

THE AGES DIGITAL LIBRARY  
**REFERENCE**

CYCLOPEDIA of BIBLICAL,  
THEOLOGICAL and  
ECCLESIASTICAL  
LITERATURE

**Christopher, Pope - Cleobians**

*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**

## Christopher, Pope.

SEE CHRISTOPHORUS.

## Christophorus

(Χριστοφορος, *Christ-bearer*), an epithet applied originally to Christians, especially to martyrs, as "bearing all for Christ," and therefore "bearing Christ." It afterwards became a proper name (Christopher). See Eusebius, *Ch. Hist.* 3:10; Bingham, *Orig. Ecclesiastes* bk. 1, ch. 1, § 4.

## Christophorus, Pope

(Nov., 903, to June, 904), deposed his predecessor Leo V, and imprisoned him; but was, in his turn, soon driven from power by a revolt of the Romans, led by the monster Sergius (q.v.), and forced to retire into a convent, where, in June, 904, he met with a wretched death. Some Roman Catholic writers count him not among the regular popes, but among the anti-popes.

## Christo-Sacrum,

a society founded at Delft, Holland (1797-1801), for the purpose "of promoting the union of all Christian denominations which admit the divinity of Jesus Christ and redemption by the merits of his passion." It was established by two members of the Reformed Church, one of whom (*Onder van Vyngaard-Ceanzius*) was burgomaster of Delft. It separated "worship" from "teaching," and used a liturgy framed after that of the Church of England. It numbered at one time some 3000 members, mostly Mennonites, but has now nearly, if not quite died out. See an apology and sketch of the society in the work *Hei genootschap Christo Sacrum vinnen Delft* (Leyden, 1801). — Hase, *Ch. History*, § 486; Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchenlexikon*, 2:514; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 2:688.

## Christs, False

(ψευδόχριστοι, <sup><41132></sup>Mark 13:22). No fewer than twenty-four different persons have appearance making pretensions to be the Christ. In the maintenance of their claims to the Messiahship there has been a great expenditure of blood and treasure. They have appeared at different times, from an early date in the second century till 1682. The first was called Caziba, or Barcocheba (q.v.); and the Jews admit that, in the defense of

this false Messiah, they lost between five and six hundred thousand souls. The last that gained any considerable number of converts was Mordecai, a Jew, of Germany, who lived in 1682. Our Lord warned his followers that such else Christs should make their appearance (~~41124~~ Matthew 20:24). **SEE ANTICHRIST.**

### Chrodegang,

bishop of Metz in the eighth century, was born of noble Frankish parents, brought up at the court of Charles Martel, and made his recorder (*referendarius*). In 742 he was raised by Pepin to the bishopric of Metz, and was very active in building churches, and in increasing the influence of Rome during the rest of his life. He is chiefly known as the founder of the Order of Cathedral and Collegiate Canons, and as the author of a Rule of Monastic Life (*Regula Sincera*) for the regulation of the monks of the monastery that he founded, whither he transported the reliques of Gorgonus, Nabor, and Nazarius, given him by Paul I. **SEE CANONS.** He died A.D. 766. His Rule (that of Benedict of Nursia modified) consists of thirty-four canons and a preface, in which he says that "the necessity of his new rule arises from the clergy neglecting the rules already in existence, and therefore he comes forward to remind them how they should live." — D'Achery, *Spicileg.* 1:565; Pertz, *Monum. Germ.* 2:267; Mansi, *Concil.* 14:313; Mosheim, *Ch. Hist.* 100. 8, pt. 2, ch. 2, n. 23; Neander, *Ch. History* (Torrey's), vol. 3, 106 sq.

### Chromatius,

bishop of Aquileia (after 388), a distinguished theological writer of the Latin Church, The place and date of his birth are not known. He was a friend of Jerome, Ambrose, Rufinus, and other distinguished men of that period. It was Chromatius who induced Jerome to translate the Old Testament into Latin, and Jerome dedicated to him the commentary on Habakkuk. When the controversy on the writings of Origen broke out between Jerome and Rufinus, Chromatius in vain endeavored to reconcile the former friends. He disapproved of the writings of Origen, but opposed the exclusion from the church of Rufinus, whom he had baptized, and who had dedicated to him several works. When bishop Anastasius of Rome condemned Rufinus, and communicated the sentence to Chromatius, the latter deemed it his right to dissent from the Roman bishop, and received Rufinus into the communion of his church. Chromatius was a warm

