes, Epistolbe* and his treatise *De Imitatione Rhetorica,* were published in one volume at Ingolstadt (1602). His life was written by Paul Bombino, a Jesuit (best edition, Mantua, 1620, 8vo). — Hume, *History of England,* ch. xli; Hook, *Eccl. Biog.* 3:428.

Campian Manuscript

Picture for Campian Manuscript

(CODEX CAMPIXNUS, so called from the Abbe des Camps, who presented it to Louis XIV in 1707), a beautiful little Greek MS. of the four Gospels in very neat uncial letters' supposed to belong to the ninth or tenth century. It was used by Wetstein, re-examined by Scholz, copied by Tisclhendorf, and collated by Tregelles. It contains many good readings. Besides the indications of sectionsin the margin, there are also scholia, some of them in the most minute writing. Besides accents and breathings, the words are marked with a musical notation. The MS. is now in the Imperial Librarty at Paris (where it is numbered 48), and is known as in of the Gospels. — Scrivener, *Introd. to N.T.* p. 110. *SEE MANUSCRIPTS, BIBLICAL.*

Camp-Meeting,

a name given to a certain class of religious meetings held in the open air. "The first camp-meeting in the United States was held in 1799, on the banks of Red River, in Kentucky. Two brothers by the name of M'Gee, one a Presbyterian and one a Methodist, being on a religious tour from;Tennessee, where the former was settled, to a place called the 'Barrens,' near Ohio, stopped at a settlement on the river to attend a sacramental occasion with the Rev. Mr. M'Greedy, a Presbyterian. John M'Gee, the Methodist, was invited to preach first, and did so with great liberty and power. His brother and Rev. Mr. Hoge followed him with sermons, with remarkable effect. The Spirit was copiously poured forth upon the people, and produced tears of contrition and shouts of joy. Rev. Messrs. M'Greedy, Hoge, and Rankins, all Presbyterians, left the house, but the M'Gees were too powerfully affected themselves to flee, under circumstances of so much interest. John was expected to preach again; but when the time arrived, he arose and informed the people that the overpowering nature of his feelings would not allow of his preaching, and exhorted them to surrender their hearts to God. Cries and sobs were heard in every part of the house. The excitement was indescribable. When the noise of this extraordinary movement reached the surrounding country, the people rushed to see what these things meant, for they had never heard of the like 'before. By this means the meeting-house was immediately overflowed. An altar was therefore erected unto the Lord in the forest.

This gave a new impulse to public interest, and many came from every direction, with provisions and other necessaries for encampment, and remained several days, dwelling in tents. It was a wonderful occasion. Sectarian divisions seemed to have 'been' forgotten, in the general concern for the prevalence of spiritual religion. The services were conducted by Presbyterians, Baptists, and Methodists. The result was unparalleled, and suggested another meeting of the kind, which was held on the Muddy River; and still another, on what was called the Ridge, both of which were attended by immense throngs. By a prudent: estimate, it was reckoned that one hundred souls were 'added to the Lord' at the last-named meeting. From this unpremeditated beginning these meetings were extended, increasing in power and usefulness, under the special direction of Presbyterians and Methodists. Because of this union of sects in their support, they were called 'general camp-meetings.' It is said that the roads leading to the grove where they were held were literally crowded, and that entire neighborhoods were forsaken of their inhabitants.' A Presbyterian minister calculated that there weie''at least twenty thousand persons present at one meeting held in Kentucky. At length, however, the Presbyterians gradually retired from the field; but the Methodists carried them into other parts of the country,' till they became general in the connection. With more or less efficacy, they have been continued to the present time, not, however, without opposition oim the part of some, and misgivings with many others in regard to their expediency" *(Essay on Camp-meetings,* 'p. 7-11).

The camp-meetings were introduced into England by. Rev. Lorenzo Dow (q.v.), an earnest Methodist preacher, who, after laboring for some time in England as an independent itinerant, and finding, in 1807, a general religious interest in Staffordshire, suggested to the people the plan of camp-meetings. The people immediately adopted it. A flag was hoisted on Mow Hill; the population gathered to it from all the surrounding regions, and the first English campmeeting was held. William Clowes and Hugh Bourne, who were among the most zealous and useful laymen in the revivals of that period, took an active part in the first meetings. Bourne vindicated them in a pamphlet, which called forth counter publications from the preachers of Burslem and Macclesfield circuits. As it' was alleged that many excesses attended such outdoor services, the Wesleyan Conference, in 1807, declared, '" It is our judgment that, even supposing such meetings to be allowable in America, they are highly improper in

England, and likely to be productive of considerable mischief, and we disclaim connection with 'them." Their advocates, however, continued to hold them. Hugh Bourne, who aroused the people of Lancashire, Cheshire, and Staffordshire with his exhortations and prayers, was expelled in 1808 from the connection by the Burslem Quarterly Meeting; and, two years later, Clowes, who continued to attend the camp-meetings, was also expelled. Clowes commenced a course of home-missionary labors, giving up his business for the purpose. In 1810 the "Primitive Methodist" denomination was organized, which sanctioned the' habit of preaching in camp-meetings, as well as in market-places and on the highways. *SEE METHODISTS, PRIMITIVE.* The Wesleyan Conference has never taken back its disapproval of the camp-meetings; but the Wesleyans in Ireland commenced to hold campmeetings in 1860, and their organ, *The Irish Evangelist,* took ground in favor of them. See *An Essay cn Camp-meetings* (N. Y. 1849); Stevens, *Hist. of Methodism,* in, 224; Bangs, *History of M. E. Church, 2:*101; Porter, *Compendiium of Methodism,* p. 146, 468; Porter, *Camp-Meetings* (N. Y. 24mo); *Meth. Quart. Review,* 1861, p. 582.

Camus, Jean Pierre,

Bishop of Belley, was born at Paris in 1582, and was consecrated bishop Aug. 31, 1609. He devoted all his energies to the duties of his diocese, especially in reforming abuses, and endeavoring to bring back the monks and nuns to a regular life. On the latter point he was rigid. In 1629 he resigned his see, and retired into the abbey of Aulnai, given to him by the king upon his resignation of his bishopric. He afterward entered the Hospital of Incurables of Paris, where he died, April 26, 1653. The number of his writings is immense; the Abbe Le Clerc attributes to him more than two hundred volumes, consisting of controversial, moral, and devout treatises,, sermons, letters, and religious novels. He was a bitter and sarcastic foe of the Mendicant orders. — Landon, *Eccl. Dictionary,* 2:526; Niceron, *Mémoires,* 36:92.

Cana (Kavã),

a town in Galilee, not far from Capernaum, and on higher ground; it is memorable as the scene of Christ's first miracle (John 2:1-11; 4:46), as well as of a subsequent one (John 4:46-54), and also as the native place of the apostle Nathanael (John 21:2). *This* Cana is not named in the Old Testament, but is mentioned by Josephus as a village of Galilee *(Life,* § 16,

64; *War,* 1:17, 5). The site has usually been identified with the present *Kefr Kenna,* a small place about four miles north-east from Nazareth, on one of the roads to Tiberias. It is a neat village, pleasantly situated on the descent of a hill looking to the southwest, and surrounded by plantations of olive and other fruit-trees. There is a large spring in the neighborhood, enclosed by a wall, which, if this be the Cana of the New Testament, is doubtless that from which water was drawn at the time of our Lord's visit. It is also observable that water-pots of compact limestone are still used in this neighborhood, and some old ones are, as might be expected, shown as those which once contained the miraculous wine. Here are also the remains of a Greek church, said to stand over the house in which the miracle was performed, and — doubtless much older — the fountain from which the water for the miracle was brought (Mislin, 3:443-446). The Christians of the village are entirely of the Greek Church. The "water-pots of stone" were shown to M. Lamartine, though at Willibald's visit, centuries before, there had been but one remaining *(Early Trav.* p. 16). In the time of the Crusades the six jars were brought to France, where one of them is said still to exist in the Musee d'Angers (see M. Didron's Essays in the *Annales Archeologiques,* 11:5; 13:2). There is also shown a house said to be that of Nathaniel. Kefr Kenna has been visited and described by most travelers in Palestine. The tradition identifying this village with Cana is certainly of considerable age (see Hegesippus, p. 5). It existed in the time of Willibald (the latter half of the eighth century), who visited it in passing from Nazareth to Tal or; and again in that of Phocas (twelfth century; see Reland, p. 680). Saewulf, who visited Palestine in A.D. 1102, says, "Six miles to the N.E. of Nazareth, on a hill, is Cana of Galilee" *(Early Trav. in Pal.* p. 47). Marinus Sanutus, in the fourteenth century, describes Cana as lying north of Sepphoris, on the side of a high hill, with a broad fertile plain in front *(Gesta Dei,* p. 253). Quaresmius states that in his time (A.D. 1620) two Canas were pointed out *(Elucid. 2:*852). See *Quar; Statement* of "Pal. Explor. Fund," April 1878, p. 67.

There is a ruined place called *Kana el-Jelil,* about eight miles N. ½ E. from Nazareth, which Dr. Robinson is inclined to regard as the more probable site of Cana. His reasons, which are certainly of considerable weight (especially the strict agreement of the name, "Cana'of Galilee"), may be seen in *Biblical Researches,* 3:204-208. They are combated by De Saulcy *(Narrative, 2:*320). According to Thomson *(Land and Book,* 2:121), few Moslems of the vicinity know of the epithet el-Jelil as applied to the place.

Dr. Robinson says, “It is situated on the left side of the wady coming down from Jefat, just where the latter enters the plain el-Buttauf, on the southern declivity of a projecting tell, and overlooking the plain. The situation is fine. It was once a considerable village of well-built houses. now deserted. Many of the dwellings are in ruins. There are also several arches belonging to modern houses, but we could discover no traces of antiquity” *(Later Bib. Researches,* p. 108).

The Old Testament mentions two other places by the same name (KANAH), one on the boundary between Manasseh and Ephraim (Joshua 16:8; 17:9, 10), the other in the tribe of Asher (Joshua 19:28). The Syriac has Katna for the Cana of the Gospels; and this compares somewhat with the *Ittah-kazin* (q.v.) on the border of Zebulon (Joshua 19:13), which appears to have occupied the site of the present Kefr Kenna. Whether the Galilean village *Kanah* (hn;* K) mentioned in the Talmud *(Yuchas.* 57) is the same with Cana of Galilee, is uncertain (comp. Otho, *Lex. Rabb.* p. 115).

There are treatises on various points connected with Christ’s first miracle at Cana, in Latin, by Brendel (Isenb.1785), Bashuysen (Serv.1726), Georgius (Viteb. 1744), Hebenstreit (Jen. 1693), Hoheisel (Gedan. 1732), Mayer (Gryph. 1703), Oeder (Onold. 1721), Sommel (Lund. 1773), Tabing (Brem. 1693), Vechner (Helm. 1640); and in German by Flatt (in Suskind’s *Magaz.* 14:73 sq.); Brackner (in *Bibl. Stud.* 4, Berl. 1867).

Ca’naän

(Hebrews *Kena’an,* ˆ[i— nK, perhaps *low;* Sept. and N.T. Χαναάν; Josephus Χανάανος), the name of a man and of a country peopled by his descendants.

1. The fourth son of Ham, and grandson of Noah (Genesis 10:6; 1 Chronicles 1:8; comp. Josephus, *Ant.* 1:6, 4). B.C. post 2514. The transgression of his father Ham (Genesis 9:22-27), to which some suppose Canaan to have been in some way a party, gave occasion to Noah to pronounce that doom on the descendants of Canaan which was, perhaps, at that moment made known to him by one of those extemporaneous inspirations with which the patriarchal fathers appear in other instances to have been favored. *SEE BLESSING.* That there is no just ground for the conclusion that the descendants of Canaan were cursed as an immediate *consequence* of the transgression of Ham, is shown by

Professor Bush, who, in his *Notes on Genesis,* has fairly met the difficulties of the subject. *SEE HAM.*

The posterity of Canaan was numerous. His eldest son, Zidon, founded the city of the same name, and was father of the Sidonians and Phoenicians. Canaan had ten other sons, who were fathers of as many tribes, dwelling in Palestine and Syria (<01005>Genesis 10:15-19; <130113>1 Chronicles 1:13). It is believed that Canaan lived and died in Palestine, which from him was called the land of Canaan. *SEE CANAANITE.*

2. The simple name "Canaan" is sometimes employed for the country itself — more generally styled "the land of C." It is so in <360205>Zephaniah 2:5; and we also find "Language of C." (<231918>Isaiah 19:18); "Wars of C." (<070301>Judges 3:1); "Inhabitants of C." (<021515>Exodus 15:15); "King of C." (<070402>Judges 4:2, 23, 24; 5:19); "Daughters of C." (<012801>Genesis 28:1, 6, 8; 36:2); "Kingdoms of C." (<191511>Psalm 135:11). In addition to the above, the word occurs in several passages where it is concealed in the Auth. Vers. by being translated. These are, <232308>Isaiah 23:8, "traffickers," and 23:11, "the merchant city;" <281202>Hosea 12:2, "He is a merchant;" <360111>Zephaniah 1:11, "merchant-people." *SEE COMMERCE.*

Land Of Canaan

Picture for Land of Canaan 1

(ˆ[ńK]/rą, according to some, from its being *lew;* see <142809>2 Chronicles 28:19; <183902>Job 40:12, among other passages in which the verb is used), a name denoting the country west of the Jordan and Dead Sea (<011312>Genesis 13:12; <051130>Deuteronomy 11:30), and between those waters and the Mediterranean; specially opposed to the "land of Gilead" — that is, the high table-land on the east of the Jordan (<042226>Numbers 32:26, 32; 33:51; <062232>Joshua 22:32; see also <011205>Genesis 12:5; 23:2, 19; 31:18; 33:18; 35:6; 37:1; 48:4, 7; 49:30; <041332>Numbers 13:2, 17; 33:40, 51; <061602>Joshua 16:2; <072112>Judges 21:12). True, the district to which the name of "low land" is thus applied contained many very elevated spots: Shechem (<011818>Genesis 33:18), Hebron (<012319>Genesis 23:19), Bethel (<013506>Genesis 35:6), Bethlehem (<014807>Genesis 48:7), Shiloh (<062102>Joshua 21:2; <072112>Judges 21:12), which are all stated to be in the "land of Canaan." But, high as the level of much of the country west of the Jordan undoubtedly is, there are several things which must always have prevented it from leaving a marked impression of general elevation. These are,

(1), that remarkable, wide, maritime plain over which the eye ranges for miles from the central hills, a feature of the country which cannot be overlooked by the most casual observer, and which impresses itself most indelibly on the recollection;

(2), the still deeper and more remarkable and impressive hollow of the Jordan valley, a view into which may be commanded from almost any of the heights of Central Palestine; and,

(3), there is the almost constant presence of the long high line of the mountains east of the Jordan, which, from their distance, have the effect more of an enormous cliff than of a mountain range-looking down on the more broken and isolated hills of Canaan, and furnishing a constant standard of height before which every thing is dwarfed. These considerations are based upon the supposition that the name was derived from the natural features of the country. But this is not countenanced by Scripture. Canaan was the son of Ham. He and his whole family colonized Western Syria, and while the whole region took his name, different sections of it were called after his sons (<01005>Genesis 10:15-20). Aram was a son of Shem, and him descendants colonized the country of Aram (<01022>Genesis 10:21-31). On the other hand, Aram cannot, at least ab, solutely, be termed a “highland region.” It comprised the vast plains along the banks of the Euphrates, and westward to the Orontes and Anti-Libanus. Canaan, on the whole, however, is rather a hilly country, with strips of plain along the coast. In one passage it is distinguished from the low valley of the Jordan (<01312>Genesis 13:12). In short, the terms Aram and Canaan, if bestowed with any reference to the comparative elevation of the respective countries, have a merely relative significance; the latter lying nearer the sea-boast, while the former — especially that part of it where the Hebrew patriarchs originated — is situated toward the interior head-waters of the great river Euphrates. *SEE ARAM.*

Picture for Land of Canaan 2

The extent and boundaries of Canaan are given with tolerable exactness in the Bible. On the west the sea was its border from Sidon to Gaza (<01019>Genesis 10:19). On the south it was bounded by a line running from Gaza to the southern end of the Dead Sea, including the Judaean hills, but excluding the country of the Amalekites (<01019>Genesis 10:19; <04329>Numbers 13:29). The Jordan was the eastern boundary; no part of Canaan lay

beyond that river (Numbers 33:51; Exodus 16:35, with Joshua v. 12; 22:11. See Reland, *Palest.* p. 3 sq.). On the north, Canaan extended as far as Hamath, which was also the utmost boundary of the "land of promise" (Genesis 17:8; Numbers 34:8). The coast from Sidon northward to Arvad, and' the ridge of Lebanon, were inhabited by Canaanites, though they do not appear to have been included in Canaan proper (Genesis 10:15-19. See Bochart, *Opp.* 1:308 sq.; Roland, *Palcest.* p. 3 sq.). For geographical and other details, *SEE PALESTINE.*

The word "Canaan," in a few instances, such as Zephaniah 2:5, and Matthew 15:22, was applied to the low maritime plains of Philistia and Phoenicia (comp. Mark 7:26; and see Gesenius on Isaiah 23:11). In the same manner, by the Greeks, the name Χνᾶ was used for Phoenicia, i.e. the sea-side plain north of the "Tyrian ladder" (see the extract in Reland, *Palcest.* p. 7, and Gesenius, *Thesaur.* p. 696), and by the later Pnoenicians, both of Phoenicia proper and of the Punic colonies in Africa (Kenrick, *Phanicia,* p. 40, 42, 460). The name occurs in this sense on the Egyptian monuments as well as on Phoenician coins (Eckhel, *Doctr.* *Numbers* 4:409), and was not even unknown to the Carthaginians (Gesenius, *Gesch. d. Hebrews Sprach.* p. 16). The Sept. in two cases, in like manner, renders the Hebrew by χώρα τῶν Φοινίκων (Exodus 16:35; Joshua 5:12; comp. v. 1), as they do "Can[aa]nites" by Φοίνικες. Agaie, in Numbers 13:29, "The Hittites, and the Jebusites, and the Amorites dwell in the mountains; *and the Canaanites dwell by the sea, and by the coast of the Jordan."* In 2 Samuel 24:7, the Canaanites are distinguished from the Hivites, though the latter were descended from Canaan; and in several passages the Canaanites are mentioned with the Hittites, Amorites, Jebusites, etc., as if they constituted a special portion of the population (Exodus 3:8; Deuteronomy 7:1; Joshua 3:10). The most probable explanation of these limited applications of the name is, that while some of the tribes which inhabited Syria retained for their territories the name of their common ancestor Canaan, others preferred taking, as a distinctive appellation, the name of some subsequent head or chief of the tribe. The very same practice prevails to this day among the great tribes of Arabia. *SEE CANAANITE.*

Canaan, Language Of

(ˆ[i— nK]t pic; *lip of Canaan),* occurs Isaiah 19:18, where it undoubtedly designates the language spoken by the Jews dwelling in

Palestine. That the language spoken by the Canaanites was substantially identical with Hebrew appears, 1. From the fact that the proper names of Canaanitish persons and places are Hebrew, and can be accounted for etymologically from the Hebrew as readily as He. brew proper names themselves (thus we have Abimelech, Kirjath-Sapher, etc.); 2. Close as was the intercourse of the Hebrews with the Canaanites, there is no hint of their needing any interpreter to mediate between them, which renders it probable that their respective languages were so nearly allied to each other as to be substantially the same; 3. The remains of the Phoenician language, which was undoubtedly Canaanitish, bear the closest analogy to the Hebrew, and are best explained from it, which proves them to be substantially the same language (Bochart, *Geogr. Sacr.* 2, col. 699 sq., ed. 1682).

To account for this, some have supposed that the Canaanites and the Hebrews were of the same original stock, and that the account in Genesis of their being descended from different branches of the Noachic family is a fiction to be put to the account of national bigotry on the part of the writer. But this is a hypothesis utterly without foundation, and which carries its own confutation in itself; for, had national bigotry directed the writer, he would have excluded the Edomites, the Ammorites, the Moabites, from the Shemitic family, as well as the Canaanites; nay, he would hardly have allowed the Canaanites to claim descent from the righteous Noah. The list of the nations in Genesis 11 is accepted by some of the most learned and unfettered scholars of Germany as a valuable and trustworthy document (Knobel, *Volkertafel der Genesis*, 1850; Bertheau, *eitrage*, p. 174, 179). *SEE ETHNOGRAPHY*. But if these were different races, how came they to have the same language? Knobel thinks that the. country was first occupied by a Shemitic race, the descendants of Lud, and that the Hamites were immigrants who adopted the language of the country into which they came (p. 204 sq.). On the other hand, Grotius, Le Clerc, and others, are of opinion that Abraham acquired the language of the country into which he came, and that Hebrew is consequently a Hamitic and not a Shemitic language (Grotius, *Dissert. de Ling. Heb.*, prefixed to his *Commentary;* Le Clerc, *De Ling. Heb.;* Beke, *Oriqines Biblicce*, p. 210; Winning, *Manual of Compar. Philolegy*, p. 275): by some later writers Abraham's native tongue is supposed to have been Indo-Germanic or Arian. On the contrary, most maintain that Abraham retained the use of the primeval language, and brought it with him to Canaan; contending that,-had he borrowed the language of the country into which he came, the result would have been a

less pure language than the Hebrew, and we should have found in it traces of idolatrous notions and usages (Havernick, *Einleit.* 151, E. T. p. 133; Pareau, *Inst. Interp.* p. 25, E. T. 1:27). This last is the oldest opinion, and there is much to be urged in its favor. It leaves, however, the close affinity of the language of Abraham and that of the Canaanites unaccounted for. The hypothesis that Abraham acquired the language of the Canaanites, and that this remained in his family, if admissible, would account not only for the affinity of the Hebrew find Phoenician tongues, but for the ease with which Abraham and his son made themselves understood in Egypt, and for the affinity of the ancient Egyptian and several modern African languages with the Hebrew. (See Bleek, *Einleit. ins A.* T. p. 61 sq.; J. G. Muler, in Herzog's *Real-Encykop.* 7:240.) — Kitto, s.v.

Ca´naainite

Picture for Ca'naainite

(Heb., usually in the sing., and with the art., *hak-Kenaani'*, ynæ[nK]hi, i.e. accurately according to Hebrew usage [Gesenius, *Hebrews Gram. §* 107], "the Canaanite;" but in the Auth. Vers., with few exceptions, rendered as plural, and therefore indistinguishafbie from µynæ[}nK], *Kenaanim'*, which also, but unfrequently, occurs; Sept. generally Χαναναῖος [or Χαναναῖοι]; but Φοίνιξ, <020615>Exodus 6:51; comp. <060501>Joshua 5:1; Vulg. *Chananeus),* properly a designation of the descendants of Canaan, the son of Ham and grandson of Noah, inhabitants of the land of Canaan and the adjoining districts. *SEE CANAAN.*

I. *Component Tribes. —*

1. These are most frequently enumerated in the formula used in the command and statement of their extermination by the Israelites, which, however, assumes the following different shapes:

(1.) Six nations: the Canaanites, Hittites, Amorites, Perizzites, Hivites, and Jebusites. This is the usual form, and, with some variation in the order of the names, it is found in <020308>Exodus 3:8, 17; 23:23; 33:2; 34:11; <052017>Deuteronomy 20:17; <060901>Joshua 9:1; 12:8; <070305>Judges 3:5. In <021305>Exodus 13:5, the same names are given with the omission of the Perizzites.

(2.) With the addition of the Girgashites, making up the mystic number seven (<05707>Deuteronomy 7:1; <06030>Joshua 3:10; 24:1). The Girgashites are retained and the Hivites omitted in <16008>Nehemiah 9:8 (comp. <15901>Ezra 9:1).

(3.) In <02308>Exodus 23:28, we find the Canaanite, the Hittite, and the Hivite.

(4.) The list often nations in <01509>Genesis 15:19-21 (where the Kenites, the Kenizzites, and the Kadmonites are added), includes some on the east of Jordan, and probably some on the south of Palestine.

(5.) In <11009>1 Kings 9:20, the Canaanites are omitted from the list.

2. Besides these there were several tribes of the Canaanites who lived beyond the borders of the Promised Land northward. These were the Arkites, Sinites,Arvvadites, Zemarites, and Hamathites (<01007>Genesis 10:17, 18), with whom, of course, the Israelites had no concern. There were also other tribes of Canaanitish origin (or possibly other names given to some of those already mentioned), who were dispossessed by the Israelites. The chief of these were the Amalekites, the Anakites, and the Rephaim (or "giants," as they are frequently called in our translation). See each of these, as well as the foregoing, in their alphabetical place.

II. *Geographical Distribution.* — In this respect the term "Canaanite" is used in two senses, a limited and a wide application.

1. For the tribe of "the Canaanites" only the dwellers in the lowland, i.e. "who dwelt by the sea and by the coasts of Jordan" (<04329>Numbers 13:29). The whole of the country west of Jordan might, as we have seen, be in some sense called a "lowland" as compared with the loftier and more extended tracts on the east; but there was a part of this western country which was still more emphatically a "lowland."

(a.) There were the plains lying between the shore of the Mediterranean and the foot of the hills of Benjamin, Judah, and Ephraim the Shephelah, or plain of Philistia, on the south; that of Sharon, between Jaffa and Carmel; the great plain of Esdraelon, in the rear of the bay of Akka; and, lastly, the plain of Phoenicia, containing Tyre, Sidon, and all the other cities of that nation.