defender of Chrysostom, and the latter wrote him a letter of thanks. Most of the works of Chromatius are lost, among others his *Letter to Jerome* (on Rufinus), and his *Letter to the Emperor Honorius* (in defense of Chrysostom); but there are still extant *Discourses on the Eight Beatitudes*, treatises *On the Fifth and Sixth Chapters of St. Matthew* and *On Baptism*, and a small number of Letters. These works have been edited at Basle (1528 and 1551), Louvain (1646), in Galland's *Bibliotheca Patrum*, vol. vii, and by Pietro Braidà, at Udine (*Sancti Chromatii episcopi Aquilejensis Scripta, sive Opuscula, etc., Utini*. 1816, 4to). Wetzer und Welte, *Kirchen-Lexikon*, 2:526; Cave, *Script. Ecclesiastes Hist. Liter.* 1:378 sq.

## Chronicles

(μὴμῳἡιδῆδι *dibrey' hay-yamim'*, words [or acts] of the days, <sup><1146></sup>1 Kings 14:19, Sept. ῥήματα τῶν ἡμερῶν, Vulg. *verba dierum*; <sup><1374></sup>1 Chronicles 27:24, βιβλίον λόγων, *fasti*; <sup><1701></sup>Esther 6:1, μνημόσυνα, *annales*; 1 Esdr. 2:12, ὑπομνηματισμοί; 1 Macc. 16:24, βιβλίον ἡμερῶν), journals or diaries, i.e. the record of the daily occurrences; the name originally given to the record made by the appointed historiographers in the kingdoms of Judah and Israel, usually called more simply "book of the kings of Israel and Judah" (<sup><1300></sup>1 Chronicles 9:1); so also of separate sovereigns, e.g. Solomon (<sup><1114></sup>1 Kings 11:41), Jehu (<sup><1434></sup>2 Chronicles 20:34), etc. *SEE HISTORY.*

## Chronicles,

(FIRST and SECOND) BOOKS OF, the designation in the English Bible of the last of the historical books of the Old Test. preceding Ezra; but in the Hebrews Scriptures they conclude the entire volume. *SEE BIBLE.*

**I. Name.** — The Hebrews call them μὴμῳἡιδῆδι (see above), *registers of days*, and reckon them but one book. The Sept. transitors, who regarded them as two books, used the appellation Παραλειπόμενα, *things omitted*, as if they were *supplementary* to the other historical records belonging to the Old-Test. canon. The Vulg. retains both the Hebrews and Greek name in Latin characters, *Dabre jammim*, or *hajamim*, and *Paralipomenon*. Jerome tells us (*ad Domnion. et Rogatian.*) that in his time they formed only one book in the Hebrews MSS., but had been divided by the Christian churches using the Sept. for convenience, on account of their length. In his *Ep. to Paulinus* he further explains the name *Paralipomenon*, and

eulogizes the book. The name *Chronica*, or *Chronicorum liber*, which is given in some copies of the Vulg., and from which we derive our English name of "Chronicles," seems to be taken from Jerome's saying in his *prologus Galeatus*, "*Dibre hajamim*, i.e. *words of days*, which we may more significantly call the *Chronicon* of the whole divine history." It was possibly suggested to him by his having translated the *Chronica* of Eusebius into Latin. Later Latin writers have given them the name of *Ephemerides*. The division into two books, after the example of the Sept. and later versions, was adopted by Bomberg in his Hebrews Bible, since which time it has been universal.

## II. Contents. —

(a.) In <sup><1300></sup>1 Chronicles 1-9 is given a series of genealogical tables, interspersed with historical, geographical, and other notices. These genealogies are not complete: the generations of Adam to Abraham (<sup><1300></sup>1 Chronicles 1:1-28); of Abraham and Esau (<sup><1302></sup>1 Chronicles 1:28-54); of Jacob and his son Judah (2); of king David (3); of Judah in another line (<sup><1300></sup>1 Chronicles 4:1-23); of Simeon (4:24-43); of Reuben, Gad, and Manasseh, with historical and topographical notices (5); two lists of the sons of Levi (<sup><1300></sup>1 Chronicles 6:1-30); genealogical registers of Heman and Asaph (<sup><1306></sup>1 Chronicles 6:31-43); of Merari (<sup><1304></sup>1 Chronicles 6:44-50); of Aaron, with a list of the residences of the Levitical families (<sup><1306></sup>1 Chronicles 6:50-81); list of the sons of Issachar (<sup><1300></sup>1 Chronicles 7:1-5); of Benjamin and Naphtali (<sup><1306></sup>1 Chronicles 7:6-13); of Manasseh (<sup><1304></sup>1 Chronicles 7:14-19); of Ephraim, with notices of their possessions (1 Chronicles 7:20-29); of Asher (<sup><1303></sup>1 Chronicles 7:30-40); a second list of the descendants of Benjamin, with the genealogy of Saul (8); list of families dwelling at Jerusalem, with intimations of the tribes to which they belonged (9).