(b.) But separated entirely from these was the still lower region of the Jordan Valley, or Arabah (q.v.), the modern *Ghor*, a region which extended in length from the sea of Cinneroth (Gennesareth) to the south of

the Dead Sea about 120 miles, with a width of from 8 to 14. The climate of these sunken regions, especially of thee valley of the Jordan, is so peculiar, that it is natural to find them the special possession of one tribe. “Amalek” — so runs one of the earliest and most precise statements in the ancient records of Scripture — “Amalek dwells in the land of the south; and the Hittite, and the Jebusite, and the Amorite dwell in the mountains; and the Canaanite dwells by the sea, and by the side of Jordan” (<04I329>Numbers 13:29). This describes the division of the country a few years only before the conquest. But there had been little or no variation for centuries. In the notice which purports to be the earliest of all, the seats of the Canaanite tribe — as distinguished from the sister tribes of Zidon, the Hittites, Amorites, and the other descendants of Canaan — are given as on the sea — shore from Zidon to Gaza, and in the Jordan Valley to Sodom, Gomorrah, and Lasha (afterward Callirrhoe), on the shore of the present Dead Sea (<01I108>Genesis 10:18-20). In <06I103>Joshua 11:3, at a time when the Israelites were actually in the western country, this is expressed more broadly. “The Canaanite on the east and the west” is carefully distinguished from the Amorite who held “the mountain” in the center of the country. In <06I302>Joshua 13:2, 3, we are told with more detail that “all the ‘circles’ (t/l/y/l/ê) of the Philistines . . . from Sihor (? the *Wady el-Arish)* unto Ekron northward, is counted to the Canaanite.” Later still, the Canaanites are still dwelling in the upper part of the Jordan Valley-Bethshean; the plain of Esdraelon-Taanach, Ibleam, and Megiddo; the plain of Sharon-Dor; and also on the plain of Phoenicia-Accho and Zidon. Here were collected the chariots which formed a prominent part of their armies (<07I119>Judges 1:19; 4:3; <06I716>Joshua 17:16), and which could indeed be driven nowhere but in these level lowlands (Stanley, *Sinai and Palest.* p. 134).

The plains which thus appear to have been in possession of the Canaanites, specially so called, were not only of great extent; they were also the richest and most important parts of the country, and it is not unlikely that this was one of the reasons why —

2. The name “Canaanite” is also applied as a general name for the non-Israelite inhabitants of the land, as we have already seen was the case with “Canaan.” Instances of this are <01I206>Genesis 12:6; <04I203>Numbers 21:3, where the name is applied to dwellers in the south, who in 13:29, are called Amalekites; <07I010>Judges 1:10, with which comp. <01I413>Genesis 14:13, and 13:18, and <06I005>Joshua 10:5, where Hebron, the highest land in Palestine, is stated to be Amorite; and <01I312>Genesis 13:12, where the “land of Canaan” is

distinguished from the very Jordan Valley itself. See also (0124:03)Genesis 24:3, 37; comp. 28:2, 6; (1231:11)Exodus 13:11; comp. 5. But in many of its occurrences it is difficult to know in which category to place the word. Thus, in Genesis 1, 11: if the floor of Atad was at Bethhogla, close to the west side of the Jordan, "the Canaanites" must be intended in the narrower and stricter sense; but the expression "inhabitants of the land" appears as if intended to be more general. Again, in (0110:18)Genesis 10:18, 19, where some believe the tribe to be intended, Gesenius takes it to apply to the whole of the Canaanite nations. But in these and other similar instances, allowance must surely be made for the different dates at which the various records thus compared were composed; and, besides this, it is difficult to estimate how accurate a knowledge the Israelites may have possessed of a set of petty nations, from whom they had been entirely removed for four hundred years, and with whom they were now again brought into contact only that they might exterminate them as soon as possible. Again, before we can solve such questions, we ought also to know more than we do of the usages and circumstances of people who differed not only from ourselves, but also possibly in a material degree from the Orientals of the present day. The tribe who possessed the ancient city of Hebron, besides being, as shown above, called interchangeably Canaanites and Amorites, are in a third passage (Genesis 23) called the children of Heth, or Hittites (comp, also 27:46, with 28:1, 6). The Canaanites who were dwelling in the land of the south when the Israelites made their attack on it may have been driven to these higher and more barren grounds by some other tribes, possibly by the Philistines who displaced the Avites, also dwellers in the low country (05:23)Deuteronomy 2:23). See Kurtz, *Hist. of the Old Covenant,* vol. 1, *§* 45.

3. *History of the Canaanitish Race.* — The Israelites were delivered from Egypt under Moses, in order that they might take possession of the land which God had promised to their fathers. This country was then inhabited by the descendants of Canaan, as described above. These nations, and especially the six or seven so frequently mentioned by name, the Israelites were commanded to dispossess and utterly to destroy (2223:23)Exodus 23:23; (0433:53)Numbers 33:53; (0520:16)Deuteronomy 20:16, 17). The destruction, however, was not to be accomplished at once. The promise on the part of God was that he would "put out those nations by little and little," and the command to the Israelites corresponded with it; the reason given being

"lest the beasts of the field increase upon thee" (<2329>Exodus 23:29; <5722>Deuteronomy 7:22).

The destructive war commenced with an attack on the Israelites by Arad, king of the Canaanites, which issued in the destruction of several cities in the extreme south of Palestine, to which the name of Hormah was given (<4201>Numbers 21:1-3). The Israelites, however, did not follow up this victory, which was simply the consequence of an unprovoked assault on them; but turning back, and compassing the land of Edom, they attempted to pass through the country on the other side of the Jordan, inhabited by a tribe of the Amorites. Their passage being refused, and an attack made on them by Sihon, king of the Amorites, they not only forced their way through his land, but destroyed its inhabitants, and, proceeding onward toward the adjoining kingdom of Bashan, they in like manner destroyed the inhabitants of that district, and slew Og, their king, who was the last of the Rephaim, or giants (Deuteronomy in, 11). The tract of which they thus became possessed was subsequently allotted to the tribes of Reuben and Gad, and the half tribe of Manasseh. *SEE EXODE*.

After the death of Moses, the Israelites crossed the Jordan, and, under the conduct of Joshua, took possession of the greater part of the Promised Land, and destroyed its inhabitants.. Several cities, however, still held out, particularly Jebus, afterward Jerusalem, which was not taken till the time of David (<100506>2 Samuel 5:6), and Sidon, which seems never to have yielded to the tribe of Asher, to whom it was nominally allotted (<070131>Judges 1:31). Scattered portions also of the Canaanitish nations escaped,, and were frequently strong enough to harass, though not to dispossess, the Israelites. The inhabitants of Gibeon, a tribe of the Hivites, made peace by stratagem, and thus escaped the destruction of their fellow-countrymen. Individuals from among the Canaanites seem, in later times, to have united themselves, in some way, to the Israelites, and not only to have lived in peace, but to have been capable of holding places of honor and power: thus Uriah, one of David's captains, was a Hittite (<131141>1 Chronicles 11:41). In the time of Solomon, when the kingdom had attained its highest glory and greatest power, all the remnants of these nations were made tributary, and bond-service was exacted from them (<110920>1 Kings 9:20). The Girgashites seem to have been either wholly destroyed or absorbed in other tribes. We find no mention of them subsequent to the book of Joshua; and the opinion that the Gergesenes, or Gadarenes, in the time of our Lord, were their descendants, has little evidence, except the similarity of names, to support

it (Rosenmüller, *Scholia in* <01106>*Genesis* 10:16; Reland, *Palcestina,* 1:27, p. 138). The Anakites were completely destroyed by Joshua except in three cities, Gaza, Gath, and Ashdod (<061121>Joshua 11:21-23); and the powerful nation of the Amalekites, many times defeated and continually harassing the Israelites, were at last totally destroyed by the tribe of Simeon (<130443>1 Chronicles 4:43). Even after the return of the Jews from the Babylonian captivity there were survivors of five of the Canaanitish nations, with whom alliances had been made by the Jews, contrary to the commands which had been given them. Some of the Canaanites, according to ancient tradition (see D'Herbelot, *Biblioth. Orient.* s.v. Falasthin), left the land of Canaan on the approach of Joshua, and emigrated to the coast of Africa (to Armenia, according to Ritter, *Erdk. 7:*585).. Procopius *(De Bello Vandalico, 2:*10) relates that there were in Numidia, at Tigisis *(Tingis),* two columns, on which were inscribed, in Phoenician characters, "We are those who fled from the face of Joshua, the robber, the son of Naue." (See Bochart, *Phaleg, 1:*24; Michaelis, *Laws of Moses,* art. 31, vol. i, p. 176, Smith's transl.; Bachiene, I, 2, I sq.; Michaelis, *Spicileg.* 1:166 sq.; Hamelsveld, 3:31 sq.) *SEE PHOENICIA.*

4. *Characteristics.* — Beyond their chariots (see above) we have no clew to any manners or customs of the Canaanites. Like the Phoenicians, they were probably given to commerce, and thus the name doubtless became in later times an occasional synonym for a merchant (<184106>Job 41:6; <202124>Proverbs 31:24; comp. <232308>Isaiah 23:8, 11; <281202>Hosea 12:2; <360111>Zephaniah 1:11. See Kenrick, *Phoenicia,* p. 232). Under the name *Kanr'ma* they appear on the Egyptian monuments, distinguished by a coat of mail and helmet, and the use of spears, javelins, and a battle-axe similar to that of Egypt (Wilkinson, 1:403, abridgm.).

Of the language of the Canaanites little can be said. On the one hand, being — if the genealogy of Genesis 10 be rightly understood — Hamites, there could be no affinity between their language and that of the Israelites who were descendants of Shem. On the other is the fact that Abram and Jacob, shortly after their entrance to the country, seem able to hold converse with them, and also that the names of Canaanite persons and places which we possess are translatable into Hebrew. Such are Melchizedek, Hamor, Shechem, Sisera, Ephrath, and also a great number of the names of places. (For an examination of this interesting but obscure subject, see Gesenius, *Hebr. Spr.* p. 223-225.) *SEE CANAAN, LANGUAGE OF.*

The "Nethinim," or servants of the Temple, seem to have originated in the dedication of captives taken in war from the petty states surrounding the Israelites. *SEE NETHINIM.* If this was the case, and if they were maintained in number from similar sources, there must be many non-Israelite names in the lists of their families which we possess in Ezra 2:43-54; Nehemiah 7:46-56. Several of the names in these catalogues, such as Sisera, Mehunim, Nephushim, are the same as those which we know to be foreign, and doubtless others would be found on examination. The Gibeonites especially were native Canaanites, who, although reduced to a state of serfdom, were allowed to exist among the Israelites. *SEE GIBEONITE.*

5. *Conquest of Canaan.* — The arbitrary and forcible invasion of the land of Canaan by the Israelites, the violent and absolute dispossession of its inhabitants by them, and the appropriation of their property -above all, the avowed purpose and actual warfare of utter extermination on their part respecting those who had never misused them, against whom they could neither exhibit nor pretend to any such claim as is acknowledged as a cause of hostility or right to the soil among civilized nations, has given grave offense to modern rationalists, and occasioned no little difficulty to pious believers in the economy of the Old Testament. The example has even been pleaded in' justification of the shameful outrages committed by Christians upon the North-American Indians, as it was by the Spaniards in their savage campaigns against the peaceful and highly cultivated Mexicans and Peruvians; nor can it be doubted that the relentless spirit evinced in the sanguinary history of the Exode was largely reflected in the stern and martial zeal of Cromwell and the Puritans. Without attempting to vindicate all the details of the war under Joshua, which in some instances (e.g. in the circumstances attending the punishment of Achan [q.v.], who, by reason of his complicity with the Canaanites in respect to the ban against them; was regarded as a traitor, and dealt with summarily, as by a court-martial, or rather by "lynch-law") appears to have transcended even the rigorous programme contemplated in its inception, although it probably went no farther in severity than the rude judgment of those charged with or engaged in the execution of the scheme deemed needful for the ends in view, we are yet called upon to investigate the grounds upon which the measure, as a whole, has been defended or may be justified; and this is the more imperative, inasmuch as the warfare and occupation themselves were not simply *suffered* while in progress, or passed over as unavoidable after their

occurrence, but positively, repeatedly, and strictly enjoined, with all their essential features of so-called atrocity or injustice, by special divine command, accompanied by the most awful sanctions direct from heaven itself. The question properly relates to two somewhat distinct points: 1. The right of the Israelites to the territory itself, and, 2. The morality of warfare in which no quarter was to be given, and no property of the enemy to be spared; the consideration of these, however, is so connected, both in the similarity of the objections and the common ground of vindication, that we may most conveniently treat them together.

"Many have asserted, in order to alleviate the difficulty, that an allotment of the world was made by Noah to his three sons, and that by this allotment the Land of Promise fell to the share of Shem; that the descendants of Ham were therefore usurpers and interlopers, and that, on this ground, the Israelites, as the descendants of Shem, had the right to dispossess them. This explanation is as old as Epiphanius, who thus answered the objection of the Manicheans. Others justify the war on the ground that the Canaanites were the first aggressors — a justification which applies only to the territory on the other side of the Jordan. Michaelis, to whom we must refer for a lengthened investigation of the subject *(Laws of Moses, §* 29, vol. 1, p. 111-179, Smith's transl.), dissatisfied with these and other attempted apologies, asserts that the Israelites had a right to the land of Canaan as the common pasture-land of their herdsmen, in consequence of the undisturbed possession and appropriation of it from the time of Abraham till the departure of Jacob into Egypt; that this claim had never been relinquished, and was well known to the Canaanites, and that therefore the Israelites only took possession of that which belonged to them. The same hypothesis is maintained by Jahn *(Hebrew Commonwealth,* ch. ii, § x, Stowe's transl.). In the Fragments attached to Taylor's edition of Calmet's *Dictionary* (4:95, 96) another ground of justification is sought in the supposed identity of race of the Egyptian dynasty under which the Israelites were oppressed with the tribes that overran Canaan, so that the destruction of the latter was merely an act of retributive justice for the injuries which their compatriots in Egypt had inflicted on the Israelites. To all these and similar attempts to justify, on the ground of *lrgal right,* the forcible occupation of the land by the Israelites, and the extermination (at least to a great extent) of the existing occupants, it is to be objected that no such reason as any of these is hinted at in the sacred record. The right to carry on a war of extermination is there rested simply on the divine

command to do so. That the Israelites were instruments in God's hand is a lesson not only continually impressed on their minds by the teaching of Moses, but enforced by their defeat whenever they relied on their own strength. That there *may* have been grounds of justification, on the plea of human or legal sight, ought not, indeed, to be denied; but it is, we imagine, quite clear, from the numerous attempts to find what these grounds were, that they are not stated in the Old Testament; and to seek for them as though they were necessary to the justification of the Israelites, seems to be an abandonment of the high ground on which alone their justification can be 'safely rested — the express command of God.

"It may be said that this is only shifting the difficulty, and that just in proportion as we exculpate the Israelites from the charges of robbery and murder, in their making war without *legal* ground, we lower the character of the Being whose commands they obeyed, and throw doubt on those commands being really given by God. This has indeed been a favorite objection of infidels to the divine authority of the Old Testament. Such objectors would do well to consider whether God has not an absolute right to dispose of men as he sees fit, and whether an exterminating war, from which there was at least an opportunity of escape by flight, is at all more opposed to our notions of justice than a destroying flood, or earthquake, or pestilence. Again, whether the fact of making a chosen nation of *His* worshippers the instrument of punishing those whose wickedness was notoriously great, did not much more impressively vindicate his character as the only God, who 'will not give his glory to another, nor his praise to graven images,' than if the punishment had been brought about by natural causes. Such considerations as these must, we apprehend, silence those who complain of injustice done to the Canaanites. But then it is objected further that such an arrangement is fraught with evil to those who are made the instruments of punishment, and, as an example, is peculiarly liable to be abused by all who have the power to persecute. As to the first of these objections, it must be remembered that the conduct of the war was never put into the hands of the Israelites; that they were continually reminded that it was for the wickedness of those nations that they were driven outs and, above all, that they themselves would be exposed to similar punishment if they were seduced into idolatry, an evil to which' they were especially prone. As to the example, it can apply to no case where there is not an equally clear expression of God's will. A person without such a commission has no more right to plead the example of the Israelites in

justification of his exterminating or even harassing those whom he imagines to be God’s enemies, than to plead the example of Moses in justification of his promulgating a new law purporting to come from God. In a word, the justification of the Israelites, as it appears to us, is to be sought in this alone, that they were clearly commissioned by God to accomplish this work of judgment, thus at once giving public testimony to, and receiving an awful impression of His power and authority, so as in some measure to check the outrageous idolatry into which almost the whole world had sunk.”

See Kitto, *Pict. Hist. of the Jews,* 1:336 sq.; also *Daily Bible Illustr. 2:*235 sq.; Bp. Sherlock, *Works, v;* Drew, *Script. Studies,* p. 122 sq.; Paley, *Sermons, p.* 429; Mill, *Sermons* (1845), p. 117; Simeon, *Wlorksi-’* 596; Scott, *The Extirpation of the Canaanites (Sermons,* 1:293 sq.); Pitman, *Destruction of the Canaanites (Easter Serm.* 1:481 sq.); Bp. Mants, *Extermination of the Canaanites (Sermons,* in, 135 sq.); Benjoin, *Vindication,* etc. (Lond. 1797); Stiebritz, *De justitia belli adv. Cananitas* (Hal. 1759); Robert, *Causa belli Israelitici adv. Cananceos* (Marb. 1778); Nonne, *De justitit armorium Israelitarum adv. Cananceos* (Brem. 1755); Schubert, *Dejustitia belli in Cananaos* (Greifsw. 1767); Hengstenberg, *Authenticity of the Pentateuch,* 2:387 sq.

Canaanite, Or Rather Cananite

(Received Text [with the Codex Sinaiticus], ὁ Κανανιτης; Codex A, Κανανείτης; Lachm. with B C, ὁ Κανανᾶιος; D, Χανανᾶιος; Vulg. *Chananeus),* the designation of the apostle SIMON, otherwise known as “Simon Zelotes.” It occurs in [401004]Matthew 10:4; [410318]Mark 3:18. This word does not signify a descendant of Canaan, that being in the Greek both of the Sept. and the N.T. Χανανᾶιος = /næ[}bKæ (comp. [401522]Matthew 15:22 with [410726]Mark 7:26). Nor does it signify, as has been suggested, a native of Kana, since that would probably be Κανίτης. But it comes from the Hebrews aNqi *kanna’, zealous,* or rather from the Chaldee ˆaN;]qi *Kanan’,* or Syriac *Kanenyeh,* by which the Jewish sect or faction of “the Zealots” — so prominent in the last days of Jerusalem — was designated (see Buxtorf, *Lex. Talm.* col. 2060). This Syriac word is the reading of the Peshito version. The Greek equivalent is Ζηλωτής, *Zelotes,* and this Luke ([420615]Luke 6:15; [440113]Acts 1:13) has correctly preserved. Matthew and Mark, on the other hand, have literally transferred the Syriac word, as the Sept. did frequently before them. There is no necessity to suppose, as Mr.

Cureton does *(Nitrian Rec.* 87), that they mistook the word for *Kena'anyeh*= Χαναναῖος, a Canaanite or descendant of Canaan. The Evangelists could hardly commit such an error, whatever subsequent transcribers of their works may have done. But that this meaning was afterward attached to the word is plain from the readings of the Codex Bezae (D) and the Vulgate above. The spelling of the A. V. has doubtless led many to the same conclusion; and it would be well if it were altered to "Kananite," or some other form (as was done in the late revision by the Am. Bib. Society, whose ʿstandard" text had" Cananite") distinguished from the well-known one in which it now stands. *SEE ZELOTES.*

Cancellarii (CHANCELLORS, LAY),

one of the inferior classes of servants of the ancient Church and clergy. "The precise nature of their duties is doubtful. Bingham supposes them to have had some such office in the Church as those of the same name in the state, and that they acted as guards of the judge's consistory. Others suppose them to have been identical with the *fyndici* or *defensores,* whose duty it was to watch over the rights of the Church, to act as superintendents of the *copiatce,* and to see that all clerks attended the celebration of morning and evening service in the Church." -Bingham, *Orig. Ecclesiastes* bk. 3, ch. 11, § 6; Farrar, *Eccl. Dict.* s.v.

Cancelli,

a lattice or balustrade; the rail separating the altar from the nave, in ancient churches, was called *cancelli. SEE CHANCEL.*

Cancellus,

a word occasionally used in the meaning of *pulpit.* As the size of churches increased, preaching in the chancel became very difficult, and it often happened that the officiating bishop or presbyter was inaudible on account of his great distance from the people. Hence a custom was introduced of placing a *suggestum,* or pulpit, from which the preacher delivered the sermon, in front of the partition which divided the chancel from the nave. It was therefore called, in consequence of its position, *cancellus.* — Farrar, *Eccl. Dict.* s.v.

Can’dace

Picture for Can’dace 1

Picture for Can’dace 2

(Κανδάκη: Hiller compares the Ethiopic ynq, *he ruled*, and qd, *a slave*, as the Ethiopian kings are still in Oriental phrase styled “prince of servants” [Simonis, *Onom. N.T.* p. 88]; but the name itself is written ykdnj, *chandaki*, in Ethiopic; comp. Ludolf, *Hist. Eth.* in, 2, 7), was the name of that queen of the Ethiopians (ἡ βασίλισσα Αἰθιόπων) whose high treasurer (εὐνοῦχος, “eunuch,” 1:e. chamberlain) was converted to Christianity under the preaching of Philip the Evangelist (<4408>Acts 8:27), A.D. 30. The country over which she ruled was not, as some writers allege, what is known to us as Abyssinia; it was that region in Upper Nubia which was called by the Greeks *Meroe*, and is supposed to correspond to the present province of Atlara, lying between 13° and 18° north latitude. From the circumstance of its being nearly enclosed by the Atbara (Astaboras or Tacazze) on the right, and the Bahr el-Abiad, or White River, and the Nile on the left, it was sometimes designated the “island” of Meroe; but the ancient kingdom appears to have extended at one period to the north of the island as far as Mount Beikal. The city of Meroe stood near the present Assour, about twenty miles north of Shendy; and the extensive and magnificent ruins found not only there, but along the upper valley of the Nile, attest the art and civilization of the ancient Ethiopians. These ruins, seen only at a distance by Bruce and Burckhardt, have since been minutely examined and accurately described by Cailliaud *(πάσης τῆς γάζης)*, Ruppel *(Reisen in Nubien, etc.)*, and other travelers. Meroe, from being long the center of commercial intercourse between Africa and the south of Asia, became one of the richest countries upon earth; the “merchandise” and wealth of Ethiopia (<2314>Isaiah 45:14) was the theme of the poets both of Palestine and Greece; and, since much of that affluence would find its way into the royal coffers, the circumstance gives emphasis to the phrase πάσης τῆς γάζης, “*all* the treasure” of Queen Candace. It is further interesting to know, from the testimonies of various authors (comp. the “Queen of Sheba,” who visited Solomon, and see Josephus, *Ant.* 8:6, 5), that for some time both before and after the Christian era, Ethiopia Proper was under the rule of female sovereigns, who all bore the appellation of “Candace,” which was not so much a proper name as a distinctive title,

common to every successive queen, like “Pharaoh” and “Ptolemy” to the kings of Erypt, and “Caesar” to the emperors of Rome. Thus Pliny *(Hist. Nat.* 6:29) says that the centurions ,whom Nero sent to explore the country reported “that a woman reigned over Meroe called *Candace,* a name which had descended to the queens for many years.” Strabo also (p. 820, ed. Casaub.) speaks of a warrior-queen of Ethiopia called Candace, in the reign of Augustus, the same whom Dion Cassius (54:5) describes as queen of the “Ethiopians living above (ὑπέρ) Egypt.” In B.C. 22 she had invaded Egypt, and soon afterward insulted the Romans on the Ethiopian frontier of Egypt. Caius Petronius, the governor of the latter province, marched against the Ethiopians, and, having defeated them in the field, took Pselca, and then crossing the sands which had long before proved fatal to Cambyses, advanced to Premnis, a strong position. He next attacked Napata, the capital of Queen Candace, took and destroyed it; but then retired to Premnis, where he left a garrison, whom the warlike queen assailed, but they were relieved by Petronius. She was still later treated favorably by Augustus. She is said to have lost one eye (see Smith’s *Dict. of Class. Biog.* s.v.). This Napata, by Dion called Tenape, is supposed to have stood near Mount Berkal, and to have been a kind of second Meroe; and there is still in that neighborhood (where there are likewise many splendid ruins) a village which bears the very similar name of *Merawe.* Eusebius- who flourished in the fourth century, says that in his day the queens of Ethiopia continued to be called Candace *(Hist. Eccl. 2:*1, 10). A curious confirmation of the fact of female sovereignty having prevailed in Ethiopia has been remarked on the existing monuments of the country. Thus, on the largest sepulchral pyramid near Assour, the ancient Meroe (see Cailliaud, plate xlvi), a female warrior, with the royal ensigns on her head, drags forward a number of captives as offerings to the gods; on another compartment she is in a warlike habit, about to destroy the same group. Heeren, after describing the monuments at Naga, or Naka, southeast of Shendy, says, “It is evident that these representations possess many peculiarities, and that they are not pure Egyptian. The most remarkable difference appears in the persons offering. The queens appear with the kings; and not merely as presenting offerings, but as heroines and conquerors. Nothing of this kind has yet been discovered on the Egyptian reliefs, either in Egypt or Nubia. It may therefore with certainty be concluded that they are subjects peculiar to Ethiopia. Among the Ethiopians, says Strabo (p. 1177), the women also are armed. Herodotus (2:100) mentions a Nitocris among the ancient queens of Ethiopia. Upon

the relief [on the monument at Kalabshe] representing the conquest of Ethiopia by Sesostris, there is a queen, with her sons, who appears before him as a captive" (Heeren, *On the Nations of Africa, 2:*399). The name Candace, or *Kandahai,* appears on the Egyptian monuments on a royal cartouche, followed by the determinative sign for a woman. It is singular enough, that when Bruce was at Shendy, the government of the district was in the hands of a female called *Sittia,* i.e. the lady or mistress. He says, "There is a tradition there that a woman, whose name was Hendaque, once governed all that country, whence we might imagine that this was part of the kingdom of Candace; for, writing this name in Greek letters, it will come to be no other than Hendaqu., the native or mistress of Chendi or Chandi" *(Travels to discover the Source of the Nile, 4:*529; comp. 1:505). It is true that, the name Kandaké being foreign to the Jews, it is in vain to seek with Calmet for its etymology in Hebrew, but the conjectural derivation proposed by Bruce is wholly inadmissible; nor is the attempt (see above) of Hiller to trace its meaning in the Ethiopic language much more satisfactory. De Dieu asserts, on the authority of ecclesiastical tradition, that the proper name of the queen mentioned in the Acts was *Lacasa,* and that of her chamberlain *Judich.* It is not unlikely that some form of Judaism was at this period professed to a certain extent in Ethiopia, as well as in the neighboring country of Abyssinia. Irenaeus (in, 12) and Eusebius *(Hist. Eccl.* 2:1) ascribe to Candace's minister her own conversion to Christianity, and the promulgation of the Gospel throughout her kingdom; and with this agrees the Abyssinian tradition that he was likewise the apostle of Tigre, that part of Abyssinia which lay nearest to Meroe; it is added that he afterward preached the Gospel in Arabia Felix, and also in the island of Ceylon, where he suffered martyrdom. (See Tillemont, *Mein. Hist. Eccl.* tom. 2.; Basnage, *Exercitatt. anti-Baron.* p. 113; Ludolf, *Corn ment. ad Hist. AEthiop.* p. 89; Wolf, *Curce,* 2:113; *American Presb. Review.* April, 1865.) *SEE ETHIOPIAN EUNUCH.*

Candidus,

an Arian writer, who flourished about 364, and is the author of a book addressed to Marius Victorinus, *de Generatione Divina.* which, together with the answer of Victorinus, is extant. It will be found in Zeigler's Commentary on Genesis (Basle, 1548, fol.). A fragment of an epistle of Candidus to Victorinus is preserved by Mabillon, *Analecta,* 4:155. — Cave, *Hist. Lit., Anno* 364; Landon, *Eccl. Dict.* s.v.

Candle,

rnr, *ner*, a *lamp*, as elsewhere rendered; λύχνος, a *light*, as elsewhere.

I. Houses in the East were, from the earliest times, lighted up with lamps, and those of the Hebrews probably resembled such as we find depicted in the tombs at Thebes. Job, describing the destruction of a family among the Arabs, and the rendering one of their habitations desolate, says, "The light shall be dark in his tabernacle, and his candle shall be put out with him" (18186Job 18:6; 21:17). On the other hand, when God promises to give David a lamp always in Jerusalem, it is an assurance that his house should never become desolate. In the language of Jeremiah, to extinguish the light in an apartment is a convertible phrase for total destruction (18250Job 25:10). A burning lamp is, on the other hand, a symbol of prosperity (18293Job 29:3). Maillet, in his *Lettres d'Egypte*, says, "The houses in Egypt are never without lights; they burn lamps all the night long, and in every occupied apartment. So requisite to the comfort of a family is this custom reckoned, that the poorest people would rather retrench a part of their food than neglect it." Roberts, in illustration of the passage, "I will search Jerusalem with candles" (36012Zephaniah 1:12), remarks, "Does a man declare his innocence of any crime, the accusers say, 'We will search thee with lamps;' 'Yes, yes, I will look into that affair with lamps;' 'What, have your lamps gone out? You see I am not guilty.' *"SEE LAMP.*

There are monographs bearing on this subject as follows: D. W. Müller, *De perennibus vet. lucernis* (Altorf, 1705); J. J. Müller, *De vet.* λυχνοκαίᾳ (Jen. 1661); Schurzfleisch, *De luminibus sacris* (in his *Controv.* 25); Stockhausen, *De cultu et usu lumisnum antiquo* (Tr. ad Rh. 1726). *SEE CANDLESTICK.*

Picture for Candlestick 1

Picture for Candlestick 2

Picture for Candlestick 3

II. *Candles in Christian Worship. —*

1. *Roman Church.* — The practice was probably derived from heathen and Jewish worship. Some Roman writers ascribe its origin to the early Christians, who, prevented by persecution from worshipping in daylight,

held their meetings under ground, where artificial light was needed (Claude de Vert, *Explication des Ceremonies de 'eglise).* Others (e.g. Bergier, *Diet. de Theologie*, s.v.) quote the book of Revelation, wherein mention is made of "candles" and golden "candlesticks," in support of the usage, and also the *Apostolical Canons* (Can. 4), where mention is made of "oil for the holy lamp." Bergier also cites Jerome *(contra Vigilantium*, 100:3) in support of the use of lights in worship; but the pass sage cited simply speaks of a usage in the Eastern Church of lighting candles when the Gospels were read as a symbol of joy at receiving the light. Jerome expressly says the usage did not exist in the West, though he seems to justify the lighting of candles and lamps before the tombs of the martyrs. *SEE LAMPS.* The use of candles in the worship of the Roman Church is defended on the ground that they symbolize Christas the "true light," and also of the injunction of Christ to his followers to be "the lights of men" (⁴⁰05¹⁴Matthew 5:14, 16).

The principal solemnities in the Roman Church at which candles are used are the mass, the administrations of the sacraments, the benedictions and processions. They are also frequently employed before the statues and images of the saints, and many use them at their private devotions, especially while praying for the dead. Numerous liturgical prescriptions regulate their use. They must be, except in cases of emergency, of wax, and their color is generally white or yellow, but rarely red. The *Paschal candle* is a large candle to which five grains of incense are attached in the form of a cross; in most Roman Catholic churches it is lighted with a newly-made fire on Easter eve. Alban Butler says that "Ennodius, bishop of Pavia (6th century), has left us two forms of prayer for the blessing of this candle. From him we learn that droppings or particles of the wax thereof, after Low Sunday, were distributed among the people, who burnt them in their houses against the influence of evil spirits, in which there was no superstition if the effect was not certainly expected, because it was hoped for and asked of God through the public prayers and blessings of the Church, directed for that end (!) The paschal candle is an emblem of Christ rising from the dead, the light of the world, and is a sign which announces to us the joy and glory of his resurrection. The five grains of frankincense fixed in it symbolically represent his five precious wounds, and the embalming. of his body at his burial, and again in the grave, by the devout persons who brought spices to his monument. This great candle anciently gave light during the watching in the church on Easter-eve in the night.

The *triple candle* arising from one stock signifies the Trinity of persons in one God, or the light of the Triune God shining to the world through Christ. This only burns during the office of holy Saturday morning; after which it is taken away, and no more made use of, not even on Easter-day." — Butler, *Feasts and Fasts* (Treat. 6, ch. 8).

2. *In the Protestant Churches.* — The Lutheran Church, after the Reformation, retained the use of lights on the altar; the Reformed churches abolished it. In the Church of England, the "Injunctions of Edward VI" (1547) forbade the use of lights, "except of two lights upon the high altar before the sacrament, which, for the signification that Christ is the very true light of the world, they shall suffer to remain still." In cathedral churches these two lights were generally kept on the altar, but not lighted; and the great writers and leaders of the Church of England wrote against the use of lights as tending to idolatry. So the Homily "On the Peril of Idolatry" quotes Lactantius as follows: "Seemeth he to be in his right mind who offereth up to the Giver of all light the light of a wax candle for a gift? He requireth another light of us, which is not smoky, but bright and clear, even the light of the mind and understanding. Their (the heathen) gods, because they be earthly, have need of light, lest they remain in darkness; whose worshippers, because they understand no heavenly thing, do draw religion, which they use, down to the earth." The Homily adds: "Thus far Lactantius, and much more, too long here to write, of candle-lighting in temples before images and idols for religion; whereby appeareth both the foolishness thereof, and also that in opinion and act we do agree altogether in our candle religion with the Gentile idolaters." The Homily goes on to show that this candle worship is closely connected with superstition and idolatry. Jeremy Taylor says of the Papists: "This is plain by their public and authorized treatment of their images; they consecrate them; they hope in them; they expect gifts and graces from them; they clothe them and crown them they erect altars and temples to them; they kiss them; they bow their head and knee before them; *they light up tapers and lamps to them, which is a direct consumptive sacrifice;* they do to their images as the heathen do to theirs; these are the words of Irenaeus, by which he reproves the folly of some that had got the pictures of Christ and Pythagoras, and other eminent persons." In the so-called "Tractarian" revival of Romish usages in 1832 and the following years, the practice of putting candles on "the altar," and lighting them on certain festival days, was resumed. In the recent "Ritualistic" revival (1865) the practice has become quite common

in the hands especially of young curates of a Romanizing turn. They defend the legality of the practice on the ground that the rubric preceding the "order for morning and evening prayer throughout the year" admits the use of "all ornaments of the church that were in this Church of England by the authority of Parliament in the second yearof the reign of Edward VI;" while the Injunction, cited above, allows *two* lights: to be kept on the altar. On the other side it is argued (1) that in the Church of England there is properly no altar, but only a communion table; (2) that, in fact, the two lights spoken of were never lighted in the early days after the Reformation, even in the cathedrals in which they were retained; and (3) that the use of candles is only a part of an idolatrous system of worship. *SEE LAMPS; SEE CANDLEMAS.*

3. For the popish ceremony of "cursing with bell, book, and candle," see BELL. — Boissonnet, Dictionnaire *des Cerimonies*, s.v. *Cierge, Chandelier;* Martigny, *Dict. dies Antiquites Chretiennes, s.v. Cierge;* Bingham, *Orig. Ecclesiastes* bk. xiv, ch. in, § 11; Goode, *Ceremonial of the Church of England, §* 9; Hook. *Church Dictionary* (defends candles), s.v. *Lights on the Altar.*

Candlemas,

in the Roman Church, the feast of the purification of the Virgin Mary, held on the 2d of February, the fortieth after Christmas, and therefore celebrated as that on which the purification of the Virgin took place (Luke 2:22). The Greek Church called it ὑπαπαντή, *festum o(cursus*, the feast of the meeting (see Luke 2:25); *alsofestumpresentationis Simeonis et Annce ;festum Simeonis;* the feast of the presentation of Simeon and Anna, or simply of Simeon. The name *festum candelarum* or *luminum*, the feast of lights (or Candlemas), came into use at a later period, after the introduction of candles into the service of the processions in honor of the Virgin. On this day the Romanists consecrate all the candles and tapers which they use in their churches during the whole year. At Rome the pope performs that ceremony himself, and distributes wax candles to the cardinals and others, who carry them in procession through the great hall of the pope's palace. Luther retained the festival as "a festival of our Lord Jesus Christ, who on this day manifested himself when he was borne into the Temple at Jerusalem and presented to the Lord." In many Lutheran churches it is still celebrated. In the Church of England the festival was abandoned in the second year of Edward VI.

The ceremonies observed on this festival are probably derived from the Februan or purificatory rites of paganism, which occurred on the same day, and which are briefly described by Ovid *(Fast.* 2). Pope Sergius (A.D. 641) has the credit of transferring this "false maumetry and untrue belief," as it is styled by Becon, in his *Reliques of Rome,* to "God's worship." This pontiff hallowed the feast "thorowe all Christendome; and every Christian man and woman of covenable age is bound to come to church and offer up their candles, as though they were bodily with our Ladye; hoping for this reverence and worship that they do to our Ladve to have a great reward in heaven." The following explanation is given by Pope Innocent III: "Why do we carry lighted candles at this festival? The answer may be derived from the book of Wisdom, where it is said (ch. 14:23) that the heathen offered sacrifices at night *(sacrifici' obscure).* The Gentiles, indeed, had devoted the month of February to the infernal deities, because, as they ignorantly believed, it was at the beginning of this month that Pluto had ravished Proserpine. Ceres, her mother, had, according to their belief, sought her through Sicily for a whole night by the light of torches kindled at the flames of AEtna. In commemoration of this, they every year, at the beginning of February, traveled the city during the night bearing lighted torches, whence this festival was called *amburbale.* But the holy fathers, being unable to abolish this custom, decided that lighted candles should be carried in honor of the blessed Virgin Mary; and thus what was formerly done for Ceres is done to-day in honor of the Virgin, and what was done formerly for Proserpine is now done in the praise of Mary" (Innocent III, *Opera,* "Serm. I. in fest. purif. Marite," fol. 47, col. 2, ed. Coloniae, 1552).

The following are the prayers for the hallowing of candles upon Candlemas-day, copied from "The Doctrine of the Mass-book," 1554. The asterisks indicate crossings: "O Lord Jesus Christ, * bless thou this creature of a *waxen taper* at our humble supplication, and by the virtue of the holy cross pour thou into it an heavenly benediction; that as thou hast granted it unto man's use for the expelling of darkness, it may receive such a strength and blessing, through the token of thy holy cross, that in what places soever it be lighted or set, the Devil may avoid out of those habitations, and tremble for fear, and fly away discouraged, and presume no more to unquiet them that serve thee, who with God," etc. Then follow other prayers, in one of which occur these passages: "We humbly beseech thes that thou wilt vouchsafe to * bless and sanctify these candles prepared unto the uses of men, and health of bodies and souls, as well on the land as

the waters." "Vouchsafe * to bless and * sanctify, and with the candle of heavenly benediction to lighten these tapers; which we thy servants taking in the honor of thy name (when they are lighted), desire to bear," etc. "Here' let the candles be sprinkled with holy water." The service concludes with this Rubric: "When the hallowing of the candle is done, let the candles be lighted and distributed."

"The festival of St. Agatha, which commences on Candlemas-day in Sicily, strongly resembles the Februan rites. Lighted tapers form a distinguishing part of the ceremonial; and the memory of Proserpine is still cherished, though under another superstition, by kindling a blazing pine torch near the very spot to which the mythological legend assigned the scene of Pluto's amorous force. An account of this festival will be found in Blunt's *Vestiges of Ancient Mlanners in Italy."* — Bingham, *Orig. Ecclesiastes* bk. 20, 100:8, § 4; Augusti, *Denkwaurdigkeiten,* Thl. 3, p. 79; Siegel, *Alterthiimer,* 3, p. 326; Eadie, *Ecclesiastes Dictionary,* s.v.; Chambers, *Book of Days,* 1:212 sq.; Brand, *Popular Antiquities,* 1:24 sq.

Candlestick

(hrwnm], *menorah';* Chald. hT;v]rb]n], *nebrashtah';* Sept. and N.T. λυχνία, properly a *lampstan* 1, as in <400515>Matthew 5:15), the candelabrum which Moses was commanded to make for the tabernacle, after the model shown him in the mount. Its form is chiefly known to us by the passages in <022531>Exodus 25:31-40; 37:17-24; on which some additional light is thrown by the Jewish writers, and by the representation of the spoils of the Temple on the arch (q.v.) of Titus at Rome, the only veritable monument extant of the kind (Prideaux, *Connection,* 1:166). It is called in <032404>Leviticus 24:4, "the pure," and in Ecclus. 26:19, "the holy candlestick." So Diodorus Siculus describes it (10:100, ed. Bip.) as "the so-called immortal light perpetually burning in the fane" (ὁ ἀθάνατος-λεγόμενος λύχνος καὶ καιόμενος ἀδιαλείπτως ἐν τῷ ναῷ).

The material of which it was made was fine (r/hf; *"pure")* gold, of which an entire talent was expended on the candelabrum itself and its appendages. The mode in which the metal was to be worked is described by a term (h2Pvqm,æ"beaten [rather *turnedl* work," Sept. τορευτή, Vulg. *ductile)* which appears to mean *wrought* with the hammer, as opposed to *cast* by fusion. Josephus, however, says *(Ant.* 3:6, 7) that it was of *cast* gold (κεχωνευμένη), and hollow. The structure of the candelabrum, as far as it

is defined in the passages referred to, consisted of a base (Ërgæ; Joseph. βάσις; according to Maimonides, three feet high); of a shaft (hnq; *reed, 1:*c. stem) rising out of i' of six arms, which came out by threes from two opposite sides of the shaft; of seven lamps, which were supported on the summits of the central shaft and the six arms, terminating in seven heads all' in one row [?], standing parallel to one another, one by one, in imitation of the planets (Whiston's *Josephus, i.* c.); and of three different kinds of ornaments belonging to the shaft and arms. These ornaments are called by names which mean *cups, circlets,* and *blossoms:* "four bowls made like unto almonds, with their knops and their flowers." The cups (µy[æbæG]; Sept. κρατῆρες, Vulg. *scyph,)* receive, in verse 30, the epithet *almondshlapd* (it being uncertain whether the resemblance was to the *fruit* or to the *flowers).* Three such cups are allotted to every arm, lbut four to the shaft: twoand-twenty in all. *SEE BOWL.* Of the four on the shaft, three are mentioned as if set severally under the spots where the three pairs of arms set out from the shaft. The place of the fourth is not assigned; but we may conceive it to have been either between the base and the cup below the lowest tier of arms, or, as Bahr prefers, to have been near the summit of the shaft. As for the name of the second ornament, the circlets (µyr æTæPKi), the word only occurs in two other places in the Old Testament (Am. 9:1; <360214>Zephaniah 2:14), in which it appears to mean the *capital* of a column: but the Jewish writers generally (cited in Ugolini *Thesaur.* 11:917) concur in considering it to mean *apples* in this place. Josephus, as he enumerates four kinds of ornaments, and therefore two of his terms must be considered identical, may be supposed to have understood *globes,* or *pomegranates* (σφαιρία, ῥοΐσκοι, *Antiq.* 3:6). But as the term here used is not the common name for pomegranates, and as the Sept. and Vulgate render σφαιρωτῆρες and *sphoerulce,* it is safest to assume that it denotes bodies of a spherical shape, and to leave the precise kind undefined. Bähr, however, is in favor of *apples (Symbolik,* 1:414). *SEE KNOP.* The name of the third ornament (µyj æræP] κρίνα, *hiia)* means *blossom, bud;* but it is so general a term that it may apply to any flower. The Sept., Vulg., Josephus, and Maimonides understand it of the lily, and Bahr prefers the flower of the almond. It now remains to consider the manner in which these three ornaments were attached to the candelabrum. The obscurity of verse 33, which orders that there shall be "three almond-shaped cups on one arm, globe and blossom, and three almondshaped cups on the other arm, globe and blossom, and so on all the arms which come out of the shaft," has led

some to suppose that there was only one globe and blossom to every three cups. However, the fact that, according to verse 34, the shaft (which, as being the principal part of the whole, is here called the *candelabrum* itself), which had only four cups, is ordered to have globes and blossoms (in the plural), is a sufficient proof to the contrary. According to Josephus, the ornaments on the shaft and branches were 70 in number, and this was a notion in which the Jews, with their peculiar reverence for that number, would readily coincide; but it seems difficult, from the description in Exodus, to confirm the statement. It is to be observed that the original text does not define the height and breadth of any part of the candelabrum; nor whether the shaft and arms were of equal height; nor whether the arms were curved round the shaft, or left it at a right angle, and then ran parallel with it. The Jewish authorities maintain that the height of the candelabrum was eighteen palms, or about five feet; and that the distance between the outer lamps on each side was about 3½feet (Jahn, *Bibl. Arch.* § 329). Bahr, however, on the ground of harmonical proportion with the altar of incense and table of shewbread, the dimensions of which are assigned, conjectures that the candelabrum was only an ell and a half high and broad. The Jewish tradition uniformly supports the opinion that the arms and shaft were of equal height, as do also Josephus and Philo *(l. c.; Quis Rer. Div. Hcer. §* 44), as well as the representation on the Arch of Titus. Scacchius has, however, maintained that they formed a pyramid, of which the shaft was the apex. The lamps themselves were doubtless simply set upon the summits of the shafts, and removed for the purpose of cleaning. As the description given in Exodus is not very clear, we abbreviate Lightfoot's explanation of it. "The foot of it was gold, from which went up a shaft straight, which was the middle light. Near the foot was a golden dish wrought almondwise, and a little above that a golden knop, and above that a golden flower. Then two branches, one on each side, bowed, and coming up as high as the middle shaft. On each of them were three golden cups placed almondwise on sharp, scallop-shell fashion, above which was a golden knop, a golden flower, and the socket. Above the branches on the middle shaft was a golden boss, above which rose two shafts more; above the coming out of these was another boss, and two more shafts, and then on the shaft upward were three golden scallop-cups, a knop, and a flower, so that the heads of the branches stood an equal height" *(Works, 2:*397, ed. Pitman). Calmet remarks that "the number 7 might remind them of the Sabbath:" we have seen that Josephus gives it a somewhat Egyptian reference to the number of the planets, but elsewhere *(War, 7:*5, 5) he

assigns to the 7 1 r nches a merely general reference to the Jewish hebdomadal division of time. The whole weight of the candlestick was 100 mince (see Lamy, *De Tab. Feed.).* It has been calculated to have been worth $25,380, exclusive of workmanship. *SEE TABERNACLE.*

This candelabrum was placed in the Holy Place, on the *south* side *(i.e.* to the *left* of a person entering the tabernacle), opposite the table of shew-bread (<2655>Exodus 26:35). Its lamps, which were supplied with wick (? of cotton) and half a log (atLou two wine-glasses) of pure olive oil only, were lighted every evening, and extinguished (as it seems) every morning (<2721>Exodus 27:21; 30:7, 8; <3240>Leviticus 24:3; <0903>1 Samuel 3:3; <1431>2 Chronicles 13:11). Although the tabernacle had no windows (<2308>Exodus 30:8; Macc. 4:50), there is no good ground for believing that the lamps burnt by day in it, whatever may have been the usage of the second Temple. It has also been much disputed whether the candelabrum stood lengthwise or diagonally as regards the tabernacle; but no conclusive argument can be adduced for either view. According to Josephus, it was placed in an oblique position (λοξῶς), so that the lamps looked to the east and south *(Ant.* 3:6, 7; <2537>Exodus 25:37). As the lamp on the central shaft was by the Jewish writers called *the western*, or *evening lamp*, some maintain that the former name could not be applicable unless the candelabrum stood across the tabernacle, as then only would the central lamp point to the west. Others, again, adhere to the latter signification, and build on a tradition that the central lamp alone burnt from evening to evening, the other six being extinguished by day (Reland, *Antiq.* 1:5, 8). The priest in the morning trimmed the lamps with' golden snuffers (µyaeq;l]m; ἐπαρυστήρες; *forcipes),* and carried away the snuff in golden dishes (t/Tj]m; ὑποθέματα; *acerres,* <2538>Exodus 25:38). When carried about, the candlestick was covered with a cloth of blue, and put with its appendages in badger-skin bags, which were supported on a bar (<0409>Numbers 4:9).

In Solomon's Temple, instead of this single candelabrum (or besides it, as the Rabbins say, but what became of it is not known; see Keil, *Tempel Sol.* p. 109), there were ten of pure gold (whose structure is not described, although *flowers* are mentioned: <1149>1 Kings 7:49; <1407>2 Chronicles 4:7), one half of which stood on the north and the other on the south side of the Holy Place. These are said to have formed a sort of railing before the vail, and to have been connected by golden chains, *under* which, on the day of

atonement, the high priest crept. They were carried away to Babylon (2Ki 25:19 Jeremiah 52:19). In the Temple of Zerubbabel there appears to have been only one candelabrum again (1 Macc. 1:21; 4:49, 50). It is probable that it also had only seven lamps. At least, that was the case in the candelabrum of the Herodian temple, according to the description of Josephus *(War,* 7:5). This candelabrum is the one which, after the destruction of Jerusalem, was carried with other spoils to Rome, where, after the triumph of Titus, it was deposited in the Temple of Peace, and, according to one story, fell into the Tiber from the Milvian bridge during the flight of Maxentius from Constantine, Oct. 28, 312 A.D.; but it probably, in A.D. 455, became a part of the plunder which Genseric transported to Carthage (Gibbon, in, 291). It was, however, again, about A.D. 533, recaptured from the Vandals by Belisarius, and carried to Constantinople, and was thence sent off to Jerusalem *(ib.* 4:2:), from which time it has disappeared altogether. It is to this candelabrum that the representation on the Arch of Titus at Rome (see Fleck, *Wissenschaftl. Reise,* I, 1, pi. 1) was intended to apply; and although the existence of the figures of eagles and marine monsters on the pediment of that lamp tends, with other minor objections, to render the accuracy of that copy questionable (as it is unlikely that the Jews should have admitted any such graven images into their temple), yet there is reason to believe that in other points it may be relied upon as a reasonably correct representation of the Herodian candelabrum. Reland has almost devoted a valuable little work to this subject, *De Spoliis Templi Hierosolym. in Arcu Titiano* (2d ed. by Schulze, 1775), p. 82 sq. See also Stellm'mn, *De candelabro aureo* (Brem. 1700); Schlichter, *De Lychnucho sacro* (Hal. 1740); Doderlein, *De Candelabris Judxorum sacris* (Viteb. 1711); Ugolino, *De Candelabro (Thesaur.* 11). *SEE CANDLE.*

From the fact that the golden candelabrum was expressly made "after the pattern shown in the mount," many have endeavored to find a symbolical meaning in all its ornaments, especially Meyer and Bahr *(Symbol.* 1:416, sq.). Generally it was "a type of preaching" (Godwyn's *Moses and Aaron,* 2:1), or of "the light of the law" (Lightfoot, 1. c.). Similarly candlesticks are elsewhere made types of the Spirit, of the Church, of witnesses (Zechariah iv [see Scholze, *De Lychnucho,* Altona, 1741]; Re 1:12 Revelation 2:5; 11:4; comp. Wemyss, *Clav. Symbol.* s.v.). When our Lord cried "I am the light of the World" (Joh 8:12 John 8:12), the allusion was probably suggested by the two large golden chandeliers, lighted in the court of the women

during the Feast of Tabernacles, which illuminated all Jerusalem (Wetstein, *ad loc.),* or perhaps to the lighting of this colossal candlestick, “the more remarkable in the profound darkness of an Oriental town” (Stanley, *Sinai and Palest.* p. 420). The figure of LIGHT, however, is common in all languages to express mental and moral illumination.