(b.) 1 Chronicles 10-29 contains the history of David's reign from the death of Saul, partly agreeing with the account given of him in the books of Samuel, though with several important additions relating to the Levites.

2 Chronicles 1-9 contains the history of Solomon. 2 Chronicles 10-28 furnishes a succinct, account of the kingdom of *Judah* while *Israel* still remained, but separate from the history of the latter.

2 Chronicles 29-36 describes the kingdom of *Judah* after the downfall of *Israel*, especially with reference to the worship of God.

From this analysis it appears that the Chronicles contain an epitome of sacred history, particularly from the origin of the Jewish nation to the end of the first captivity. Besides important notices of a historical character not found in the other books, there are others of a doctrinal and devotional nature. There is one psalm (~~1347~~ 1 Chronicles 16:7-36), the first which David assigned for public worship (~~1347~~ 1 Chronicles 16:7).

**III. Diction.** — This is such as suits the time *immediately* subsequent to the Captivity. It is substantially the same with that of Ezra, Nehemiah, and Esther, which were all written shortly after the Babylonish exile. It is mixed with *Aramaisms*, marking at once the decline of the Jews in power and the corruption of their native tongue. The pure Hebrew had then been laid aside. It was lost during their sojourn in Babylon. The *orthography* is characterized by an adoption of the *matres lectionis* and frequent interchanges of the weak letters, with other peculiarities (see below, § 4).

**IV. Age and Author.** — Internal evidence sufficiently demonstrates that the Chronicles were written after the Captivity. Thus the history is brought down to the end of the exile, and mention is made of the restoration by Cyrus (~~482~~ 2 Chronicles 36:21, 22). It is certain that they were compiled after the time of Jeremiah (~~485~~ 2 Chronicles 35:25), who lived to see the destruction of Jerusalem by the Chaldaeans. The same opinion is supported by the character of the *orthography* and the nature of the *language* employed, as we have already seen, both which are Aramaean in complexion, and harmonize with the books confessedly written after the exile. The Jews generally (unanimously, according to Huet, *Demonst. Evangelica*, 4:14) ascribe the Chronicles to Ezra (*Baba Bathra*, f. 15, 100:1). In fact, the internal evidence as to the time when the books of Chronicles were compiled seems to tally remarkably with the tradition concerning their authorship. Notwithstanding this agreement, however, the authenticity of *Chronicles* has been vehemently impugned by De Wette and other German critics, whose arguments have been successfully refuted by Dahler, Keil, Movers, and others. It has been clearly shown that the attack was grounded not upon any real marks of spuriousness in the books themselves, but solely upon the desire of the critics in question to remove a witness whose evidence was fatal to their favorite theory as to the post-Babylonian origin of the books of Moses. If the accounts in the books of Chronicles of the courses of priests and Levites, and the ordinances of divine service as arranged by David, and restored by Hezekiah and Josiah,

are genuine, it necessarily follows that the Levitical law as set forth in the Pentateuch was not invented after the return from the Captivity. Hence the successful vindication of the authenticity of Chronicles has a very important bearing upon many of the very gravest theological questions.