Cane,

the rendering in only two passages (<23424>Isaiah 43:24; <24620>Jeremiah 6:20) of the Hebrews word hkq; *kaneh’,* from which, indeed, the modern term (Chald., Syr., and Arab. essentially the same; Gr. κάννη, Lat. *canna)* appears to have been derived, signifying properly a *reed* (as usually translated), i.e. the tall sedgy plant with a hollow stem (from hkq; to *erect),* growing in moist places (<11145>1 Kings 14:15; <18421>Job 40:21; <23916>Isaiah 19:6; 35:7; so <19831>Psalm 68:31, *beast of the reeds* [A. V. “multitude of spearmen,”], *i.e.* the crocodile); also the sweetflag (<26719>Ezekiel 27:19; <22044>Song of Solomon 4:14; fully <02123>Exodus 30:23); also the cultivated reed used as a staff (<26916>Ezekiel 29:6; <23616>Isaiah 36:6); hence a measuring reed or *rod* (<26403>Ezekiel 40:3, 5; 42:16-19); also a simple *stalk* of grain (<01405>Genesis 41:5, 22); likewise the upper *bone* of the arm (<18122>Job 31:22); the *rod* or beam of a balance, put for the balance itself (<23466>Isaiah 46:6); the shaft or *stem* of the sacred candelabrum (<02303>Exodus 30:31; 37:17), as well as its branches or *tubes* (<02552>Exodus 25:32, 33, 35, etc.). As the name of a plant, the word designates in Scripture three kinds of the genus *A rundo,* of which we accordingly give here a detailed description.

Picture for Cane 1

1. *Common Cane.* — In most of the passages of the Old Testament the word *kaneh* seems to be applied strictly to reeds of different kinds growing in waterthat is, to the hollow stems or culms of grasses, which are usually weak, easily shaken about by wind or by water, fragile, and breaking into sharp-pointed splinters. Thus, in <11145>1 Kings 14:15, “As a *reed* is shaken in the water;” <18421>Job 40:21, “He lieth in the covert of the *reed;”* <23916>Isaiah 19:6, “And they shall turn the rivers far away; and the *reeds* and flags shall wither.” Also in <23507>Isaiah 35:7; while in <12221>2 Kings 18:21; <23616>Isaiah 36:6; and <26907>Ezekiel 29:7, there is reference to the weak and fragile nature of the reed: “Lo, thou trustest in the staff of this broken *reed,* on Egypt, whereon if a man lean, it will go into his hand, and pierce it.”

The Greek word κάλαμος appears to have been considered the proper equivalent for the Hebrew *kaiehl,* being the term used by Matthew (<4012 20>Matthew 12:20) when quoting the words of Isaiah (<2342 03>Isaiah 42:3), "A bruised *reed* shall he not break." The Greek word Latinized is well known in the forms of *calamus* and *culmus.* Both seem to have been derived from the Arabic *kalea,* signifying a "reed" or "pen," and forming numerous compounds, with the latter signification, in the languages of the East. It also denotes a weaver's reed, and even cuttings of trees for planting or grafting. Or they may all be derived from the Sanscrit *kalm,* having the same signification. The German *halm,* and the English *haulm,* usually applied to the straw or stems of grasses, would seem to have the same origin. The Greek κάλαμος and the Latin *calamus* were used with as wide a signification as the Oriental *kalm,* and denoted a reed, the stalk or stem of corn, or any thing made therefrom, as a pen, an arrow, a reed pipe. Κάλαμος is also applied to any plant which is neither shrub, bush (ὕλη), nor tree (δένδρου) (see Liddell and Scott's *Greek Lex.).* So *calamus* means' any twig, sprig, or scion (Pliny, 16:14, 24). The term κάλαμος occurs very frequently in the New Testament, and apparently with the same latitude of meaning: thus, in the sense of a reed or culm of a grass, <4011 07>Matthew 11:7; <4207 24>Luke 7:24, "A *reed* shaken by the wind;" of a pen in 3 John 13, "But I will not with *pen* and ink write unto thee;" <4027 29>Matthew 27:29, "Put a *reed* in his right hand;" ver. 30, "Took the *reed* and smote him on the head;" and in <4115 19>Mark 15:19, it may mean a reed or twig of any kind. So also in <4027 48>Matthew 27:48, and <4115 36>Mark 15:36, where it is said that they filled a sponge with vinegar, and put it on a *reed,* while in the parallel passage, <4319 29>John 19:29, it is said that they filled a sponge with vinegar, and put it upon *hyssop,* and put it to his mouth; from which it is probable that the term κάλαμος was applied by both the Evangelists to the stem of the plant named hyssop, whatever this may have been, in like manner as Pliny (Joh 24:14, 75) applies the term *calamus* to the stem of a bramble.

In later times the term cane has been applied more particularly to the stems of the *Calamus rotang,* and other species of ratan canes, which we have good grounds for believing were unknown to the ancients, notwithstanding the opinion of Sprengel *(Hist. Rei Herb.* 1:171), "Ctesias makes two kinds of 'calamue,'. the male without pith, the female with it, the latter without doubt the *Calamus rotang,* the other our *Bambusca,* as Pliny restates (16:36)." *SEE FLAG.*

2. *Cultivated Cane.* — Of this Dioscorides describes the different kinds in his chapter περὶ καλάμου (1:114).

1. Κάλαμος ὁ ναστός, or the *Arundofarcta,* of which arrows are made *(Arundo arenaria?).*

2. The female, of which reed pipes were made *(A. donax ?).*

3. Hollow, with frequent knots, fitted for writing, probably a species of *Saccharum.*

4. Thick and hollow, growing in rivers, which is called *donax,* and also *Cypria (Arundo donax).*

5. *Phragmites (Arundo phragmites),* slender, light-colored, and well known.

6. The reed called *Phleos (Arundo anpelodesmos Cyrillii). (Flora Neapol.* t. 12.)

These are all described (1. c.) immediately before the papyrus, while κάλαμος ἀρωματικός is described in a different part of the book, namely, in ch. 17, along with spices and perfumes. The Arabs describe the different kinds of reed under the head of *Kusb,* or *Kussub,* of which they ‘give *Kalamus* as the synonymous Greek term.

From the context of several of the above passages of Scripture in which *kaneh* is mentioned, it is evident that it was a plant growing in water; and we have seen, from the meaning of the word in other languages, that it must have been applied to one of the true reeds, as, for instance, *Arundo AEgyptiaca* (perhaps only a variety of *A. donax),* growing on the banks of the Nile. In the New Testament κάλαμος seems to be applied chiefly to plants growing in dry and even barren situations, as in <420724>Luke 7:24, “What went ye into the wilderness to see a reed shaken by the wind ?” To such passages, some of the species of reed-like grasses, with slender stems and light flocculent inflorescence, formerly referred to *Saccharum,* but now separated as distinct genera, are well suited. *SEE REED.*

Picture for Cane 2

3. *Sweet Cane.* — This is designated in Hebrews by KENEH’ BO’SEM b22vb hnq], *reed of fragrance,* <023023>Exodus 30:23), or KANEH’ HAT-TOB (b/Fhi hnq; *good* or fragrant *reed,* <240620>Jeremiah 6:20). It is probably

intended also by *kaneh* (“ reed”) simply in Song of Solomon 4:14; Isaiah 43:24; and Ezekiel 27:17, as it is enumerated with other fragrant and aromatic substances. Finally, it was brought from a far country (Jeremiah 6:20; Ezekiel 27:19): Dan also, and Javan, going to and fro, carried bright iron, cassia, and calamus to the markets of Tyre.

The best description by ancient writers of this plant is that of Dioscorides (1:17), who calls it the *aromatic reed* (κάλαμος ἀρωματικός), and immediately after as a *rush* (σχοῖνος). He states it to be a produce of India, of a tawny color, much jointed, breaking into splinters, and having the hollow stem filled with pith like the web of a spider; also that it is mixed with ointments and fumigations on account of its odor. Hippocrates was acquainted with apparently the same substance (κάλαμος εὐώδης and σχοῖνος εὔοσμος), which Theophrastus, Polybius (v. 46), and Strabo (16:2) describe as growing in Coele-Syria, where modern travelers, however, have observed only common or scentless flags. Bochart, indeed, doubts whether the Scriptural plant could have been brought from India *(Hieroz.* pt. 2:1. 5, 100:6); but Dr. Vincent maintains that this trade was then fthy open *(Periplus of the Erythrcean Sea,* 2:365). Hence Dr. Royle *(Illustr. of Himal. Botany,* p. 425) identifies the “sweet cane” of Scripture with the *Andrcp gon calamus (aromaticus), a* plant extensively cultivated in India, from which an oil, deemed to be the famous *spikenard* of antiquity, is extracted (Royle, *Essay on Hindoo Medicine,* p. 33, 142; Hackett, *On the Spikenard of the Ancients,* p. 34; *Calcutta Med. Trans.* 1:367). *SEE CALAMUS.*

Cange, Du.

SEE DUCANGE.

Canisius, Henricus

or *de Hondt*, nephew of Petrus, was born at Nimeguen, studied at Louvain, and taught the canon law in the University of Ingolstadt, where he died in 1610. The work by which he is best known is his *Antique Lectiones* (1601, 1602, 1603. 6 vols.), republished by Basnage in 1725 (7 vols.), with notes, and with the Greek text in addition to the Latin version, which Canisius had given alone. Canisius also published *Summa Juris Cancnici; Commentarium in Regulas Juris; Prclectiones academicse; De decimis primitiis, et usuris; De sponsalibus et matrimonio:* all collected and

published by Bouvet in his *Opera Canoetica Canisii* (Louvain, *1649).* — *Biog. Univ.* 7:12; Landon, *Eccl. Dictionary,* 2:534.

Canisius, Petrus,

of Nimeguen, a Jesuit, born May 8, 1524, entered the order of the Jesuits in 1543, became professor and rector of the University of In-olstadt in 1549, and rector of the college of the Jesuits in Vienna in 1551. He used his influence with the emperor Ferdinand I for the suppression of Protestantism. As the first German "provincial" of the Jesuits, he established colleges of the order at Prague, Augsburg, Dillingen, and Fribourg (in Switzerland), at which latter place he died, Dec. 21, 1597. Canisius was one of the most prominent opponents of the Reformation in Germany, and the arrest of the reformatory movement in Austria and Bavaria is for a large part owing to his labors and his influence. In order to counteract the influence of the catechisms of Luther, and other works of the founders of Protestantism, he wrote his *Summa Doctrinx Christiance* (1584; with a commentary by P. Busaeus, Cologne, 1586, and Augsburg, 1833 sq. 4 vols.; new edition, Landshut, 1842), which was translated into nearly all languages (Greek, Prague, 1612; Greek-Latin, Augsburg, 1612), and a shorter catechism, entitled *Institutiones Christ. pietatis* (1566),which, until the middle of the 18th century, served as the basis of popular instruction in the Catholic schools of Germany, and has, even in modern times, again come into use (new editions: Landshut, 1833; 'Mainz, 1840). *SEE CATECHISM;* also *Theol. Quartelschrift,* 1863, Heft 3, p. 446. Canisius also edited the letters of Jerome, Leo the Great, and Cyril of Alexandria, and compiled a Catholic Prayer-book *(Manuale Catholicum,* Antwerp, 1530; Augsburg, 1841; German, 8th edit. Landshut, 1829). The Protestants called him "the Austrian Dog," while the Jesuits praised him as the second apostle of Germany, and even endeavored to obtain his beatification. Their efforts, for a long time unfruitful, were at length crowned, with success during the pontificate of Pius IX, who placed Canisius on the list of the "Beati." Biographies of Canisius were published in Latin by Raderus and Sacchini (Munich, 1623); in French by Dorigny (Paris, 1708); in Italian by Langore and Foligatti; in German by Werfer (in *Leben ausgezeichneter Catholiken,* Schaffhausen, 1852, 2 vols.).

Canker

(γάγγραινα), a *gangrene* (<55217>2 Timothy 2:17), *nortification;* a disease which spreads by degrees over the whole body. To such a putrid state of the system the apostle compares the corrupt doctrines of Hymenaeus and Philetus.

Canker-Worm

(qlyi, *yelek, feeding,* <29104>Joel 1:4; 2:25; "caterpillar," <19534>Psalm 105:34; <24514>Jeremiah 51:14, 27; Sept. βροῦχος, *i.e.* locust-grub; but ἀκρρί, locust, in Jeremiah; Chald. ahr]* P, winged locust; Syr. creeping locust) is generally referred to some hairy or caterpillar-like species of locust (<24627>Jeremiah 51:27, rmis; *bristly,* Auth. Ver. "rough"). Possibly it merely describes the *locust* in a certain stage of its growth, viz. just when it emerges from the caterpillar state and obtains the use of its wings; see <34016>Nahum 3:16," *the canker-worm has thrown of* (fvP; A. V. *spoileth)* its scales [or "*expanded* its wings"] and *flown away ;"* thus corresponding to the description by Jerome (in loc. Nab.) of the *attelabus* (ἀττέλαβος), or "wingless locust" (Credner, *Joel,* p. 305; see Bochart, *Hieroz. 2:*445). *SEE LOCUST.*

Canne, John,

a Baptist minister, was born in England about the year 1590 or 1600. In early life he was a minister in the Established Church, but joined the Baptists not far from 1630. He was for some time pastor of the church in Southwark, London, being successor to Mr. Hubbard, its first pastor. He was banished to Holland, where (not considering baptism a prerequisite to communion) he succeeded Ainsworth (q.v.) as pastor of his church in Amsterdam, and was deservedly popular. While in banishment in 1634, he published a work on the *Necessity of Separation from the Church of England.* In 1640 he returned on a visit to England, and founded the Baptist Church in Broadmead, Bristol. Mr. Canne was equally eminent for learning, piety, knowledge of the Scriptures, and zeal for reformation. Canne's most important labor is his selection of marginal references to the Bible. He was the author of *three* sets of notes, which accompanied three editions of the Bible. His great ambition was "to make the Bible its own interpreter." — Ivimey, *English Baptists;* Jamieson, *Cyclop. of Biogruphy,* 105; Neal, *History of the Puritans.*

Can’neh

(Hebrews *Kanneh’*, hNK; one codex fully hnlk; Sept. Χαναά, v. r. Χανάαν; Vulg. *Chene),* doubtless a contracted form (Ezekiel 27:23) for the earlier CALNEH *SEE CALNEH* (q.v.) of Genesis 10:10.

Cannon James S., D.D.,

an eminent minister of the Reformed Dutch Church, was born in Curaqoa, Jan. 28, 1776, and was educated under Dr. Peter Wilson and Rev. Alex. Miller at Hackensack, N. J. He was licensed to preach in 1796 by the Classis of Hackensack, and shortly after became pastor of the Reformed Dutch Church of Millstone and Six-mile Run, finally devoting his whole service to the latter church. His pastoral industry was remarkable, yet he wrote and committed to memory all his sermons. During part of his pastoral work he had to preach one sermon in Dutch and one in English every Sunday. In 1826 he was chosen Professor of Pastoral Theology and Ecclesiastical History in the Seminary at New Brunswick, and here he spent the remainder of his life, a laborious student, and a faithful and successful teacher. “His views of truth were more distinguished by exactness and solidity than by any far-reaching power; and yet, when he had discussed a subject, there was little left to be said.” A large number of ministers were trained by Dr. Cannon. He died in great peace, July 25, 1852. After his death, the substance of his course of instruction was published under the title *Lectures on Pastoral Theology* (New York, 1853, 8vo). “The subjects embraced in the lectures are: ‘The qualifications for the pastoral office,’ ‘pastoral duties,’ ‘the administration of the sacraments,’ ‘catechetical instruction,’ ‘visitation of the sick,’ ‘pastoral visitation,’ ‘religious declension,’ ‘extension of the Church,’ ‘instruction by example.’ Dr. Cannon’s discussion ofthe sacraments is particularly able, clear, and conclusive.” — N. *Brunswick Review,* May, 1854, p. 104; *Bibliotheca Sacra,* April, 1854, p. 420.

Canon Of Scripture,

as the phrase is usually employed, may be defined as “the Authoritative Standard of Religion and Morals, composed of those writings which have been given for this purpose by God to men.” A definition frequently given of the Canon is, that it is “the Catalogue of the Sacred Books;” while Semler *(Von Freier U nersu(hungen des Canons),* Doederlein *(Institutio*

Theol. Christ. 1:83), and others, define it as "the List of the Books publicly read in the meetings of the early Christians;" both these, however, are defective, and the latter is not only historically incorrect, but omits the essential idea of the divine authority of these Scriptures. We here give a copious account of the subject in general, referring our readers to special articles for more details on the several books of the Bible.

I. *Origin and uses of the term "Canon." —*

1. In *classical* Greek, the word (Κανών, akin to הנה; a "reed," [comp. Gesen. *Thes.* s.v.] κάνη, κάννα, *canna [canals, channel],* CANE, *cannon)* signifies,

(1) Properly, a *straight rod,* as the rod of a shield, or that used in weaving *(l'ciatorium),* or a carpenter's rule.

(2) Metaphorically, a *testing rule* in ethics (comp. Aristot. *Eth. Nic.* 3:4, 5), or in art (the *Canon* of Polycletus; Luc. *ds Salt.* p. 946 B), or in language (the *Canons of* Grammar). The gift of tongues (<44207>Acts 2:7) was regarded as the "canon" or test which determined the direction of the labors of the several apostles (Severian. ap. Cram. *Cat. in Act.* 2:7). Chronological tables were called "canons of time" (Plut. *Sol.* 27); and the summary of a book was called κανών, as giving the "rule," as it were, of its composition. The Alexandrine grammarians applied the word in this sense to the great "classical" writers, who were styled "'the rule" (ὁ Κανών), or the perfect model of style and language.

(3) But, in addition to these active meanings, the word was also used passively for a measured space (at Olympia), and, in later times, for a fixed tax (Du Cange, s.v.).

2. In *ecclesiastical* usage, the word occurs in the Sept. in its literal sense (<70706>Judges 13:6), and again in Aquila (<183805>Job 38:5). In the N.T. it is found in two places in Paul's epistles (<480616>Galatians 6:16; <471013>2 Corinthians 10:13-16), and in the second place the transition from an active to a passive sense is worthy of notice. In patristic writings the word is commonly used both as a rule in the widest sense, and especially in the phrases "the rule of the Church," "the rule of faith," "the rule of truth." In the fourth century, when the practice of the Church was farther systematized, the decisions of synods were styled "Canons," and the discipline by which ministers were bound was technically "the Rule," and those who were thus bound were

styled *Canonici* (“ Canons”). In the phrase “the canon (i.e. fixed part) of the mass,” from which the popular sense of “canonize” is derived, the passive sense again prevailed. (See below.)

3. As applied to *Scripture,* the derivatives of κανών are used long before the simple word. The Latin translation of Origen speaks of *Scripture, Canonicce (de Princ.* 4:33), *libri regulares (Comm. in Matt. §* 117), and *libri canonizati* (id. § 28). In another place the phrase *habei’i in Canone (Prol. in Song of Solomon* s. f.) occurs, but probably only as a translation of κανονίζεσθαι, which is used in this and cognate senses in Athanasius *(Ep. Fest.),* the Laodicene Canons (ἀκανόνιστα, Can. lix), and later writers (Isid. Pelus. *Ep.* cxiv; comp. Aug. *de doctr. Chr.* 4:9 [6]; and as a contrast, *Anon.* ap. Euseb. *H. E.* v. 28).

The first direct application of the term κανών to the Scriptures seems to be by Amphilochius (cir. 380), in his Catalogue of the Scriptures, where the word indicates the rule by which the contents of the Bible must be determined, and thus secondarily an index of the constituent books. Among Latin writers the word is commonly found from the time of Jerome *(Prol. Gal.)* and Augustine *(De Civ.* 17:24; 18:38), and their usage of the word, which is wider than that of Greek writers, is the source of its modern acceptation.

The uncanonical books were described simply as “those without,” or “those uncanonized” (ἀκανόνιστα, *Conc. Laod.* lix). The apocryphal books, which were supposed to occupy an intermediate position, were called “books read” (ἀναγιγνωσκόμενα, Athan. *Ep. Fest.),* or “ecclesiastical” *(ecclesiastici,* Rufin. *in Symb. Apost. §* 38), though the latter title was also applied to the canonical Scriptures, which (Leont. *de Sect.* ii) were also called “books of the Testament” (ἐνδιάθηκα βιβγία), and Jerome styled the whole collection by the striking name of “the holy library” *(Bibliotheca sancta),* which happily expresses the unity and variety of the Bible (Credner, *Zur Gesch. d. Kan. §* 1; Westcott, *Hist. of Canon of N.T.* App. D).

II. *The Jewish Canons. —*

1. According to the command of Moses, the “book of the law” was “put in the side of the ark” (Deuteronomy 31:25 seq.), but not *in* it (1 Kings 8:9; comp. Joseph. *Ant.* 3:1, 7; 5:1, 17); and thus, in the reign of Josiah, Hilkiah is said to have “found the book of the law in the house of the

Lord" (<122218>2 Kings 22:8; comp. <141434>2 Chronicles 34:14). This "book of the law," which, in addition to the direct precepts (<122407>Exodus 24:7), contained general exhortations (<052661>Deuteronomy 28:61) and historical narratives (<021714>Exodus 17:14), was farther increased by the records of Joshua (<062426>Joshua 24:26), and other writings (<091025>1 Samuel 10:25). From these sacredly guarded autographs copies were taken and circulated among the people (<141709>2 Chronicles 17:9). At a subsequent time collections of proverbs were made (<202501>Proverbs 25:1), and the later prophets (especially Jeremiah; comp. Kueper, *Jerem. Libror. ss. interp. et vindex*, Berol. 1837) were familiar with the writings of their predecessors, a circumstance which may naturally be connected with the training of "the prophetic schools." It perhaps marks a farther step in the formation of the Canon when "the book of the Lord" is mentioned by Isaiah as a general collection of sacred teaching (34:16 [where it is implied that his own writings were to be added to those previously regarded as sacred; see Gesenius, *Comment.* in loc.]; comp. 29:18) at once familiar and authoritative; but it is unlikely that any definite collection either of "the Psalms" or of "the Prophets" existed before the Captivity. At that time Zechariah speaks of "the law" and "the former prophets" as in some measure coordinate (<380712>Zechariah 7:12); and Daniel refers to *"the books"* (<270902>Daniel 9:2) in a manner which seems to mark the prophetic writings as already collected into a whole. Shortly after the return from Babylon, the Levites read and expounded the word of the Lord to the people (<160801>Nehemiah 8:1-8; 9:13).

2. Popular belief assigned to Ezra and "the great synagogue" the task of collecting and Ipromulgating the Scriptures as part of their work in organizing the Jewish Church. Doubts have been thrown upon this belief (Ran, *De Synag. magnas*, 1726; comp. Ewald, *Gesch. d. V. Isr.* 4:191 [see below]); but the statement is in every way consistent with the history of Judaism, and with the internal evidence of the books themselves. The later embellishments of the tradition, which represent Ezra as the second author of all the books (2 Esdras), or define more exactly the nature of his work, can only be accepted as signs of the universal belief in his labors, and ought not to cast discredit upon the simple fact that the foundation of the present Canon is due to lim. Nor can it be supposed that the work was completed at once; so that the account (2 Macc. 2:13) which assigns a collection of books to Nehemiah is in itself a confirmation of the general truth of the gradual formation of the Canon during the Persian period. The work of Nehemiah is not described as initiatory or final. The tradition omits all

mention of the law, which may be supposed to have assumed its final shape under Ezra, but says that Nehemiah "gathered together the [writings] concerning the kings and prophets, and the [writings] of David, and letters of kings concerning offerings," while 'founding a library" (2 Macc. l. c.). The various classes of books were thus completed in succession; and this view harmonizes with what must have been the natural development of the Jewish faith after the Return. The constitution of the Church and the formation of the Canon were both, from their nature, gradual and mutually dependent. The construction of an ecclesiastical polity involved the practical determination of the divine rule of truth, though, as in the parallel case of the Christian Scriptures, open persecution first gave a clear and distinct expression to the implicit faith.

The foregoing tradition occurs in one of the oldest books of the Talmud, the *Pirke Aboth;* and it is repeated, with greater minuteness, in the Babylonian Gemara *(Baba Bathra*, fol. 13, 2. See the passages in Buxtorf's *Tiberias.* lib. 1, 100:10; comp. Wachner, *Antiq. Heb.* 1:13). The substance of it is that, after Moses and the elders, the sacred books were watched over by the prophets, and that the Canon was completed by Ezra, Nehemiah, and the men of the Great Synagogue. The earliest form in which this appears is in the fourth book of Esdras, a work dating from the end of the first or beginning of the second century after Christ. Here it is asserted that Ezra, by divine command and by divine aid, caused to be composed 94 books by three men (Vulg. 204 books by five men) in forty days, 70 of which, wherein "is a vein of understanding, a fountain of wisdom, and a stream of knowledge," were to be given to the wise of the people, while the rest were to be made public, that "both the worthy and the unworthy might read them" (14:42-47). These twenty-four thus made public are doubtless the canonical books. The statement is very vague; but that this is its reference is rendered probable by the appearance in the writings of some of the Christian fathers of a tradition that the sacred writings, which had been lost during the exile, were restored by Ezra in the time of Artaxerxes by inspiration (Clemens Alex., *Strom.* I, 22, p. 410; Potter; Tertullian, *De cultu foim.* 1:3; Irenaens, *adv. Hoer.* in, 21 [25], etc.). Against this tradition it has been objected that it proves too much, for it says that the men of the Great Synagogue *wrote* the later books, such as the twelve minor prophets, etc. But that by *writing* is here meant, not the original composing of these books, but the *ascription* (the to-writing) of them to the sacred Canon, may be inferred, partly from the circumstance that, in the

same tradition, the men of Hezekiah are said to have *written* the Proverbs, which can only mean that they *copied* them (see Proverbs 25:1) for the purpose of inserting them in the Canon, and partly from the fact that the word here used (ˆb t k) is used by the Targumist on Proverbs 25:1 as equivalent to the Hebrews q t i[; *to transcribe.* An attempt has also been made to discredit this tradition by adducing the circumstance that Simon the Just, who lived long after Ezra, is said, in the *Pirke Aboth,* to have been one of the members of the Great Synagogue; but to this much weight cannot be allowed, partly because Simon is, in the passage referred to, said to have been one of the *remnants* of the Great Synagogue, which indicates his having outlived it, and principally because the same body of tradition which states this opinion makes him the *successor* of Ezra; so that either the whole is a mistake, or the Simon referred to must have been a different person from the Simon who is commonly known by the title of "Just" (comp. Othonis *Lex. Rabbin. Philol.* p. 604, Genesis 1675; Haivernick's *Einletung in das A. T.* Th. 1:Abt. I, 1:43). Or we may adopt the opinion of Hartmann *(Diz enge Verbindung des Alt. Test. mit d. Neuen,* p. 127) that the college of men learned in the law which gathered round Ezra and Nehemiah, and which properly was the Synagogue, continued to receive accessions for many years after their death, by means of which it existed till the time of the Maccabees, without our being required to suppose that what is affirmed concerning its doings in the time of Ezra is meant to refer to it during the entire period of its existence. Suspicions have also been cast upon this tradition from the multitude of extravagant wonders narrated by the Jews respecting the Great Synagogue. But such are found in almost every traditionary record attaching to persons or bodies which possess a nationally heroic character; and it is surely unreasonable because a chronicler tells one or two things which are incredible, that we should disbelieve all besides that he records, however possible or even probable it may be. To this it may be added that there are some things, such as the order of daily prayer, the settling of the text of the Old Testament, the establishment of the traditional interpretation of Scripture, etc., which must be assigned to the period immediately after the Captivity, and which presuppose the existence of some institute such as the Great Synagogue, whether this be regarded as formally constituted by Ezra or as a voluntary association of priests and scribes (Zunz, *Die Gottesdienstlichen Vortr. d. Juden,* p. 33). Moreover there are some passages of Scripture (e.g. 1 Chronicles in, 23, 24) which belong to a period somewhat later than any of the canonical writers. *SEE EZRA.*

This tradition, again, is confirmed by the following circumstances:

(a.) The time in question was the latest at which this could be done. As the duty to be performed was not merely that of determining the genuineness of certain books, but of pointing out those which had been divinely ordained as a rule of faith and morals to the Church, it was one which none but a prophet could discharge. Now in the days of Nehemiah and Ezra there were several prophets living, among whom we know the names of Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi; but with that age expired the line of prophets which God had appointed "to comfort Jacob, and deliver them by assured hope" (Ecclus. 49:10). On this point the evidence of Josephus, the apocryphal books, and Jewish tradition, is harmonious (comp. Joseph. *cont. Apion.* 1:8; 1 Macc. 4:46; 9:27; 14:41; Jerome, *ad Jes.* 49:21; Vitringa, *Obs. Sac.* lib. 6, cap. 6, 7; Havernick, *Einleit. 1:*1, 27; Hengstenberg, *Beitrdge zur Einleit. ins A.* T. 1:245). As the men of the Great Synagogue were thus the last of the prophets, if the Canon was not fixed by them, the time was passed when it could be fixed at all.

(b.) That it was fixed at that time appears from the fact that all *subsequent* references to the sacred writings presuppose the existence of the complete Canon, as well as from the fact that of no one among the apocryphal books is it so much as hinted, either by the author or by any other Jewish writer, that it was worthy of a place among the sacred books, though of some of them the pretensions are in other respects sufficiently high (e.g. Ecclus. 33:16-18; 1, 28). Josephus, indeed, distinctly affirms *(cont. Ap.* 1. c.) that, during the long period that had elapsed between the time of the close of the Canon and his day, no one had dared either to add to, or to take from, or to alter any thing in the sacred books. This plainly shows that about the time of Artaxerxes, to which Josephus refers, and which was the age of Ezra and Nehemiah, the collection of the sacred books was completed by an authority which thenceforward ceased to exist. *SEE SYNAGOGUE, GREAT.*

3. The persecution of Antiochus (B.C. 168) was for the Old Testament what the persecution of Diocletian was for the New, the final crisis which stamped the sacred writings with their peculiar character. The king sought out "the books of the law" (τὰ βιβλία τοῦ νόμου, 1 Macc, 1:56) and burnt them; and the possession of a "book of the covenant" (βιβλίον διαθήκης) was a capital crime (Joseph. *Ant. 12:*5, 4). But this

proscription of “the law” naturally served only to direct the attention of the people more closely to these sacred books themselves. After the Maccabean persecution the history of the formation of the Canon is merged in the history of its contents. The Bible appears from that time as a whole, though it was natural that the several parts were not vet placed on an equal footing, nor regarded universally and in every respect with equal reverence (comp. Zunz, D. *Gottesd. Vortr. d. Jud.* p. 14, 25, etc.).

But while the combined evidence of tradition and of the general course of Jewish history leads to the conclusion that the Canon in its present shape was formed gradually during a lengthened interval, beginning with Ezra and extending through a part or even the whole (<161211>Nehemiah 12:11, 22) of the Persian period (B.C. 458-332), when the cessation of the prophetic gift pointed out the necessity and defined the limits of the collection, it is of the utmost importance to notice that the collection was peculiar in character and circumscribed in contents. All the evidence which can be obtained tends to show that it is false, both in theory and fact, to describe the 0. T. as “all the relics of the Hebrmeo-Chaldaic literature up to a certain epoch” (De Wette, *Einl. §* 8), if the phrase is intended to refer to the time when the Canon was completed.

The epilogue of Ecclesiastes (<211211>Ecclesiastes 12:11 sq.) speaks of an extensive literature, with which the teaching of Wisdom is contrasted, and “weariness of the flesh” is described as the result of the study bestowed upon it. It is impossible that these “many writings” can have perished in the interval between the composition of Ecclesiastes and the Greek invasion, and the Apocrypha includes several fragments which must be referred to the Persian period (Buxtorf, *Tiberias,* 10:10 sq.; Hottinger, *Thes. Phil.;* Hengstenberg, *Beitrdge,* i; Havernick, *Einl.* i; Oehler, art. *Kanon d. A. T.* in Herzog’s *Encyklop.).*

4. The division of the O.T. Canon into three parts, “the Law,” “the Prophets,” and “the Writings” (µybæWtK]W µyaæybæN] hr;/T), is very ancient; it appears in the prologue to Ecclesiasticus, in the New Testament, in Philo, in Josephus, and in the Talmud (Surenhusii Βιβ. Καταλλ p. 49). Respecting the *principle* on which the division has been made, there is considerable difference of opinion. All are agreed that the first part, the Law, which embraces the Pentateuch, was so named from its containing the national laws and regulations. The *second* embraces the rest of the historical books, with the exception of Ruth, Esther, Ezra, Nehemiah, and

the Chronicles; and the writings of the prophets, except Daniel and Lamentations. It is probable that it received its name *aparte potiori*, the majority of the books it contains being the production of men who were *professionally* prophets. That this criterion, however, *determined* the omission or insertion of a book in this second division, as asserted by Hengstenberg *(Authent. des Daniel*, p. 27), and by Havernick *(Eal.* I, sec. 11), cannot be admitted; for, on the one hand, we find inserted in this division the book of Amos, who was "neither a prophet nor a prophet's son;" and on the other, there is omitted from it the Book of Lamentations, which was unquestionably the production of a prophet. The insertion of this book in the last rather than in the second division has its source probably in some liturgical reason, in order that it might stand beside the Psalms and other lyric poetry of the sacred books. It is more 'difficult to account for the insertion of the book of Daniel in the third rather than in the second division; and much stress has been laid on this circumstance, as affording evidence unfavorable to the canonical claims of this book. But it is not certain that this book *always* occupied its present position. Is it not possible that for some reason of a mystical or controversial kind, to both of which sources of influence the Jews during the early ages of Christianity were much exposed, they may have altered the position of Daniel from the second to the third division? What renders this probable is, that the Talmudists stand alone in this arrangement. Josephus, Siracides, Philo, the New Testament, all refer to the Hagiographa in such a way as to induce the belief that it comprised only the *poetical* portions of the Old Testament — the psalms, hymns, and songs; while in all the catalogues of the Old-Testament writers given by the early fathers, up to the time of Jerome, Daniel is ranked among the prophets, generally in the position he occupies in our common version. In the version of the Sept., also, he is ranked with the prophets next to Ezekiel. Nor does Jerome agree with the Talmud in all respects, nor does one class of Jewish rabbis agree with another in the arrangement of the sacred books. All this shows that no such fixed and unalterable arrangement of the sacred books, as that which is commonly assumed, existed anterior to the fifth century of the Christian aera, and proves very distinctly that the place then assigned to Daniel by the Talmudists was *not* the place he had during the preceding period, or originally occupied. *SEE DANIEL, BOOK OF*. As respects the name given to the *third* division, the most probable account of it is, that at first it was fullerviz., 'the *other* writings," as distinguished froip the Law and the Prophets (comp. the expression τὰ ἄλλα βιβλία, used by the Son of

Sirach, *Ecclus.* Prol.); and that in process of time it. was abbreviated into "the writings." This part is commonly cited under the title *Hagiographa* (q.v.)

5. The O.T. Canon, as established in the time of Ezra, has remained unaltered to the present day. Some, indeed, have supposed that, because the Sept. version contains some books not in the Hebrew, there must have been a double Canon, a Palestinian and an Egyptian (Semler, *Apparat. ad liberaliorem V. T. interpret. §* 9, 10; Corrodi, *Beleuchtung der Gesch. des Jidisch. u. Christlich. Kanons,* p.155-184; Augusti, *Einleit. ins. A. T.* p. 79); but this notion has been completely disproved by Eichhorn *(Einlit.* 1:23), Havernick *(Einl.* 1, § 16), and others. All extant evidence is against it. The Son of Sirach, and Philo, both Alexandrian Jews, make no allusion to it; and Josephus, who evidently used the Greek version, expressly declares against it in the passage above referred to *(Ap.* 1:8). The earlier notices of the Canon simply designate it by the threefold division already considered. The Son of Sirach, mentions "the Law, the Prophets, and the other books of the fathers;" and again, "the Law, the Prophecies, and the rest of the books;." expressions which clearly indicate that in his day the Canon was fixed. In the New Test. our Lord frequently refers to the Old Test. under the title of "The Scriptures," or of "The Law" (<42242>Matthew 21:42; 22:29; <43010>John 10:30, etc.); and in one place he speaks of "the Law of Moses, the Prophets, and the Psalms" (<42444>Luke 24:44); by the third of these titles intending, doubtless, to designate the Hagiographa, either after the Jewish custom of denoting a collection of books by the title of that with which it comnmenced, or, as Hävernick suggests, using the term ψαλμοί as a general designation of these books, because of the larger comparative amount of lyric poetry contained in them. *(Einl. §* 14). Paul applies to the Old Test. the appellations "the Holy Writings" (γραφαὶ ἁγίαι, <45102>Romans 1:2); "the Sacred Letters" (ἱερὰ γράμματα, <550315>2 Timothy 3:15), and "the Old Covenant" (ἡ παλαιὰ διαθήκη, <470314>2 Corinthians 3:14). 'Both our Lord and his apostles ascribe divine authority to the ancient Canon (<401503>Matthew 15:3; <43034>John 10:34-36; <550316>2 Timothy 3:16; <610119>2 Peter 1:19-21, etc.); and in the course of the New Test. quotations are ;nade from all the books of the Old except Ruth, Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther, Canticles, Lamentations, and Ezekiel, the omission of such may be accounted for on the simple principle that the writers had no occasion to quote from them. Coincidences of language show that the apostles were familiar with several of the apocryphal books (Bleek, *Ueber d. Stellung d.*

Apokr. in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1853, p. 267 sq.), but they do not contain one authoritative or direct quotation from them, while, with the exception of Judges, Eccles., Song of Solomon, Esther, Ezra, and Nehemiah, every other book in the Hebrew Canon is used either for illustration or proof. Philo attests the existence in his time of the ἱερὰ γράμματα, describes them as comprising laws, oracles uttered by the prophets, hymns, and the other books by which knowledge and godliness may be increased and perfected *(De Vita Contemplat.* in *Opp. 2:*275, ed Mangey); and quotations from or references to the most of the books are scattered through his writings. The evidence of Josephus is very important; for, besides general references to the sacred books, he gives a formal account of the Canon as it was acknowledged in his day, ascribing five books, containing laws and an account of the origin of man, to Moses, thirteen to the Prophets, and four, containing songs of praise to God and ethical precepts for men, to different writers, and affirming that the faith of the Jews in these books is such that for them they would suffer all tortures and death itself *(cont. Apien.* 1:7, 8; Eichhorn, *Einleit.* 1, § 50; Jahn, *Intrcduction* p. 50). The popular belief that the Sadducees received only the books of Moses (Tertull. *De prcescr. heret.* 45; Jerome, *in Matth.* 22:31, p. 181; Origen, c. *Cels.* 1:49), rests on no sufficient authority; and if they had done so, Josephus could not have failed to notice the fact in his account of the different sects. *SEE SADDUCEES.* In the traditions of the Talmud, on the other hand, Gamaliel is represented as using passages from the Prophets and the Hagiographa in his controversies with ‘them, and they reply with quotations from the same sources without scruple or objection. (See Eichhorn, *Einl. §* 35; Lightfoot, *Horce Hebr. et Talm. 2:*616; Schmid, *Enarr, Sent. Fl. Josephi de Libris V. T.* 1777; Guildenapfel. *Dissert. Josephi de Sadd. Can. Sent. exhibens,* 1804.) In the Talmudic Tract entitled *Baba Bathra,* a catalogue of the books of the sacred Canon is given, which exactly corresponds with that now found in the Hebrew Bible (Buxtorf, *Tiberias,* 100:11).

III. *The Christian Canon of the Old Testament.* — Melito, bishop of Sardis in the second century of the Christian mera, gives, as the result of careful inquiry, the same books in the Old-Testament Canon as we have now, with the exception of Nehemiah, Esther, and Lamentations; the first two of which, however, he probably included in Ezra, and the last in Jeremiah (Euseb. *Hist.* <2104>*Ecclesiastes* 4:26; Eichhorn, *Einl.* 1, § 52). The catalogues of Origen (Euseb. *Hist.* <2106>*Ecclesiastes 6:*2, 5), of Jerome

(Prol. Galeat. in *Opp.* in), and of others of the fathers, give substantially the same list (Eichhorn, 1. c.; Augusti, *Einl. §* 54; Cosins, *Scholastical Hist. of the Canon,* ch. in, vi; Henderson, *On Inspiration, p.* 449).

The general use of the Septuagint (enlarged by apocryphal additions) produced effects which are plainly visible in the history of the O.T. Canon among the early Christian writers. In proportion as the fathers were more or less absolutely dependent on that version for their knowledge of the Old-Testament Scriptures, they gradually, lost in common practice the sense of the difference between the books of the Hebrew Canon and the Apocrypha. The custom of individuals grew into the custom of the Church; and the public use of the apocryphal books obliterated in popular regard the characteristic marks of their origin and value, which could only be discovered by the scholar. But the custom of the Church was not fixed in an absolute judgment. The same remark applies to the details of patristic evidence on the contents of the Canon. Their habit must be distinguished from their judgment.

1. From what has been said, it is evident that the history of the Christian Canon is to be sought, in the first instance, from definite catalogues rather than from isolated quotations. But even this evidence is incomplete and unsatisfactory. (See the Tables 1. and 2.) During the first four centuries this Hebrew Canon is the only one which is distinctly recognized, and it is supported by the combined authority of those fathers whose critical judgment is entitled to the greatest weight. The real divergence as to the contents of the Old-Testament Canon is to be traced to Augustine, who enumerates the books contained in "the whole Canon of Scripture," including the Apocrypha, without any special mark of distinction, although it may be reasonably doubted whether he differed intentionally from Jerome except in language *(De Doctr. Christ. 2:*8 [13]; comp. *De Civ.* 18:36; *Gaud.* 1:38).

The enlarged Canon of Augustine, though wholly unsupported by any Greek authority, was adopted at the Council of Carthage (A.D. 397?), though with a reservation (Song of Solomon 47, *"de conJirmando isto Canone transmarina ecclesi: consulatur"),* and afterward published in the decretals which bear the name of Innocent, Damasus, and Gelasius (comp. Credner, *Zur Gesch. d. Kan.* p. 151 sq.); and it recurs in many later writers. But, nevertheless, a continuous succession of the more learned fathers in the West maintained the distinctive authority of the Hebrew

Canon up to the period of the Reformation. In the 6th century Primasius *(Comm. in Apoc.* 4, Cosin, § 92?), in the 7th Gregory the Great *(Moral.* 19:21, p. 622), in the 8th Bede (In *Apoc.* iv ?), in the 9th Alcuin *(ap.* Hody, p. 654; yet see *Carm.* 6, 7), in the 10th Radulphus Flav. *(In Leviticus* 14, Hody, p. 655), in the 12th Peter of Clugni *(Ep. c. Petr.* Hody, 1. c.), Hugo de S.Victore *(de Script.* 6), and John of Salisbury (Hody, p. 656; Cosin, § 130), in the 13th Hugo Cardinalis (Hody, p. 656), in the 14th Nicholas Liranus (Hody, p. 657; Cosin, § 146), Wiclif (? comp. Hody, p. 658), and Occam (Hody, p. 657; Cosin, § 147), in the 15th Thomas Anglicus (Cosin, § 150), and Thomas de Walden (Id. § 151), in the 16th Card. Ximenes *(Ed. Compl. Prcef.),* Sixtus Senensis *(Biblioth. 1:*1), and Card. Cajetan (Hody, p. 662; Cosin, § 173), repeat with approval the decision of Jerome, and draw a clear line between the canonical and apocryphal books (Cosin, *Scholastical History of the Canon;* Reuss, *Die Gesch. d. heiligen Schrifiten d. N.T.* ed. 2, § 328).

Picture for Canon of Scripture 1

Picture for Canon of Scripture 2

2. Up to the date of the Council of Trent (q.v.), the Romanists allow that the question of the Canon was open, but one of the first labors of that assembly was. to circumscribe a freedom which the growth of literature seemed to render perilous. The decree of the Council “on the Canonical Scriptures,” which was made at the 4th session (April 8th, 1546), at which about 53 representatives were present, pronounced the enlarged Canon, including the apocryphal books, to be deserving in all its parts of “equal veneration” (pari pietatis affectu), and added a list of books “to prevent the possibility of doubt” (ne cui dubitatio suboriri possit). This hasty and peremptory decree, unlike in its form to any catalogue before published, was closed by a solemn anathema against all who should “not receive the entire books, with all their parts, as sacred and canonical” (Si quis autem libros ipsos integros cum omnibus suis partibus, prout in ecclesia catholica legi consueverunt et in veteri vulgata Latina editione habentur, pro sacris et canonicis non susceperit ... anathema esto, *Conc. Trid. Sess.* 4). This decree was not, however, passed without opposition (Sarpi, p. 159 sq. ed. 1655, though Pallavacino denies this); and, in spite of the absolute terms in which it is expressed, later Romanists have sought to find a method of escaping from the definite equalization of the two classes of sacred writings by a forced interpretation of the subsidiary clauses Du Pin *(Dissert*

prelimn. 1:1), Lamy *(App. Bibl. 2:*5), and Jahn *(Einlin d. A. T.* 1:141 sq. ap. Reuss, § 337) endeavored to establish two classes of proto-canonical and deutero-canonical books, attributing to the first a dogmatic, and to the second only an ethical authority. But such a classification, however true it may be, is obviously at variance with the terms of the Tridentine decision, and has found comparatively little favor among Romish writers (comp. [Herbst] Welte, *Einl.* 2:1 sq.). *SEE DEUTEROCANONICAL.*

3. The reformed churches unanimously agreed in confirming the Hebrew Canon of Jerome, and refused to allow any dogmatic authority to the apocryphal books, but the form in which this judgment was expressed varied considerably in the different confessions. The Lutheran formularies contain no definite article on the subject, but the note which Luther placed in the front of his German translation of the Apocrypha (ed. 1534) is an adequate declaration of the later judgment of the Communion: "Apocrypha, that is, books which are not placed on an equal footing *(nicht gleich gehalten)* with Holy Scripture, and yet are profitable and good for reading." This general view was further expanded in the special prefaces to the separate books, in which Luther freely criticized their individual worth, and wholly rejected 3 and 4 Esdras as unworthy of translation. At an earlier period Carlstadt (1520) published a critical essay, *De canonicis scripturis libellus* (reprinted in Credner, *Zur Gesch. D Kan.* p. 291 sq.), in which he followed the Hebrew division of the canonical books into three ranks, and added Wisd., Ecclus., Judith, Tobit, 1 and 2 Macc., as Hagiographa, though not included in the Hebrew collection, while he rejected the remainder of the Apocrypha, with considerable parts of Daniel, as "utterly apocryphal" *(plane apocryphi;* Credn. p. 389, 410 sq.).

4. The Calvinistic churches generally treated the question with more precision, and introduced into their symbolic documents a distinction between the "canonical" and "apocryphal," or "ecclesiastical" books. The Gallican Confession (1561), after an enumeration of the Hieronymian Canon (Art. 3), adds (Art. 4) '"that the other ecclesiastical books are useful, yet not such that any article of faith could be established out of them" *(quo* [sc. *Spiritu Sancto] suggerente docemur, illos* [sc. *libros Canonicos] ab aliis libris ecclesiasticis discernere, qui, ut sint utiles, non sunt tamen ejusmodi, ut ex iis constitui possit aliquis fidei articulus).* The Belgic Confession (1561?) contains a similar enumeration of the canonical books (Art. 4), and allows their public use by the Church, but denies to them all independent authority in matters of faith (Art. 6). The later

Helvetic Confession (1562, Bullinger) notices the distinction between the canonical and apocryphal books, without pronouncing any judgment on the question (Niemeyer, *Libr. Symb. Ecclesiastes Ref.* p. 468). The Westminster Confession (Art. 3) places the apocryphal books on a level with other human writings, and concedes to them no other authority in the Church.

5. The English Church (Art. 6) appeals directly to the opinion of St. Jerome, and concedes to the apocryphal books (including [1571] 4 Esdras and the Prayer of Manasses) a use "for example of life and instruction of manners," but not for the establishment of doctrine; and a similar decision is given in the Irish Articles of 1615 (Hardwick, *ut sup.* p. 341 sq.). The original English Articles of 1552 contained no catalogue (Art. 5) of the contents of "Holy Scripture," and no mention of the Apocrypha, although the Tridentine decree (1546) might seem to have rendered this necessary. The example of foreign churches may have led to the addition upon the later revision. The Methodist Episcopal Church has adopted the same Canon of Scripture, but entirely omits the Apocrypha *(Discipline*, pt. i, ch. 1, § 2, Art. 5); and those books, as they stand in the Hebrew Canon and Greek Testament, are alone received by the evangelical churches of America.