There is particularly the circumstance that these books bring down the genealogy of David (<sup><1389></sup>1 Chronicles 3:19, etc.) to a period admitted on all hands to be subsequent to the restoration. Indeed, from the resemblance of several of the names given in that list with some of those in the ancestry of Christ (<sup><1385></sup>Luke 3:25, 26), the genealogy of David is there brought down to the ninth generation after Zerubbabel (Strong's *Harmony and Exposition of the Gospels*, p. 17, note *m*). This passage, however, may have been added by final editors of the sacred canon, traditionally reputed to have been the members of the Great Synagogue (q.v.). That the author was at least a contemporary of Zerubbabel is clear; and to show still more the writer's intimate acquaintance with and interest in him, Shelomith, a daughter of Zerubbabel, is inserted, and numerous details given about the family. The name Hattush (<sup><1382></sup>1 Chronicles 3:22) occurs also in <sup><1382></sup>Ezra 8:2, as that of a descendant of David who returned with Ezra from Babylon: this would favor the view advanced if the identity could be established; but for this there is no evidence. But a more important note of time is the notice in <sup><1397></sup>1 Chronicles 9:17, 18, regarding the Levitical porters, "who hitherto (**hNhAd** [i until now, to the time of the writer) waited in the king's gate;" and of two of which, Akkub and Talmon, mention is made in <sup><1625></sup>Nehemiah 12:25, 26, as "keeping the ward at the thresholds of the gates ... in the days of Nehemiah, and of Ezra the priest the scribe."

These conclusions of date from historical notices are confirmed by various peculiarities of expression and by the whole literary character of the composition. Of the peculiarities marking the late age of the writer is the term **hryBi** (*birah*, "palace"), applied to the Temple, instead of the old and usual **l kyh** (*heykal*). This was an imitation of the great Persian cities, in correspondence with which Jerusalem is conceived of as having its palace, afterwards called **Βάσις**. *SEE BARIS*. Another term with which the Hebrews became acquainted in Babylon was **/WB** (*buts*), *byssus*, which occurs in none of the older books, notwithstanding the frequent mention of **vv** (*shesh*), or "fine linen," and is found only in <sup><1381></sup>1 Chronicles 4:21; 15:27; <sup><1424></sup>2 Chronicles 2:14; 3:14; 5:12; <sup><1706></sup>Esther 1:6; 8:15; and in a book

written in Chaldaea, <sup><32716></sup>Ezekiel 27:16 (Eichhorn, *Einleitung*, § 493). So also the mention of <sup><32716></sup>Κοῦδα (*adarkon*, "dram," but more correctly *daric*, 1 (Chronicles 29:7; also <sup><13109></sup>Ezra 2:69; 8:27; <sup><13171></sup>Nehemiah 7:70), a Persian coin, the current money of the time. Jahn (*Einleitung*, § 50) refers to a remark in <sup><14083></sup>2 Chronicles 3:3, that the cubit was after the "first (or old) measure," intimating that a new standard was in use in the time of the writer. The literary character of the work, in general, entirely betokens a period when the language was greatly deteriorated through foreign influences, particularly during the exile, manifesting many peculiarities of style and orthography. Many examples of the latter, as the interchange of *aleph* with *he* quiescent, may be seen on comparing the two lists of David's heroes in <sup><13101></sup>1 Chronicles 9 and 2 Samuel 13. With respect, again, to the later books, more particularly that of Ezra, there are many important resemblances, a list of which may be found in Havernick, p. 270.

This determination of the age of the composition narrows the ground of inquiry as to its authorship. The Jewish opinion that Ezra was the author of the Chronicles was universally received down to the middle of the seventeenth century, when it was called in question by the English deistical writer Hobbes, who assigned to it an earlier date. It was Spinoza who first referred it, on the contrary, to a later period than the time of Ezra, bringing it down to the time of the Maccabees, a view adopted in modern times by Gramberg, and partly by De Wette. Carpzov, Eichhorn, Havernick, Welte, and modern writers in general, consider Ezra to be the author. Ewald (*Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, 2d ed., 1:252) admits that the Chronicles and the book of Ezra are by the same author, and even contends that they originally formed one work, not the production of Ezra himself, but a much later writer. Jahn denies all appearance of similarity between the Chronicles and Ezra, and ascribes the former to some unknown writer at the close of the Captivity.