6. The expressed opinion of the later Greek Church on the Canon of'Scripture has been modified in some cases by the circumstances under which the declaration was made. The "Confession" of Cyril Lucar, who was most favorably disposed toward the Protestant churches, confirms the Laodicene Catalogue, and marks the apocryphal books as not possessing the same divine authority as those whose canonicity is unquestioned (Kimmel, *Mon. Fid. Ecclesiastes Or. 1:*42). In this judgment Cyril Lucar was followed by his friend Metrophanes Critopulus, in whose confession a complete list of the books of the Hebrew Canon is given (Kimmel, 2:105 sq.), while some value is assigned to the apocryphal books in consideration of their ethical value; and the detailed decision of Metrophanes is quoted with approval in the "Orthodox Teaching" of Platon, Metropolitan of Moscow (ed. Athens, 1836, p. 59). The "Orthodox Confession" simply refers the subject of Scripture to the Church (Kimmel, p. 159; comp. p. 123). O:n the other hand, the Synod at Jerusalem, held in 1672, "against the ,Calvinists," which is commonly said to have been led by Romish influence (yet comp. Kimmel, p. 88), pronounced that the books which Cyril Lucar "ignorantly or maliciously called apocryphal" are "canonical

and Holy Scripture," on the authority of the testimony of the ancient Church ([Kimmel,] Weissenborn, *Dosith. Confess.* p. 467 sq.). The Constantinopolitan Synod, which was held in the same year, notices the difference existing between the Apostolic, Laodicene, and Carthaginian Catalogues, and appears to distinguish the apocryphal books as not wholly to be rejected. The authorized Russian Catechism *(The Doctrine of the Russian Church,* etc., by Rev. W. Blackmore, Aberd. 1845, p. 37 sq.) distinctly quotes and defends the Hebrew Canon on the authority of the Greek fathers, and repeats the judgment of Athanasius on the usefulness of the apocryphal books as a preparatory study in the Bible; and there can be no doubt that the current of Greek opinion, in accordance with the unanimous agreement of the ancient Greek Catalogues, coincides with this judgment.

7. The history of the Syrian Canon of the O.T. is involved in great obscurity from the scantiness of the evidence which can be brought to bear upon it. The Peshito was made, in the first instance, directly from the Hebrew, and consequently adhered to the Hebrew Canon; but as the Sept. was used afterward in revising the version, many of the apocryphal books were translated from the Greek at an early period, and added to the original collection (Assemani, *Bibl. Or.* 1:71). Yet this change was only made gradually. In the time of Ephrem (cir. A.D. 370) the apocryphal additions to Daniel were yet wanting, and his commentaries were confined to the books of the Hebrew Canon, though he was acquainted with the Apocrypha (Lardner, *Credibility,* 4:427 sq.; see Lengerke, *Daniel,* p. cxii). The later Syrian writers do not throw much light upon the question. Gregory Bar Hebrieus, in his short commentary on Scripture, treats of the books in the following order (Assemani, *Bibl. Orient.* 2:282): the Pentateuch, Joshua, Judges, 1 and 2 Samuel, Psalm, 1 and 2 Kings, Proverbs, *Ecclus.*, Ecclesiastes., Song of Solomon, *Wrisd.*, Ruth, *Hist. Sus.*, Job, Isaiah, 12 Proph., Jeremiah, Lamentations, Ezekiel, Daniel, *Bel,* 4 Gosp., Acts... 14 Epist. of Paul; omitting 1 and 2 Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther, *Tobit,* 1 and 2 *Macc., Judith, (Baruch ?), Apocalypse,* Epist. *James,* 1 Peter; 1 John.

In the Scriptural Vocabulary of Jacob of Edessa (Assemani, 2:499), the order and number of the books commented upon is somewhat different: Pent., Joshua, Judges, Job, 1 and 2 Samuel, David (i.e. Psalm), 1 and 2 Kings, Isaiah, 12 Proph., Jeremiah, Lamentations, *Baruch,* Ezekiel, Daniel, Proverbs, *Wisd.*, Song of Solomon, Ruth, Esther, *Judith, Ecclus.*, Acts,

Epist. *James,* 1 Peter, 1 John, 14 Epist. of Paul, 4 Gosp.; omitting 1 and 2 Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah, Ecclesiastes, *Tobit,* 1 and 2 *Macc., Apoc.* (comp. Assemani, *Bibl. Orient.* 3:4, note).

The Catalogue of Ebed-Jesu (Assemani, *Bibl. Orient.* 3:5 sq.) is rather a general survey of all the Hebrew and Christian literature with which he was acquainted (Catalogus librorum omnium Ecclesiasticorum) than a Canon of Scripture. After enumerating the books of the Hebrew Canon, together with *Ecclus., Wisd., Judith, add. to Dan.,* and *Baruch,* he adds, without any break, "the traditions of the Elders" (Mishna), the works of Josephus, including the Fables of Esop which were popularly ascribed to him, and at the end rsentions the "book of *Tobias and Tobit."'* In like manner, after enumerating the 4 Gosp., Acts, 3 Catho Epist. and 14 Epist. of Paul, he passes at once to the Diatessaron of Tatian, and the writings of "the disciples of the apostles." Little dependence, however, can be placed on these lists, as they rest on no critical foundation, and it is known from other sources that varieties of opinion on the subject of the Canon existed in the Syrian Church (Assemani, *Bibl. Orient.* 3:6, note).

One testimony, however, which derives its origin from the Syrian Church, is specially worthy of notice. Junilius, an African bishop of the 6th century, has preserved a full and interesting account of the teachings of Paulus, a Persian, on Holy Scripture, who was educated at Nisibis, where "the Divine Law was regularly explained by public masters" as a branch of common education (Junil. *De part; leg. Prcef.).* He divides the books of the Bible into two classes, those of '" perfect" and those of "mean" authority. The first class includes all the books of the Hebrew Canon with the exception of 1 and 2 Chron., Job, Canticles, and Esther, and with the addition of *Ecclesiasticus.* The second class consists of Chronicles (2), Job, Esdras (2), *,Judith,* Esther, and *Maccabees* (2), which are added by "very many" *(plurimi)* to the canonical books. The remaining books are pronounced to be of no authority, and of these Canticles and Wisdom are said to be added by "some" *(quidam)* to the Canon. The classification as it stands is not without difficulties, but it deserves more attention than it has received (comp. Hody, p. 653; Gallandi *Biblioth.* 12:79 sq. The reprint in Wordsworth, *On the Canon,* App. A, p. 42 sq., is very imperfect).

8. The Armenian Canon, as far as it can be ascertained from editions, follows that of the Sept., but it is of no critical authority; and a similar remark applies to the Ethiopic Canon, though it is more easy in this case to

trace the changes through which it has passed (Dillmann, *Ueber d. Aeth. Kan.,* in Ewald's *Jahrbuch,* 1853, p. 144 sq.).

See, on this branch of the subject, in addition to the works above, Schmid, *Hist. ant. et vindic. Can. S. Vet. et Nov. Test.* (Lips. 1775); [H. Corrodi], *Versuch einer Beleuchtung . . . d. Bibl. Kanons* (Halle, 1792); Movers, *'Loci quidam Hist. Can. V. T. illustrati* (Breslau, 1842). The great work of Hody *(De biblior. text.* Oxon. 1705) contains a rich store of materials, though even this is not free from minor errors. Stuart's *Critical History - and Defence; of the Old-Test. Canon* is rather an apology than a history. *SEE APOCRYPHA.*

IV. *The Canon of the New Testament.* — The history of the N.-T. Canon presents a remarkable analogy to that of the Canon of the O.T. The beginnings of both Canons are obscure from the circumstances under which they arose; both grew silently under the guidance of an inward instinct rather than by the force of external authority; both were connected with other religious literature by a series of books which claimed a partial and questionable authority; both gained definiteness in times of persecution. The chief difference lies in the general consent — with which all the churches ῥof the West have joined in ratifying one Canon of the N.T., while they are divided as to the position of the O.T. Apocrypha.

1. An ecclesiastical tradition (Photius, *Bibl. Cod.* p. 254) ascribes to the apostle John the work of collecting and sanctioning the writings which were worthy of a place in the Canon; but this tradition is too late, too unsupported by collateral evidence, and too much opposed by certain facts, such as the existence of doubt in some of the early churches as to the canonicity of certain books, the different arrangement of the books apparent in catalogues of the Canon still extant, etc., for any weight to be allowed to it. A much more probable opinion, and one in which nearly all the modern writers who are favorable to the claims of the Canon are agreed, is, that each of the original churches, especially those of larger size and greater ability, collected for itself a complete set. of those writings which could be proved, by competent testimony, to be the production of inspired men, and to have been communicated by them to any of the churches as: part of the written word of God; so that in this way a great many complete collections of the N.T. Scriptures came to be extant, the accordance of which with each other, as to the books admitted, furnishes irrefragable evidence of the correctness of the Canon as we now have it.

This opinion, which in itself is highly probable, is rendered still more so when we consider the scrupulous care which the early churches took to discriminate spurious compositions from such as were authentic — the existence, among some, of doubt regarding certain of the N.T. books, indicating, that each Church claimed the right of satisfying itself in this matter — their high veneration for the genuine apostolic writings — their anxious regard for each other's prosperity leading to the free communication from one to another of whatever could promote this, and, of course, among other things, of those writings which had been intrusted to any one of them, and by which, more than by any other means, the spiritual welfare of the whole would be promoted — the practice of the fathers of arguing the canonicity of any book, from its reception by the churches, as a sufficient proof of this-and the reason assigned by Eusebius (*Hist.* <2002>*Ecclesiastes* 3:25) for dividing the books of the N.T. into ὁμολογούμενοι and ἀντιλεγόμενοι, viz. that the former class was composed of those which the universal tradition of the churches authenticated, while the latter contained such as had been received by the majority, but not by all (Storch, *Comment. Hist. Crit. de Libb. N. Testamenti Canone,* etc. p. 112 sq.; Olshausen's *Echtheit der IV. Evang.* p. 439). In this way we may readily believe that, without the intervention of any authoritative decision, either from an individual or a council, but by the natural process of each body, of Christians seeking to procure for themselves and to convey to their brethren authentic copies of writings in which all were deeply interested, the Canon of the New Testament was formed.

2. The first certain notice which we have of the existence of any of the New-Testament writings in a collected form occurs in <610316>2 Peter 3:16, where the writer speaks of the epistles of Paul in such a way as to lead us to infer that at that time the whole or the greater part of these were collected together, were known among the churches generally (for Peter is not addressing any particular church), and were regarded as on a par with "the other Scriptures," by which latter expression Peter plainly means the sacred writings both of the Old and the New Testament, as far as then extant. That John must have had before him copies of the other evangelists is probable from the *supplementary* character of his own gospel. In the anonymous Epistle to Diognetus, which is, on good grounds, supposed to be one of the earliest of the uninspired Christian writings, the writer speaks of the Law, the Prophets, the Gospels, and the Apostles (§ xi, ed. Hefele).

Ignatius speaks of "betaking himself to the Gospel as the flesh of Jesus, and to the apostles as the presbytery of the Church," and adds, "the prophets also we love," thus showing that it was to the Scriptures he was referring *(Ep. ad Philadelphenos, §* v, ed. Iefele). Theophilus of Antioch speaks frequently of the New-Testament writings under the appellation of αἱ ἅγιαι γραφαί, or ὁ θεῖος λόγος, and in one place mentions the Law, the Prophets, and the Gospels as alike divinely inspired *(ad. Autol.* 3:11). Clement of Alexandria frequently refers to the books of the New Testament, and distinguishes them into "the Gospels and Apostolic Discourses" *(Quis Dives 'ahl us?* prope fin.; *Stromat.* saepissime). — Tertullian distinctly intimates the existence of the New-Testament Canon in a complete form in his day by calling it "Evangelicum Instrumentum" *(adv. Marc.* 4:2), by describing the whole Bible as "totum instrumentum utriusque Testamenti" *(adv. Prax.* 100:20), and by distinguishing between the "Scriptura Vetus" and the "Novum Testamentumn" *(Ibid:* 100:13). — Irenseus repeatedly calls the writings of the New Testament "the Holy Scriptures," "the Oracles of God" *(adv. Haer.* 2:27; 1:8, etc.), and in one place he puts the evangelical and apostolical writings on a par with the Law and the Prophets *(Ibid. 1:*3, *§* 6). From these allusions we may justly infer that before the middle of the third century the New-Testament Scriptures were generally known by the Christians in a collected form, and reverenced as the word of God. That the books they received were the same as those now possessed by us is evident from the quotations from them furnished by the early fathers, and which have been so carefully collected by the learned and laborious Lardner in his *Credibility of the Gospel History.* The same thing appears from the researches of Origen and Eusebius, both of whom carefully inquired, and have accurately recorded what books were received as canonical by the tradition of the churches or the church writers (ἐκκλησιαστικὴ παράδοσις), and both of whom enumerate the same books as are in our present Canon, though some of them, such as the Epistles of James and Jude, the 2d Ep. of Peter, the 2d and 3d of John, and the Apocalypse, they mention that though received by the majority, they were doubted by some (Euseb, *H. E.* 3:25; 6:24). Besides these sources of information, we have no fewer than ten ancient catalogues of the New-Testament books still extant. Of these, *six* accord exactly with our present Canon, while of the rest *three* omit only the Apocalypse, and *one* omits, with this, the Epistle to the Hebrews (Lardner's *Works,* vol. 4 and 5. 8vo; Horne's *Introduction,* 1, 70, 8th edition).

3. The history of the N.T. Canon may be conveniently divided into three periods. The first extends to the time of Hegesippus (c. A.D. 170), and includes the aera of the separate circulation and gradual collection of the apostolic writings. The second is closed by the persecution of Diocletian (A.D. 303), and marks the separation of the sacred writings from the remaining ecclesiastical literature. The third may be defined by the third Council of Carthage (a.D. 397), in which a catalogue of the books of Scripture was formally ratified by conciliar authority. The first is characteristically a period of tradition, the second of speculation, the third of authority; and it would not be difficult to trace the features of the successive ages in the course of the history of the Canon. For this, however, we have not room in detail, but must refer to the foregoing statements in support of this remark, the truth of which is farther sustained by the history of the times.

The persecution of Diocletian was directed in a great measure against the Christian writing (Lact. *Instit.* 5:2; *de mort. persec.* 16). The influence of the Scriptures was already so great and so notorious that the surest method of destroying the faith seemed to be the destruction of the records on which it was supported. The plan of the emperor was in which it was supported. The plan of the emperor was in part successful. Some were found who obtained protection by the surrender of the sacred books, and at a later time the question of the readmission of these “traitors” (*traditores*), as they were emphatically called, created a schism in the Church. The Donatists, who maintained the sterner judgment on their crime, may be regarded as maintaining in its strictest integrity the popular judgment in Africa on the contents of the Canon of Scripture which was the occasion of the dissension; and Augustine allows that they held, in commom with the Catholics, the same “canonical Scriptures,” and were alike “bound by the authority of both Testaments” (August. C. *Cresc.* 1:31, 57; *Ep.* 129, 3.) The only doubt which can be raised as to the integrity of the Donatist Canon arises from the uncertain language that Augustine himself uses as to the Epistle to the Hebrews, which the Donatists may also have countenanced. But, however, this may have been, the commplete Canon arises from the uncertain language that Augustine himself uses as to the Epistle to the Hebews, which the Donatists may also have countenanced. But, however this may have been, the complete Canon of the N.T., as commonly received at present, was ratified at the third Council of Carthage (A.D. 397), and from that time was accepted throughout the Latin Church

(Jerome, Innocent, Rufinus, Philastrius), though occasional doubts as to the Epistle to the Hebrews still remained (Isid. Hisp. *Proem.* § 85-109). It will be perceived that there was no dispute as to the authentic and inspired character of most of the books, and as to the remainder thre exist very respectable testimonies even in this early age (see Table IV). *SEE ANTILEGOMENA.*

Picture for Canon of Scripture 3

Picture for Canon of Scripture 4

4. At the era of the Reformation the question of the N.T. Canon again assumed great importance. The hasty decree of the Council of Trent, which affirmed the authority of all the books commonly received, called out the opposition of controversialists, who quoted and enforced the early doubts. Erasmus, with characteristic moderation, denied the apostolic origin of the *Epistle to the Hebrews,* 2 *Peter,* and the *Apocalypse,* but left their canoncial authoriday unquestioned (*Praef. Ad Antilegom.*). Luther, on the other hand, with bold self-reliance, created a purely subjective standard for the canonicity of the Scriptures in the character of their "teaching of Christ," and while he placed the Gospel and first Epistle of John, the Epistles of Paul o the Romans, Galatians, Ephesians, and the first Epistle of Peter, in the first rank as containing the "kernel of Christianity," he set aside the *Epistle to the Hebrews, Jude, James,* and the *Apocalypse* at the end of his version, and spoke of them and the remaining Antilegomena with varying degrees of disrespect, though he did not separate 2 *Peter* and 2, 3 *John* from the other Epistles (comp. Landerer, art. *Kanon* in Herzog's *Encyklop.* p. 295 sq.). The doubts which Luther rested mainly on internal evidence were variously extended by some of his followers (Melancthon, *Centur. Magdeb.,* Flacius, Gerhard; comp. Reuss, § 334); and especially with a polemical aim against the Romish Church by Chemnitz *(Exam. Cone. Trid. 1:*73). But while the tendency of the Lutheran writers was to place the Antilegomena on a lower stage or authority, their views received no direct sanction in any of the Lutheran symbolic books which admit the "prophetic and apostolic writings of the Old and New Testaments" as a whole, without further classification or detail. The doubts as to the Antilegomo ena of the N.T. were not confined to the Lutherans. Carlstadt, who was originally a friend of Luther and afterward professor at Zurich, endeavored to bring back the question to a critical discussion of evidence, and placed the Antilegomena in a third class "on account of the

controversy as to the books, or rather (ut certius loquar) as to their authors" *(De Can. Scrpt.* p. 410-12, ed Credn.). Calvin, while he denied the Pauline authorship of the *Epistle t) the Hebrews,* and at least questioned the authenticity of 2 *Peter,* did not set aside their canonicity *(PrePf. ad Hebr.; ad 2 Petr.);* and he notices the doubts as to *James* and *Jude* only to dismiss them.

5. The language of the Articles of the Church of England with regard to the N.T. is remarkable. In the Articles of 1552 no list of the books of Scripture is given; but in the Elizabethan Articles (1562, 1571) a definition of Holy Scripture is given as "the canonical books of the Old and New Testament, *of whose authority was never any doubt in the Church"* (Art. 6). This definition is followed by an enumeration of the books of the O.T. and of the Apocrypha; and then it is said summarily, without a detailed catalogue, "all the books of the N.T., as they are commonly received, we do receive and account them for canonical" (pro canonicis habemus). A distinction thus remains between the "canonical books" and such "canonical books as have never been doubted in the Chilrch;" and it seems impossible to avoid the conclusion that the framers of the Articles intended to leave a freedom of judgment on a point on which the greatest of the Continental reformers, and even of Romish scholars (Sixtus Sen. *Biblio!h.* S. 1:1; Cajetan, *Preef. ad Epp. ad Hebr., ac.,* 2, 3 *John, Jud.)* were divided. The omission cannot have arisen solely from the fact that the Article in question was framed with reference to the Church of Rome, with which the Church of England was agreed on the N.-T. Canon, for all the other Protestant confessions which contain any list of books give a list of the books of the New as well as of the Old Testament *(Conf. Belg. 4; Conf. Gall.* 3; *Conf. Fid.* 1). But, if this license is rightly conceded by the Anglican Articles, the great writers of the Church of England have not availed themselves of it. The early commentators on the Articles take little (Burnet) or no notice (Beveridge) of the doubts as to the Antilegomena; and the chief controversialists of the Reformation accepted the full Canon with emphatic avowal (Whitaker, *Disp. on Scripture,* cxiv, p. 105; Fulke's *Defence of Esg. Trans.* p. 8; Jewel, *Defence of Apol.* 2:9, 1).

6. The judgment of the Greek Church in the case of the O.T. was seen to be little more than a reflection of the opinions of the West. The difference between the Roman and Reformed churches on the N.T. were less marked; and the two conflicting Greek confessions confirm, in general terms, without any distinct enumeration of books, the popular Canon of the N.T.

(Cyr. Luc. *Conf.* 1, p. 42; Dosith. *Confess.* 1, p. 467). The Confession of Metrophanes gives a complete list of the books, and compares their number-thirty-three with the years of the Savior's life, that "not even the number of the sacred books might be devoid of a divine mystery" (Metroph. Critop. *Conf.* 2:105, ed. Kimm. et Weissenb.). At present, as was already the case at the close of the 17th century (Leo Allatius, ap. Fabric. *Bibl. Groec.* v, App. p. 38), the Antilegomena are reckoned by the Greek Church as equal in canonical authority in all respects with the remaining books *(Catechism,* ut sup.).

V. *Authority of the present Canon of Scripture. —*

1. The assaults which have been made, especially during the present century, upon the authenticity of the separate books of the O.T. and N. Test., are noticed under the special articles. The general course which they have taken is simple and natural. Semler *(Untersuch. d. Kan.* 1771-5) first led the way toward the later subjective criticism, though he rightly connected the formation of the Canon with the formation of the Catholic Church, but without any clear recognition of the providential power which wrought in both. Next followed a series of special essays, in which the several books were discussed individually, with little regard to the place which they occupy in the whole collection (Schleier-macher, Bretschneider, De Wette, etc.). At last an; ideal view of the early history of Christianity was used as the standard by which the books were to be tried, and the books were regarded as results of typical forms of doctrine, and not the sources of them (F. C. Baur, Schwegler, Zeller). All true sense of historic evidence was thus lost. The growth of the Church was left without explanation, and the original relations and organic unity of the N.T. were disregarded.

2. In order to establish the Canon of Scripture, it is necessary to show that all the books of which it is composed are of divine authority; that they are entire and incorrupt; that, having them, it is complete without any addition from any other source; and that it comprises the whole of those books for which divine authority can be proved. It is obvious that, if any of these four particulars be not true, Scripture cannot be *the sole and supreme* standard of religious truth and duty. If any of the books of which it is composed be not of divine authority, then part of it we are not bound to submit to, and consequently, *as a whole,* it is not the standard of truth and morals. If its separate parts be not in the state in which they left the hands of their

authors, but have been mutilated, interpolated, or altered; then it can form no safe standard; for, in appealing to it, one cannot be sure that the appeal is not made to what is spurious, and what, consequently, may be erroneous. If it require or admit of supplementary revelations from God, whether preserved by tradition or communicated from time to time to the Church, it obviously would be a mere contradiction in terms to call it *complete*, as a standard of the divine will. And if any other books were extant, having an equal claim, with the books of which it is composed, to be regarded as of divine authority, it would be absurd to call it the *sole* standard of truth, for in this case the one class of books would be quite as deserving of our reverence as the other.

3. Respecting the *evidence* by which the Canon is thus to be established, there exists considerable difference of opinion among Christians. Some contend, with the Romanists, that the authoritative decision of the Church is alone competent to determine the Canon; others appeal to the concurrent testimony of the Jewish and early Christian writers; and others rest their strongest reliance on the internal evidence furnished by the books of Scripture themselves. We cannot say that we are satisfied with any of these sources of evidence exclusively. As Michaelis remarks, the first is one to which no consistent Protestant can appeal, for the matter to be determined is of such a kind that, unless we grant the Church to be infallible, it is quite possible that she may, at any given period of her existence, determine erroneously; and one sees not why the question may not be as successfully investigated by a private individual as by a Church. The concurrent testimony of the ancient witnesses is invaluable as far as it goes; but it may be doubted if it be sufficient of itself to *settle* this question, for the question is not *entirely* one of facts, and testimony is good proof only for *facts.* As for the internal evidence, one needs only to look at the havoc which Semler and his school have made of the Canon, to be satisfied that where dogmatical considerations are allowed to determine exclusively such questions, each man will extend or curtail the Canon so as to adjust it to his own preconceived notions. As the question is one partly of fact and partly of opinion, the appropriate grounds of decision will be best secured by a combination of authentic testimony with the evidence supplied by the books themselves. We want to know that these books were really written by the persons whose names they bear; we want to be satisfied that these persons were commonly reputed and held by their contemporaries to be assisted by the Divine Spirit in what they wrote; and we want to be sure

that care was taken by those to whom their writings were first addressed, that these should be preserved entire and uncorrupt. For all this we must appeal to the testimony of competent witnesses as the only suitable evidence for such matters. But, after we have ascertained these points affirmatively, we still require to be satisfied that the books themselves contain nothing obviously incompatible with the ascription to their authors of the divine assistance, but, on the contrary, are in all respects favorable to this supposition. We want to see that they are in harmony with each other; that the statements they contain are credible; that the doctrines they teach are not foolish, immoral, or self-contradictory; that their authors really assumed to be under the divine direction in what they wrote, and afforded competent proofs of this to those around them; and that all the circumstances of the case; such as the style of the writers, the allusions made by them to places and events, etc., are in keeping with the conclusion to which the external evidence has already led. In this way we advance to a complete moral proof of the divine authority and canonical claims of the sacred writings. *SEE EVIDENCES.*

(1.) The external evidence of the several books, in turn, relates to three principal points:

(a.) Their *genuineness;* in other words, the fact that we have the actual works which have heretofore been known by these names, without essential defect, corruption, or interpolation. This is the province of criticism (q.v.) to show, as has been done by an irrefragable chain of documentary testimony.

(b.) Their *authenticity* (q.v.), or that they are the productions of the respective authors asserted or believed, which is a question wholly of historical investigation, aided by grammatical comparison; and this has been shown respecting the most of them in as positive a manner as in the case of any other equally ancient writings.

(c.) Their *inspiration* (q.v.); the most essential point of the three is this relation, an element which, although confessedly obscure and difficult to adjust in every respect with their human features, especially in the absence of any similar experience in modern times, is yet capable of twofold proof: 1st, from statements and implication of revelation contained in the books themselves, showing that they are a divine communication; and, 2dly, from the concurrent voice of the ancient as well as modern body of believers. This last argument is undoubtedly the chief one, of an external character,

that must be relied upon in defense of the authority, of the Holy Scriptures, and it may well be claimed as a sufficient satisfaction to all rightly constituted minds,

[1] that these books, both singly and as a whole, were so generally and early recognized as of divine authority by those who had the best opportunity to judge of their claims, by reason of proximity in time and place to their origin and intimacy with their authors, while, at the same time, they exhibited their caution and freedom from prejudice by rejecting many other more pretentious ones as unworthy their acceptance; and

[2] that the universal Church, with few and unimportant exceptions, has ever since not only cordially acquiesced, but firmly retained, in the face of almost every conceivable effort that the ingenuity or force of those of an opposite opinion could bring to bear upon the question, the same traditionary persuasion; nor

[3] has any really unanswerable difficulty yet been alleged in the way of such a belief.

(2.) With the external evidence furnished above in favor of the sacred Canon, the internal fully accords. In the Old Testament all is in keeping with the assumption that its books were written by Jews, sustaining the character, surrounded by the circumstances, and living at the time ascribed to their authors; or, if any apparent discrepancies have been found in any of them, they are of such a kind as farther inquiry has served to explain and reconcile. The literary peculiarities of the New Testament, its language, its idioms, its style, its allusions, all are accordant with the hypothesis that its authors were exactly what they profess to have been — Jews converted to Christianity, and living at the commencement of the Christian era. Of both Testaments the theological and ethical systems are in harmony, while all that they contain tends to one grand result-the manifestation of the power and perfection of Deity, and the restoration of man to the image, service, and love of his Creator. The conclusion from the whole facts of the case can be. none other than that the Bible is entitled to that implicit and undivided reverence which it demands as the only divinely appointed *Canon* of religious truth and duty.

VI. *Literature.* — For the later period of the history of the N.T. Canon, from the close of the second century, the great work of Lardner *(Credibility of the Gospel History,* in his *Works,* 1-6, ed. Kippis, 1788; also

1838, 10 vols. 8vo) furnishes copious materials. For the earlier period his criticism is necessarily imperfect, and requires to be combined with the results of later inquiries. Kirchhofer's collection of the original passages which bear on the history of the Canon *(Quellensammlung,* etc., Ziirich, 1844) is useful and fairly complete, but frequently inaccurate. The writings of F. C. Baur and his followers often contain very valuable hints as to the characteristics of the several books in relation to later teaching, however perverse their conclusions may be. In opposition to them Thiersch has vindicated, perhaps with an excess of zeal, but yet,, in the main, rightly, the position of the apostolic writings in relation to the first *age(Versuch zur Herstellung,* etc., Erlangen, 1845; and *Erwiederung,* etc., Erlang. 1846). The section of Reuss on the subject *(Die Gesch. d. hell. Schriften d. N.T.,* 2d ed. Braunschw. 1853; also in French, *Histoire du Canrn,* Strasbourg, 1863, 8vo), and the article of Landerer (Herzog's *Ency-, klop.* s.v.), contain valuable summaries of the evidence.; Other references and a fuller discussion of the chief points are given by Westcott in *The History of the Canon of the N.T.* (Cambr. 1855). In addition to the works named throughout this article, the following may also be consulted: Cosin, *Scholastical History of the Canon* (4to, London, 1657, 1672, 1683; also. *Works,* in; 4:410); Du Pin, *History of the Canon and Writers of the Books of the Old and New Test.* (2 vols. folio, London, 1699, 1700); Ens, *Bibliotheca Sacra, sive Diatribe de Librorum Nov. Test. Canone* (12mo, Amstel., 1710); Storch, *Comment. Hist. Crit. de Libb. Nov. Test., Canone* (8vo, Fr. ad 6. 1755); Schmid, *Hist. Antiq. et Vindicatio Canonis V. et N. Test.* (8vo, Lips. 1775); Jones, *New and full Method of settling the Canonical Authority of the New Test.* (3 vols. Oxf. 1827); Alexander, *Canon of the Old and New Test. ascertained* (12mo, Princeton, 1826; Lond. 1828, 1831); Stuart, *Old-Test. Canon* (12mo, Andover, 1845; Edinb. and Lond. 1849); Wordsworth, *Hulsean Lectures* (8vo, London, 1848); Gaussen, *Le Canon des Saintes ecritures au double points le vue de la science et de lafoi* (Lausanne, 1860, 2 vols.; Engl. translation, *The Canon of Scripture,* etc. [London, 1862, 8vo]); *Bibliotheca Sacra, 11:*278; Credner, *Gesch. d. neutest. Kanon* (edit. Volkmar, Berlin, 1860) ; Hilgenfeld, *Kan. des N.T.* (Halle, 1863); Hofmann, *Die hei'igen. Schrift. d. N.T.,* etc. (Nordlingen, 1862, pt. 1). .

Canon, Ecclesiastical

(κανών, *rule,* see the foregoing article, § i), a term used in various senses, as follows:

CANON, a clerical title.

1. The roll or church register in which, in the ancient Church, the names of the clergy were written was called the *canon;* and the clergy were hence called *canonici* (Bingham, *Orig. Eccl.* bk. 1, ch. 5, § 10). In Cyril *(Praef. Catech.* n. 3), the presence of the clergy is expressed by the words κανονικῶν παρουσία. *SEE CANONICE.*

2. *Cathedral Canons.* — Chrodegangus, bishop of Metz, about A.D. 755, gave a common cloister-life law to his clergy, and thus originated the proper *vita canonica*, as attached to a cathedral church. *SEE CHAPTER.* Originally canons were only priests or inferior ecclesiastics who lived in community, residing near the cathedral church to assist the bishop, depending entirely on his will, supported by the revenues of the bishopric, and living in the same house, as his counselors or domestics. They even inherited his movables till A.D. 817, when this was prohibited by the Council of Aix-la-Chapelle. By degrees these communities of priests, shaking off their dependence, formed separate bodies, of which the bishops were still the head. In the tenth century there were communities of the same kind, established even in cities where there were no bishops: these were called collegiates, as the terms “college” and “congregation” were used indifferently. Under the second race of French kings the canonical life spread over the country, and each cathedral had its *chapter* distinct from the rest of the clergy (Farrar, s.v.). Benedict XII (1339) endeavored to secure a general adoption of the rule of Augustine by the canons, :which gave rise to the distinction between *canons regular* (i.e. those who follow that rule) and *canons secular* (those who do not). *SEE CANONS, REGULAR.* As demoralization increased, the canonries were filled by younger sons of nobles, without ordination, for the sake of the revenues. The *expectancies* (q.v.) of canonries became objects of traffic, as advowsons (q.v.) now are in the English Church. The Reformation abolished most of the chapters and canonries in Germany: a few remain at Brandenburg, Merseburg, Naumburg, and Meissen.

In the Church of England, *canons* or *prebendaries* are clergymen who receive a stipend for the performance of divine service in a cathedral or collegiate church. *SEE CHAPTER; SEE DEAN.*

Canon Of The Mass

(canon Missae), a part of the mass or communion service of the Church of Rome. The office of the mass is divided into three parts: (1) from the introit to the preface; (2) which contains *the canon,* from the *Sanctus* to the time of communion; and (3) the thanksgiving. The second is considered the *essential* part, being that which contains the consecration of the elements. The Greeks call it *civafo*pa, probably because of the exhortation of the priest at the commencement to the people, *sursunm corda.* In the Roman liturgy the canon begins at the words *Te igitur,* etc. In the Roman Church the form of the canon remains the same at every mass. It is sometimes, by ancient writers, called the actio. It is also known by the name *secreta,* or *secretum,* because the priest is ordered to say it in a low voice; and, according to Goar, the same practice is observed in the East. (See *Cone. Trident.* sess. 22, can. 9.) — Martene, *De ant. nit.* 1:144; Landon, *Eccl. Diet.* . 5.; Procter On *Common Prayer,* 319. See MASS.

Canon Law, Canons Of Discipline, Canons And Decretals Of Rome.

The canons or rules of discipline of the Romish Church form a body of law which has been accumulating for centuries. They are made up of the so-called Apostolical Canons, of decrees of councils, and of decrees and rules promulgated by the popes. The different collections of these are,

1. For the early ages, the so-called "Apostolical Canons," the Greek "Collections" in the *Codex Canonum;*

2. For the Middle Age, up to Gratian's time, a number of collections;

3. From the twelfth century onward, the decretals of Gratian, of Gregory IX, and Boniface VIII, the Clementines, the Extravagants, and the *Corpus Juris Canonici.*

I. *Early Ages.* —

(I.) CANONS APOSTOLICAL, a collection of canons (in number seventy-six or eightyfive, according to the different methods of division), *not* to be attributed, as the name implies, to the apostles. Beveridge, in his *Codex Can. Eccl. Prim.,* seeks to show that these canons are the synodal rules and regulations made in councils anterior to the Council of Nicsea, in which view Petrus de Marca, Dupin, and others agree. Daille *(De*

Pseudepigraphis Apostolicis) considers them the work of the fifth century. That they are not of apostolical origin is very clear from the use in them of terms and mention of ceremonies quite unknown in the apostolic age, as well as from the fact that they were never even cited under the name of apostolical before the Council of Ephesus, if, indeed, we ought not, as some think, to read in the acts of that council, instead of "the canons of the apostles," "the canons of the fathers." Previously to this synod they are cited as *Canones Patrum, Canones antiqui* or *ecclesiastici.* Bellarmine and Baronius claim apostolical authority for only the first fifty canons. Pope Gelasius *(Distinct.* xv, can. *Sancta Romana)* plainly declares, *Liber Canonum Apostolorum apocryphus est;* but the authenticity of the passage is doubted. It is the opinion of Beveridge *(Cod. Canonum Ecclesiastes Primitive*, Lond. 1678) that the Apost. Canons were enacted in different synods about the close of the second century and beginning of the third; and that the collection was made soon after, but since that time interpolated; and that the compiler of the collection cannot be ascertained. Dr. Schaff sums up the whole case in the following judicious passages:" The contents of the so-called Apostolical Canons are borrowed partly from the Scriptures, especially the Pastoral Epistles, partly from tradition, and partly from the decrees of early councils at Antioch, Neo-Caesarea, Nice, Laodicea, etc. (but probably not Chalcedon, 451). They are therefore evidently of gradual growth, and were collected either after the middle of the fourth century or not till the latter part of the fifth, by some unknown hand, probably also in Syria. They are designed to furnish a complete system of discipline for the clergy. Of the laity they say scarcely a word. The eighty-fifth and last canon settles the canon of the Scripture, but reckons among the New Testament books two epistles of Clement and the genuine books of the pseudo-Apostolic Constitutions. The Greek Church, at the Trullan C ouncil of 692, adopted the whole collection of eighty-five canons as authentic and binding, and John of Damascus even placed it on a parallel with the epistles of the apostle Paul, thus showing that he had no sense of the infinite superiority of the inspired writings. The Latin Church rejected it at first, but subsequently decided for the smaller collection of fifty canons, which Dionysius Exiguus, about the year 500, translated from a Greek manuscript." — Schaff, *Church History,* vol. 1, § 114.

Although these canons have special reference to discipline, they are not entirely silent on the subject of dogmas, morals, and the ceremonial of worship. They clearly distinguish between the orders of bishop and priest,

affirm the superiority of the former, speak of an altar and a sacrifice in the Church of Christ, and prescribe matters to be observed in the administration of baptism, the eucharist, penance, ordination, with many other things evincing a late date. They may be found in Labbei *Concilia,* vol. i, and in Cotelerii *Patr. Opera,* 1:199; also in Ultzen, *Constitutiones Apostolicce* (Rostock, 1853, 8vo); in English, in Chase, *Constitutions and Canons of the Apostles* (New York, 1848, 8vo), and in Hammond, *Canons of the Church* (N. Y. 1844, p. 188 sq.). See Krabbe, *De Codice Canonum,* etc., translated by Chase, in *Bibliotheca Sacra,* 4:1; Mosheim, *Commentaries,* cent. 1, § 51; Bunsen, *Hippolytus* (Engl. transl. vols. 5-7); and the article CLEMENTINES *SEE CLEMENTINES* .

(II.) *Greek Collections:* CODEX CANONUM.

1. The first mention of a *Codex Canonum* is found in the Acts of the Council of Chalcedon (A.D. 451), where a number of canons of previous councils (Nice, Ancyra, Antioch, Laodicea, and Constantinople) were approved. Other collections existed at the time, and others, again, followed, but none were considered as law for the whole Church. The so-called *Codex Canonum Ecclesic Universce* (Book of the Canons) was first published by Justellus (Paris, 1610, 8So), reproduced in the *Bibli. otheca Juris Canon. Vet.,* op. *Voelli et Justelli* (Paris, 1661, vol. 1), and also in Migne, *Patrol. Curs. Conplet.* (Paris, 1848, vol. 67). It is not authentic; the title and arrangement are Justeau's, and the work is only an unsuccessful attempt of his to make an authentic Greek Codex from the old collections and MSS.

2. In the fifth century we find the *Western Church* recognizing the authority of the Greek canons, and there are *three* principal collections of them, viz.:

(1) The *Spanish* or *Isidorian* (erroneously so called because found in Isidor of Seville's later collection). It contained the canons of Nice, Ancyra, Neo-Cmesarea, and Gangra. As to its date, we know for certain only this much, that this translation of the Nicene canons was known in Gaul A.D. 439 *(Concil. Regense,* c. 3), and that of the Ancyran canons was quoted in the *Concil. Epaonens,* A.D. 517. A later translation, adding the canons of Antioch, Constantinople, and Chalcedon to those above named, was compiled toward the end of the fifth century. It was first published from an Oxford MS. under the title *Codex Eccleszce Romance* (ad. Paschas. Quesnell, in *Opp. Leonis,* Par. 1675, t. 2.)

(2) The so-called *Versio* or *translutio prisca,* first published by Justellus in the *Bibliothecajur. Canon, 1:*275, from an incomplete MS., and afterward, in more complete form, by Ballerini *(Opp. Leonws,* 3:473).

(3) The translation and collection made by Dionysius Exiguus (q.v.), made probably at Rome toward the end of the fifth century. He afterward (about A.D. 510?) made a second collection, adding a number of papal decretals. These were merged into one, and the *codex* thus formed was generally accepted throughout the Church. Pope Adrian (A.D. 774) presented an enlarged copy of it to Charlemagne, and it became the basis of the French canon law. In this enlarged form it is designated as the *Adriano-Donysian* Codex. It may be found in the *Biblioth. Jur. Can.* 1:101, and in Migne's *Patrol. Lat.* (Par. 1848, vol. 67).

II. *Middle Age. —*

1. In *Africa* the Nicene canons were supplemented by those of native councils, especially of Carthage (q.v.). Fulgentius Ferrandus (q.v.), in 547, composed the *Breviatio Canonum,* adding African decisions up to 427: it was published by Pithou (Paris, 1588), and in Migne, *Patrolog.* (1848, vol. 67, p. 949). Cresconius, an African bishop, about 690 issued a *Concord-a Canonum (Bibl. Jur. Can.* 1, App. p. 33).

2. In *Spain* a Codex existed in the sixth century, which was afterward the basis of the pseudo-Isidorian Decretals. In the seventh century it assumed the form in which we know it *(Codex Canonum Eccl. Hisp.* (Madrid, 1808, fol.); and part 2:*Epistole decretales,* etc. *Romans Pontuiicum* (Madrid, 1821, fol.). It contains canons of the Greek, African, French, and Spanish councils and synods, with Papal decrees from Damasus to Gregory I. It does not appear that Isidor of Seville really had any share in preparing the collection which, after the discovery of the fraudulent decretals, *SEE PSEUDO-ISIDORIAN*, was known by his name. A new edition of the fraudulent decretals appeared in 1863, viz. *Decretales Pseudo-Isidoriance,* etc., ed. Paulus Hinschius (Leipsic, 2 vols. 8vo).

3. In the *British Islands* and in the *Anglo-Saxon* Church native canons prevailed, of which we have no early records. D'Achery has gathered the fragments of an *Irish* Codex of the eighth century in his *Spicilegium, 1:*491 sq., which contains Greek, African, Gallic, mind Spanish canons, as well as native ones. See also Spelman, *Concilia, decreta, etc. in re eccl. orbis Britannici* (Lond. 1639-64, 2 vols. fol.).

4. In *France* the Spanish collection came into use in the eighth century, along with the Adriano-Dionysian mentioned above. In the ninth century many of the forged decretals from the pseudo-Isidorian collection were mingled with the authentic canons. The confusion led to several new collections:

(1) *Canonum collectio,* in 381 titles, toward the end of the eighth century;

(2) *Collectio Acheriana* (perhaps of the beginning of the ninth century);

(3) the *Penitentialis* of bishop Halitsgar of Cambray, A.D. 925. Besides these there were numerous small collections, called *Capitula Episcoporum.*

The great increase of the worldly power of the clergy under the Carlovingian dynasty necessitated more copious and complete collections of the canons. Among the more important we name

(1) the *Collectio Anselmo dedicata* (883-897, 12 vols.), of Italian origin. It includes the pseudo-Isidorian decretals, and also the *Institutes of Justinian,* which for the first time now appear in the canon law collections.

(2) Regini's *Libri duo de causis Synodalibus et discip eccles.* was compiled about A.D. 906, and includes also some of the false decretals. It is important for its account of the acts of German councils.

(3) Burchard's *Liber decretorum collectarium* (1012-1023), in 20 books. To strengthen the authority of certain canons, Burchard ascribes them to too early dates, and his errors, followed by Gratian, have been incorporated into later Looks. The nineteenth book, treating of penitential discipline, one of whose titles is *Consuetudines svup(rstitiosce,* throws much light on the state of society in that age. Several editions exist: the latest is in Migne, *Patrolog.* vol. 140 (Paris, 1853).

(4) Important *manuscript* collections of the eleventh century are the *Collectio ducdecim partium* (after 1023); that of *Anselm of Lucca* (died 1086), in 13 books; two collections of *cardinal Deusdedit,* each

in 4 books (1086-1087), in which the valuable archives of the Lateran were employed.

(5) To *Ivo of Chartres* (died 1117) two collections are ascribed, viz.: the *Decretum,* in 17 books, and the *Pannormia,* in 8 books, of which the former seems to be a collection of materials for the latter. They are given by Migne, *Patrolog. Lat.* vol. 161. There are several other MS. collections of minor importance.

III. *From the Twelfth Century. —*

1. *Gratian's.* The want of a collection containing all canons and decretals of general interest, omitting merely local ones, and having a good arrangement, began to be universal about the twelfth century. GRATIAN, a monk of the convent of St. Felix, in Bologna, undertook to supply it. His work is now known as the *Decretum Gratiani.* It was compiled from all preceding books and many MSS. It is divided into three parts. The first part is subdivided into 101 *Distinctiones,* and each of these into canons. Of the *distinctiones,* 81 relate to the clergy, and this part of the book is called by Gratian himself *Tractatus ordinandorum.* Part 2 contains 16 *causce,* or points of law, subdivided into *questiones,* each of which is answered by *canones.* Part 3, *De consecratione,* contains the sacraments, in five *Distinetiones.* In this work Gratian not only made a collection of the different canons in a certain order, but presented all the canons treating upon one subject under that head. The *decretum,* with all its shortcomings — for it was not yet a complete work — soon superseded all other collections. But what mostly helped to, gain for this *decretum* its position is, that Gratian's comments and elucidations resulted in the formation of a new school of canonists and decretalists at Bologna. This made the *decretum* known to all the churches, and brought it into such high esteem that the popes themselves quoted it, though it was not received by them as an official codex.

2. *Other Collections before Gregory IX. —* The papal decretals after the twelfth century became so abundant on points of discipline that the collection of Gratian, however complete at first, soon ceased to be so, and new collections were made. We mention only the principal ones.

(1.) The *Breviarium extravagantiun* of Bernardus of Pavia (t bishop of Pavia 1213), compiled in 1190, and containing newer decretals not in Gratian's Decretum, and therefore called *extra decretum vagantes,* for

which he made use of several minor collections posterior to Gratian, e.g. the *Arpendix Concilii Lateranensis,* etc. His divisions under the titles *Index, Indicium, Clerus, Connubia* (Sponsalia), and *Crimen* were adopted in subsequent collections. The *Summa* of this work, written by Bernardus himself, was approved of by the Bologna school. As this was the first collection of *Extravagantes,* it is known as *Volumen primur,* or *Compilatio prima.*

(2.) The compilation of *Petrus Collivacinus,* made by order of Innocent III, containing the decretals of Innocent during the first eleven years of his reign (1198-1210). It was approved by the Bologna canonists, and known as *Compdlatio tertia.* The decretals of the popes, from Alexander III (1181) to Celestin III (1198), were compiled by Gilbertus and Alanus, two Englishmen, but were not received at Bologna until they were revised and completed by Johannes Gallensis, which was admitted and known as *Compilatio secunda.*

(3.) The *Compilatio quarta* was made after the fourth Lateran Council (1215), and contains the decretals of Innocent after 1210. These four compilations are given by Labbe, *Antiques collectiones decretalium cum Ant. August. et . Cujacii not. et emend.* (Paris, 1609-1621).

3. *Decretal of Gregory IX.* — In 1230 Gregory IX directed his chaplain, Raymond of Pennaforte, to make a new collection of decretals, suppressing many superfluous parts of the old collections, and arranging the whole systematically. This *Decretalium Gregorii IX compilatio* was in 1234 sent by the pope to the University of Bologna, with the bull *Volentes igitur,* superseding the older compilations, although two of them had been published by popes. The new collection was introduced into university instruction as well as general practical use. Appendices and supplements were added by Innocent IV (1245), Alexander IV, Urban IV, Clement IV, and Gregory X.

4. *Decretal of Boniface VIII.* — In 1298 a new collection, including the post-Gregorian decretals, was published by Pope Boniface VIII under the title *Liber sextus,* because it was a completion of the five books of Gregory. After the publication of the *Liber sextus* Boniface issued a series of decretals (among which we find the celebrated *Unam sanctam* against Philip of France in 1302), as did also his successor, Benedict XI. These were united under the style of *Constitutiones extravagantium libri sexti,* with comments by cardinal Johannes Monachus.

5. *The Clementines.* — In 1313 Pope Clement V published *Liber septimus,* which included constitutions of the General Synod of Vienna (1311) and his own decretals, in five books, and sent it to the University of Orleans. Here he seems to have stopped its circulation, intending to replace it by a new collection, which was completed under his successor, John XXII, who sent it to the Universities of Paris and Bologna. It became a full authority in the Church, under the name *Clementines* (Constitutiones Clementinae). With the Clementines the code of canon law, as such, may be said to have been completed, as "the power of the popes has not since been sufficient to give the force of law to their enactments throughout Christendom." Later laws have been added from papal decretals, decisions of Trent, etc., but they have never obtained *legal* authority.

6. *Corpus Juris Canonici.* — The *Decretum Gratiani,* Gregorian collection, *Liber sextus,* and *Constitutiones Clementince,* were afterward, however, collected under the joint appellation of CORPUS JURIS CANONICI. The Paris edition, edited by Chappuis (1499-1502), divides the *Extravagantes* into two parts; first, *Extravagantes Joannis P. XXII,* contains 20 decretals of John XXII, under 14 titles, arranged in the usual system; the second, or *Extravagantes communes,* embraces 74 decretals, from Urban IV (1261-1264) to Sixtus IV (1471-1484). There have been many editions of the *Corpus Juris Canonici;* among them may be named that of Lancelotti (Cologne, 1783, 2 vols. 4to); of Boehmer and Richter (Lips. 1839, 2 vols. 4to). The Paris edition of 1687 (2 vols. 4to) is much esteemed.

Petrus Matthews, of Lyon, compiled in 1590 a *Liber septimus decretalium,* in 5 vols., containing decretals from Sixtus IV to Sixtus V (1585-1590), and forming a sort of supplement to the *Extravagantes communes;* but the work was not sanctioned. Gregory XIII gave orders for the compilation of an authentic *Liber septimus,* which was completed under Clement VIII (1598). It contains the dogmatic decisions of the Synods of Florence and Trent, but was soon after withdrawn. No attempts have since been made to collect the decretals of the succeeding popes.

Prevalence of the Canon Law in Modern Times. — "The canon law, borrowing from the Roman civil law many of its principles and rules of proceeding, has at different times undergone careful revision and the most learned and scientific treatment at the hands of its professors, and was very generally received in those Christian states which acknowledge the

supremacy of the pope; and it still gives ecclesiastical law, more or less, to Roman Catholic Christendom, although its provisions have in many countries been considerably modified by the *Concordats* (q. v) which the popes now and then find it expedient to enter into with Roman Catholic sovereigns and governments, whose municipal system does not admit of the application of the canon law in its integrity. Indeed, the fact of its main object being to establish the supremacy of the ecclesiastical authority over the temporal power is sufficient to explain why, in modern times, it is found to conflict with the views of public law and government, even in the case of the most absolute and despotic governments."

In the Protestant Church of Germany the canon law is still the basis of the common Church law. Luther burned the *Corpus Juris* at Wittenberg (Dec. 20, 1520); but, nevertheless, the canon law was afterward taught in the universities, and its rules as to benefices, marriage, etc., became the basis of ecclesiastical law in the German Protestant Church (Herzog, *Real-Encyklopaidie*, s.v.). Calvin calls the legislation of the Roman Church "an overgrown and barbarous empire;" and maintains that Church laws bind the conscience only as they are Christ's laws *(Institutes*, bk. 4, ch. 10).

In England, the canon law, even in Roman Catholic times, never obtained so firm a footing as. on the Continent. Hook *(Church Dictionary*, s.v. Canon) says that "as to the Church of England, even at that time, when the papal authority was at the highest,: none of these foreign canons, or any new canons, made at any national or provincial synod here, had any man. ner of force if they were against the prerogative of the king or the laws of the land. It is true that every Christian nation in communion with the pope sent some bishops, abbots, or priors to those foreign councils, and generally four were sent out of England; and it was by those means, together with the allowance of the civil power, that some canons made there were received here, but such as were against the laws were totally rejected. Nevertheless, some of these foreign canons were received in England, and obtained the force of laws by the general approbation of the king and people (though it may be difficult to know what these canons are); and it was upon this pretense that the pope claimed an ecclesiastical jurisdiction, independent of the king, and sent his legates to England: with commissions to determine causes according to those canons, which were now compiled into several volumes, and called *jus canonicum:* these were not only enjoined to be obeyed as laws, but publicly to be read and expounded in all schools and universities as the civil law was read and

expounded there, under pain of excommunication to those who neglected. Hence arose quarrels between kings and several archbishops and other prelates who adhered to those papal usurpations. There was, however, a kind of national canon law in England, composed of *legative and provincial* constitutions, adapted to the particular necessities of the English Church. The legative constitutions were ecclesiastical laws enacted in national synods, held under the cardinals Otho and Othobon, legates from Pope Gregory IX and Pope Clement IV, in the reign of king Henry III, about the years 1220 and 1268. The *provincial* constitutions are principally the decrees of provincial synods, held under divers archbishops of Canterbury, from Stephen Langton, in the reign of Henry III, to Henry Chicheley, in the reign of Henry V, and adopted also by the province of York in the reign of Henry VI. At the dawn of the Reformation, in the reign of Henry VIII, it was enacted in Parliament that a review should be had of the canon law; and till such review should be made, all canons, constitutions, ordinances, and synodals provincial being then already made, and not repugnant to the law of the land or the Kling's prerogative, should still be used and executed. And as no such review has yet been perfected, upon this enactment now depends the authority of the canon law in England, the limitations of which appear, upon the whole, to be as follows: that no canon contrary to the common or statute law, or the prerogative royal, is of any validity; that, subject to this condition, the canons made anterior to the parliamentary provision above mentioned, and adopted in our system (for there are some which have had no reception among us), are binding both on clergy and laity; but that canons made since that period, and having no sanction from the Parliament, are, as regards the laity at least, of no force." *SEE CANONS OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.*

Before the Reformation, degrees were as frequent in the canon law as in the civil law. Many persons became graduates in both, or juris utriusque doctores; and this degree is still common in foreign universities. But Henry VIII, in the twenty-seventh year of his reign, issued a mandate to the University of Cambridge to the effect that no lectures on canon law should be read, and no degree whatever in that faculty conferred in the university for the future. It is probable that Oxford received a similar prohibition about the same time, as degrees in canon law have ever since been discontinued in England *(Penny Cyclopcedia,* 6:244).

In Scotland, Presbyterian though the ecclesiastical system of that country be, the old Roman canon law still prevails to a certain extent. "So deep

hath this canon law been rooted," observes Lord Stair, in his *Institutes of the Scotch Law*, "that even where the pope's authority is rejected, yet consideration must be had to these laws, not only as those by which Church benefices have been erected and ordered, but as likewise containing many equitable and profitable laws, which, because of their weighty matter, and their being once received, may more fitly be retained than rejected." In two old Scotch acts of Parliament, made in 1540 and 1551, the canon law is used in conjunction with the Roman law to denote the common law of the country, the expression used being "the common law, baith canon, civil, and statutes of the realme" (Chambers's *Encyclopedia*, s.v.).

In the United States the Roman Catholic Church is ruled by the Roman canon law, and also by the decrees of national and provincial councils, and by the regulations set forth by the bishops, subject to the revision of Rome.

See, on the subject of this article generally, the following authorities; Herzog, *Real-Encyklopddie, 7:*303 sq.; Blackstone, *Commentaries, 1:*83; Knight, Politic*al Dictionary, s.v.;* Denoux, Theol. Scolas*tique, 2:204 sq.*; Cunningham, *Historical Theology*, vol. ii, ch. *xv; Hagenbach, Theol.* Encykloladdie, § 112; *Walter, Fontes juris* Ecclesiastici (Bonn, 1162); *Boehmer, Institutt. Jur*is Canonici (*Hal. 1770, Fith ed.).*

Canon Of The Church Of England.

The authority of the English canons rests upon "the statute 25 Heniy VIII, commonly called the act of submission of the clergy, by which they acknowledged that the convocation had been always assembled by the king's writ; and they promised, *in verbo sacerdotis* not to attempt, claim, or put in use, or enact, promulge, or execute any new canons in convocation without the king's assent or license. Then follows this enacting clause, viz.: That they shall not attempt, allege, or claim, or put in use any constitutions or canons without the king's assent." The first book of English canons was published in Latin in 1571, archbishop Parker and the bishops of Ely and Winchester being the principal agents in its construction, though "all the bishops in both provinces in synod, in their own persons or by proxy, signed it." These canons underwent various modifications, until, in 1604, bishop Bancroft collected a hundred and forty-one canons out of the articles, injunctions, and synodical acts passed and published in the reigns of Edward VI and Elizabeth, which were adopted by the Convocation of that year. These canons, which at first appeared in Latin, we have in English, under the title of "Constitutions and

Canons Ecclesiastical." The code of canons was amplified in 1606, and finally completed by the addition of seventeen more in 1640. They do not constitute the law of the land, because they were not made pursuant to the statute 25 Henry VIII, since they were made in a convocation, sitting by the king's writ to the archbishops, after the Parliament was dissolved. After the Restoration, when an act was passed to restore the bishops to their ordinary jurisdiction, a proviso was made that the act should not confirm the canons of 1640. This clause makes void the royal confirmation. Hence we may conclude that canons should be made in a convocation, the Parliament sitting; that, being so made, they are to be confirmed by the sovereign; and that without such confirmation they do not bind the laity, much less any order or rule made by a bishop alone, where there is neither custom nor canon for it. See Burn, *Ecclesiastical Law*, App. to vol. 4:The canons are also given by Hammond, *The Definitions of Faith and Canons of Discipline*, etc. (New York, 1844, 12mo). See Cardwell, *Synzodalia* (Oxford, 1842, 2 vols. 8vo); Hall, *Inquiry on the Canons and Articles* (London); Eden, *Church Dictionary*, *s.v.*; Hook, *Church Dictionary*, s.v. *SEE ENGLAND, CHURCH OF.*

Canon Of The Protestant Episcopal Church

(of America), the law or discipline of that Church. The canons are of two kinds:

(1.) "The constitution and canons of the General Convention, forming a code for the uniform government of every diocese and every church;"

(2.) "The constitutions and canons of the several dioceses, of force only within their several precincts, and generally subordinate to the power of the General Convention." The canons are liable to be repealed or altered by the successive Conventions. They are given by Hammond, *Definitions of Faith and Canons of Discipline* (N. York, 1844, p. 283 sq.). There is also a *Digest of the Canons* by Dr. Hawks and Judge Hoffman (N. Y. 1860); see also Hoffman, *Treatise on the Law of the Protestant Episcopal Church* (N. York, 1850); *Digest of the Canons for the Government of the Protestant Episcopal Church*, adopted in the General Conventions of 1859, 1862, and 1865 (Boston, 1866, 8vo). *SEE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH.*

Canon Regular,

Picture for Canon Regular

a class of monastic orders in the Roman Catholic Church. The class comprises those canons (q.v.) who not only live in common, and under the same rule, but also bind themselves by either simple or solemn vows, and who therefore really constitute what is called in the Roman Church a "religious" order, *SEE ORDER, RELIGIOUS*. The "canons" owe their origin to Chrodegang (q.v.), who established them on a monastic basis; but after the tenth century the common life began to cease among a large portion of them. In the eleventh and twelfth centuries many attempts were made to restore their monastic character, and a number of congregations were founded. The most important among them were the Premonstratenses (q.v.), the congregation of St. Genoveva (q.v.), St. Rufus (q.v.), and of St. Victor (q.v.) in France, the Gilbertine canons (q.v.) in England, and the canons of the Holy Cross, or sometimes also called canons of the Holy Sepulchre, at Jerusalem. ,All the congregations followed either the rule of St Augustine, or composed their rule out of those of Augustine and Benedict. They were very numerous in England, where they were introduced about 1105, and where they had, at the time of their dissolution, 175 houses (in. eluding those of the canonesses). Their habit was a long black cassock, with a white rochet over it, and over that a black cloak and hood. In 1519 cardinal Wolsey undertook the reformation of all the congregations of regular canons existing in England, in virtue of a bull of Leo X. He ordered them to hold general chapters every third year, and to restore a rigid discipline. A few years after they were suppressed, together with all other English monasteries. In Ireland the regular canons were so numerous that they counted as many houses as all other orders together. One of the most celebrated reformers of the order in France was bishop Ivo of Chartres (t 1115); yet he did not found an independent congregation. *The Congregation of St. Lawfrence,* near Oulx, in the Dauphine, which was founded in 1050 by Gerard Charbrerius, spread especially in Savoy and south-eastern France. At the end of the eighteenth century they had nearly disappeared. The superior of the monastery of St. Lawrence, which still existed, bore the title of provost, possessed episcopal jurisdiction in his provostry, and was only dependent on the pope. *The Congregation of Marbach,* in Alsace, was established about 1100 by Manegold de Lutembach, and is said by some writers to have had, at one I

time, about 300 monasteries. Very numerous was the *Congregation of Arouaise,* established about the same time by three hermits, one of whom was made a cardinal. It spread over England, Scotland, Flanders, and I Poland. A reformed congregation of the *Regular Canons of Lorraine* (called the "Congregation of our Saviour") was established by Pierre Fourier in 1624, but I many of the other congregations refused to recognize it. The most celebrated and numerous of the congregations in Italy, next to that of Lateran, *SEE LATERAN*, was the *Congregation of our Savior (of Bologna),* founded by Stephen Cioni in 1408, which possessed, in the eighteenth century, three monasteries in the city of Rome. Few orders of the Roman Church have been oftener and more generally pervaded by gross abuses and corruptions than the regular canons. The greater number of the French congregations were extinguished by the French Revolution. A new congregation of regular canons "of the Sacred Heart" (generally called, after the street in Paris in which they had their first house, the Congregation of *Picpus)* was founded in 1823 by abbe Coudrin (see PICPus, Congregation of). See Helyot, *Ordres Religieux,* 1:761 sq.; Fehr, *Geschichte der Monchsorden,* 1:55 sq.; 2:27 and 408.

Canonesses (Canonissae),

a class of female orders in the Roman Church, organized after the model of the regular canons (q.v.), observing the rule of St. Augustine, and living in common. They are first found in the seventh century. They took no solemn vows, but were to remain unmarried, were generally governed by an abbess, and were under the spiritual direction of the canons. These female societies, like the canons (q.v.), fell into irregularities; gave up the common life, and their property fell mostly into the hands of the nobility, who provided for some of their daughters by canonical livings. Reformed congregations were frequently instituted, sometimes following the reformed congregations of the canons, sometimes being independent of them. Reformatory movements were particularly extensive at the close of the twelfth century, when the Beghards (q.v.) and Beguines (q.v.) made their appearance in many towns of the Netherlands. Those who did not bind themselves by a monastic rule were called secular canonesses *(Canonicses seculares,* or also *Domicellce),* and they were almost exclusively found in the institutions of noble ladies. Many of them married and then resigned their benefices. The Reformation in Germany did not abolish the houses of the canonesses, but changed most of them into asylums for the unmarried daughters of the Protestant nobility. Celebrated

houses (“stifter”) of this class were at Gandersheim, Herford, Quedlinburg, Gernrode, etc., and after their model even new Protestant houses were founded at Halle, Altenburg, Frankfort, and in other places, especially in Mecklenburg and Westphalia. See Helyot, *Ordres Religieux* (Paris, 1847), 1:789.

Canonicae,

virgins who devoted themselves to the celibate before the monastic life was known, and therefore before there were monasteries to receive them; and called *canonicce* (canonical virgins), because their names were enrolled in the canon or *matricula* of the Church, that is, in the catalogue of ecclesiastics. They differed from the monastic virgins in this, that they lived privately in their fathers’ houses, and had their maintenance from them, or, in case of necessity, from the Church; but the others lived in communities, and upon their own labor; so that it is now out of dispute, says Bingham, that, as the ascetics for the first three hundred years were not monks, so neither were the sacred virgins of the Church nuns confined to a cloister, as in after ages. — Bingham, *Orig. Eccl.* bk. 7, ch. 4, § 1.

Canonical Hours,

certain stated hours of the day assigned to prayer and devotion. Such are Nocturns, Matins, Lauds, Nones, Vespers, and Complini. It is not known at what period these hours were settled in the early Church. The Apostolical Constitutions direct prayers to be said at dawn, and at the third, sixth, and ninth hours, as well as at evening. In England the canonical hours are from eight to twelve in the forenoon, before or after which marriage cannot lawfully be performed in any church. — Bingham, *Orig. Ecclesiastes* bk. 13, ch. 9, § 8; Procter *On Common Prayer*, p. 10. *SEE BREVIARY.*

Canonical Obedience

is that submission which, by the ecclesiastical laws, inferior clergy are to pay to their bishops, and members of religious orders to their superiors.

Canonist,

a professor of, or a writer upon, the Canon Law (q.v.).

Canonization,

in the Roman and Greek churches, the act and ceremony of proclaiming a deceased person who has previously been *beatified, SEE BEATIFICATION*, a saint, and enrolling such a one in the catalogue of saints to be honored. In the *Roman* Church' this is done by the pope only, who, after examination, "declares the person in question to have led a perfect life, and that God hath worked miracles at his intercession, either during his life or after his death, and that, consequently, he is worthy to be honored as a saint, which implies permission to exhibit his relics, to invoke him, and to celebrate mass and an office in his honor." In the *Greek* Church the ceremony of canonization takes place only in the presence of the patriarch, who, having assembled his bishops for this purpose in synod, causes the testimonies of the witnesses in favor of the person to be canonized to be examined. A thousand witnesses are required. The trouble and expense incident to this process are so great that canonizations in the East are few.

Anciently the reverence due to "saints" was thought to be fulfilled by putting the name of the saint on the Sacred Diptychs, or *Album Sanctorum*, or erecting oratories or churches under the invocation of the saint. "Canonization in the Roman sense was not known before the tenth century, but some hold that the first canonization was celebrated by Leo III, A.D. 804; and, from the close correspondence of its ceremonies with those which were performed at the apotheosis or deification of the ancient Romans, it is with great probability supposed to derive its origin thence. In consequence of the multiplication of saints during the Dark Ages, the canonizing of any deceased Christians was prohibited by a solemn ordinance in the ninth century, unless it were done with the consent of the bishop. This edict occasioned a new accession of power to the Roman pontiff, as it ultimately vested in him the exclusive right of canonizing whomsoever he pleased. John XV was the first pope who exercised this assumed right, and who, in the year 995, with great formality, enrolled Udalric, bishop of Augsburg, among the number of the saints. Before a beatified person can be canonized four consistories are held. In the first the pope causes the petition of the parties requesting the canonization to be examined by three auditors of the rota, and directs the cardinals to revise all the necessary instruments; in the second the cardinals report the matter to the Roman pontiff; in the third, which is a public consistory, the cardinals pay their adoration to the pope. One person, called the devil's

advocate, says all he can against the person to be canonized, raises doubts on the genuineness of the miracles said to be wrought by him, and exposes any want of formality in the procedure. It is said that the ingenuity and eloquence of the devil's advocate nearly prevented the canonization of cardinal Borromeo in the seventeenth century. But another advocate makes a pompous oration in praise of the person who is to be created a saint, in which he largely expatiates on the miracles said to have been wrought by him, and even pretends to know from what motives he acted. In the fourth and last consistory, the pope, having convened all the cardinals, orders the report concerning the deceased to be read, and then proceeds to take their votes, whether he is to be canonized or not. Previously to pronouncing the sentence declaring the beatified party to be a saint, the pope makes a solemn protestation that, by this act of canonization, he does not intend to do anything contrary to faith, or to the Catholic [Romish] Church, or to the honor of God. On the day appointed for the ceremony the church of St. Peter at Rome is hung with tapestry, on which are emblazoned the arms of the pope, and of the sovereign or prince who desires the canonization, and is also brilliantly illuminated. Thousands of devout members of the Romish communion fill that capacious edifice, eager to profit by the intercessions of the new saint with the Almighty. During the ceremony of canonizing, the pope and cardinals are all dressed in white. The expenses, which are very considerable, are defrayed by the royal or princely personage at whose request the beatified person is enrolled among the saints. The cost of canonizing the saints Pedro de Alcantara and Maria Maddalena di Pazzi, under the pontificate of Clement IX, amounted to sixty-four thousand scudi" (or dollars) (Eadie, *Ecclesiastes Dict.* s.v.). No person can be canonized until at least fifty years after death, nor if he be believed to have passed into purgatory, nor if he be a baptized infant dead before reaching years of discretion, except in cases of martyrdom. The act of *beatification* precedes that of canonization. *SEE BEATIFICATION.*

The worship of "canonized saints" is enjoined by the Council of Trent (Sess. 25, *De invocatione,* etc.). Many Romanists have declared against this superstition; and the Protestant churches reject it as idolatrous. Canonization is a relic of Paganism. In the thirteenth century a Dualist came very near being canonized. In 1269 there died at Ferrara a wealthy citizen, Armanno Pungilovo, whose extraordinary charities endeared him to the poor, while his austere and exemplary life procured him a general reputation of sanctity. He was buried in the cathedral, in the presence of an

immense crowd, who lamented their benefactor; and such was the public veneration that miracles were soon wrought, or appeared to be, on the spot where he was buried. An altar was built over his remains, and statues were erected in his honor throughout the churches of the diocese. The bishop and chapter of Ferrara proceeded to an investigation of the miracles wrought at his tomb, as a preliminary step to applying for his canonization, and professed themselves satisfied of the veracity of persons who testified that they had themselves been cured — some of blindness, others of paralysis. What was the general consternation when the Dominican AldoLrandini, inquisitor general of Lombardy, brought forward irresistible evidence that the deceased was a member of the Catharists (q.v.); that his house had been for years the asylum of their teachers; and that he had both received and administered the *consolamentmn* (q.v.). The clergy of Ferrara were slowly and unwillingly convinced, the people not at all; but, after repeated investigations, and a delay of more than thirty years, those remains, which had well-nigh been proposed to the adoration of the faithful, were dug up with ignominy and burned to ashes. See Heilmann, *Ccnsecratio Santorum,* etc. (Hal. 1754, 4to); Elliott, *Delineation cf Romanisn,* bk. 4, ch. 4; Hurd, *Religious Rites and Ceremones,* 244; Ferraris, *Prornta Bibliotheca,* s.v. Veneratio Sanctorum, 9:119 sq.; Chemnitius, *Examen Concil. Trident.* pt. 2, loc. 6; pt. in, loc. 4; Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie, 7:*326; Eadie, *Eccl. Dictionary,* s.v.; Hook, *Ch. Dictionary,* s.v.

Canopy

(κωνῳπεῖον, from κώνωψ, a *Vnat;* Vulg. *conopeum):*

(1) In the O.T. the term employed for the hanging of the couch of Holofernes (Judith 10:21; 13:9; 16:19), where alone it occurs in the Bible, although, perhaps, from the “pillars” of the litter described in <220310>Song of Solomon 3:10, it may be argued that its equipage would include a canopy. It probably retained the mosquito nets or curtains in which the name originated, although its description (Judith 10:21) betrays luxury and display rather than such simple usefulness. Varro (*R. R.* 2:10, 8) uses the term *(quae in conopeis jacent)* of languid women very much as the book of Judith (ἀναπαυόμενος . . . ἐν τῷ κωνωπείῳ) describes the position of a luxurious general. (For farther classical illustration, see Smith, *Diet. of Ant.* s.v. Conopeum.) It might possibly be asked why Judith, whose business I was to escape without delay, should have taken the trouble to pull down

the canopy on the body of Holofernes? Probably it was an instance of the Hebrew notion that blood should be instantly covered (comp. 2 Samuel 20:12; Leviticus 17:13), *SEE BLOOD*, and for this purpose the light bedding of Syria was inadequate. *SEE BED.* Tent furniture also is naturally lighter, even when most luxurious, than that of a palace, and thus a woman's hand might unfix it from the pillars without much difficulty.

(2) In ecclesiastical use, *SEE BALDACHIN.*

Canstein, Karl Hildebrand, Baron von,

was born Aug. 15, 1667, at Lindenburg, in Germany, studied law at Frankfort on the Oder. traveled nmach in Europe, and in 1688 was appointed page of the elector of Brandenburg. He afterward served as a volunteer in the Netherlands. A dangerous sickness obliged him to leave the military service, and led him to a religious life, in which he was greatly helped by Spener (q.v.). His wish to spread the Bible among the poor led him to form the idea of printing it with stereotype plates. Thus originated the famous institution, called in German *Die Cansteinsche Bibelanstalt.* He lived to see 100,000 Testaments and 40,000 Bibles sold from the establishment. It is still continued on a very large scale; the books are furnished at cost prices (about twenty-five cents for the Bible and eight for the Testament). Up to 1854, 4,612,000 Bibles and 2,630,000 Testaments had been sold. He edited a *'Harmonie der* 4 *Evangelisten* (2d ed. 1727, fol.), and also wrote *Lebensbeschreibung Speners* (Life of Spener), the edition of which by Lange, 1740, contains a biography of Canstein, who died at Halle, Aug. 19, 1719. See also Niemeyer, *Geschichte der Cansteinschen Bibelanstalt* (Halle, 1827, 8vo); Plath, *Leben von Canstein* (1861, 8vo); Bertram, *Geschichte der Cansteinschen Bibelanstalt* (1863, 8vo); *Jahrbiicherf. Deutsche Theologie,* 9:392. — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale,* 8:510; Herzog, *Real-Encyklopdie,* 2:552.

Canterbury (Cantuaria Dorobernum),

the capital of the county of Kent, a cathedral city and the seat of an archbishop, who is the metropolitan of all England. It is 56 miles from London, E.S.E., on the road to Dover. When Augustine became archbishop of this see, A.D. 597, king Ethelbert granted his palace here to the archbishop and his monks, who thereupon began to build a monastery, converting an ancient church in the neighborhood '(said to have been used by the Roman Christians) into his cathedral church. Cuthbert, the eleventh

archbishop, A.D. 740, added a church to the east of this. In the course of ages it received numerous additions, until it assumed its present magnificent form. Among those who helped to repair, enlarge, and rebuild it were archbishops Odo (A.D. 940), Lanfranc (1070), and Anselm (1093). In 1174 the choir was destroyed by fire, and in order to the rebuilding of it a number of French and English artificers were summoned. Among the former was a certain William of Sens, and to him, a man of real genius, the work was intrusted. The church was rich in relics: Plegemund had brought hither the body of the martyr Blasius from Rome; there were the relics of St. Wilfred, St. Dunstan, and St. Elpheae; the murder of Thomas Becket (q.v.) took place in the north transept, Dec. 29, 1170. The total exterior length of the cathedral is 545 feet, by 156 in breadth at the eastern transept. The crypt is of greater extent and loftier — owing to the choir being raised by numerous steps at the east end — than any other in England. The archbishop of Canterbury is primate of all England, metropolitan, and first peer of the realm. He ranks next to royalty, and crowns the sovereign. His ecclesiastical province includes all England, except the six northern counties. Among his privileges, he can confer degrees in divinity, law, and medicine. His seats are at Lambeth and Addington Park. He is patron of 149 livings. The present archbishop is Charles Thomas Longley, translated to the see in 1862. — Landon, *Eccl. Dictionary*, s.v.; Chambers, *Encyclopedia*, s.v.

Cantharus

(a *cup* or *pot).* In the atrium of ancient churches there was commonly a fountain or cistern, in which worshippers could wash their hands and faces before entering the church. Eusebius says that in the court over against the church were placed fountains (κρήναι) of water, as symbols of purification, for such to wash as entered into the church *(De Orat.* c. xi). Paulinus, bishop of Nola, calls this fountain *cantharus (Epist.* xii, *ad Sever.).* In some places, according to Dufresne, the fountain was surrounded with lions, from whose mouths water spouted; whence the place is also called by some ecclesiastical writers *leontarium.* It is also called *nymphceum,* κολυμβεῖον, both of which signify a fountain. Tertullian exposes the absurdity of men going to prayers: with washed hands while they retained a filthy spirit and polluted soul. Some of the Roman Catholic writers pretend to justify their use of holy water from the existence of this ancient custom. It is, however, more probable that it owes

its origin to the Grecian rite called περιῤῥαντήρια, or *lustral sprinklings.* — *Bingham, Orig. Ecclesiastes* bk. 8, ch. 3, § 6, 7.

Canthçras

(Κανθηράς), a person mentioned by Josephus *(Ant.* 20:1, 3) as having been deposed from the Jewish high-priesthood by Herod, king of Chalcis, to make room for Joseph, the son of Canu, A.D. 45; he is elsewhere *(Ant.* 19:6, 2) identified with the SIMON *SEE SIMON* (q.v.) who had before enjoyed that honor, as the son of (Simon, the son of) Bobthius, father-in-law of Herod the Great *(Ant.* 15:9, 3). *SEE HIGH-PRIEST.*