The identity of authorship of the books of Chronicles and 'Ezra can be established by numerous arguments, besides the marks of similarity in expression already adverted to. The internal relation of the Chronicles and the book of Ezra was early recognized. This is seen from the arrangement of the two adopted by the Sept. different from that of the Jewish canon. Further, the writer of the *third* (apocryphal) book of Ezra has wrought up the two writings into one. The conclusion of Chronicles and the beginning of the book of Ezra are almost identical in expression, from which it is but reasonable 'to infer that the one was. intended to be a continuation of the



other; the one history terminating with the decree for the restoration from captivity, the other narrating how that decree was obtained and how it was carried out. Without this connection the opening words of the book of Ezra must appear exceedingly abrupt, presenting a form of commencement which is in reality only a continuation. (See <sup><4500></sup>Ezra 1:1.) The connection thus indicated is further evinced by the style, the manner of narration, and of regarding events from a Levitical point of view, common to the two works; the whole spirit, in fact, and characteristics are identical. Thus the frequent citations of the law, and in similar terms, as **ƒPvMki**(*kam-mishpat*), meaning "according to the law of Moses" (<sup><4323></sup>1 Chronicles 23:31; <sup><4453></sup>2 Chronicles 35:13; Ezra, 3:4; yet also in <sup><4488></sup>Nehemiah 8:18). The descriptions of the sacrificial rites are in the two books very full, and in nearly the same terms (comp. <sup><4512></sup>Ezra 2:2-5, with passages like <sup><4364></sup>1 Chronicles 16:40; <sup><4488></sup>2 Chronicles 8:18; 13:11); so also the account of the celebration of the passover (<sup><4569></sup>Ezra 6:19, etc., and <sup><4418></sup>2 Chronicles 30:35), and the order of the Levites in charge of the Temple (<sup><4583></sup>Ezra 3:8, 9; 1 Chronicles 33:2, 3). What presents the greatest apparent contrast in the two books is the high priest's genealogy in <sup><4301></sup>1 Chronicles 6:1-15, in the descending line, terminating with the Captivity, and in Ezra. 7:1-5, in the ascending line, from that priest himself to Aaron; but a little consideration will reconcile the discrepancy. The two lists are partly parallel, and partly the one is a continuation of the other; as regards the latter point there can be no conflict, and as to the former it will be observed that the list in Ezra is considerably abridged, many links being omitted (Bertheau), and this could the more readily be done if the writer had elsewhere given a complete register. *SEE EZRA (BOOK OF).*

The only serious objection to their authorship by Ezra is the fact (above noticed) that certain genealogies (e.g. of Zerubbabel (<sup><4369></sup>1 Chronicles 3:19-24; comp. that of the high-priests, <sup><4621></sup>Nehemiah 12:11) are continued much later than his time; but these few verses may have been inserted by a later hand, without affecting his general authorship, just as the notice of the death of Moses (<sup><4540></sup>Deuteronomy 34) must have been added to the Pentateuch by another hand than his own. *SEE CANON (OF SCRIPTURE).*

**V. Scope and Method.** — The books of Chronicles, as compared with those of Kings, are more *didactic* than *historical*. The *historical* tendency is subordinated to the *didactic*. Indeed, the purely historic form appears to

be preserved only in so far as it presented an appropriate medium for those religious and moral observations which the author specially aimed to adduce. Samuel and Kings are more occupied with the relation of *political* occurrences, while the Chronicles furnish detailed accounts of *ecclesiastical* institutions. Thus <sup><371></sup>1 Chronicles 17:11-14, compared with <sup><102></sup>2 Samuel 8:12-16, manifests more distinctly the Messianic character of the promises made to David (see Pye, *Script. Testimony*, 1:171). So, too, in the genealogical table, while no place is given to some of the tribes, as Dan and Asher, that of Judah in the line of David is traced down to the writer's own time (<sup><100></sup>1 Chronicles 1:1-27; 2:1, 3-15; <sup><100></sup> 3), beyond any other historical notice of the O.T., and connecting with the genealogy of Christ (Matthew 1). *SEE GENEALOGY.*

The *plan* of these books, of which the book of Ezra is a continuation, forming one work, immediately becomes apparent if we consider it as the compilation of Ezra, or some one nearly contemporary with him. One of the greatest difficulties connected with the Captivity and the return must have been the maintenance of that genealogical distribution of the lands which yet was a vital point of the Jewish economy. Accordingly it appears to have been one to which both Ezra and Nehemiah gave their earnest attention, as David, Hezekiah, and other kings had done before them. Another difficulty intimately connected with this was the maintenance of the Temple services at Jerusalem. This could only be effected by the residence of the priests and Levites in Jerusalem in the order of their courses; and this residence was only practicable in case of the payment of the appointed tithes, first-fruits, and other offerings. As soon as these ceased the priests and Levites were obliged to disperse to their own villages to obtain a livelihood, and the Temple services were neglected. But then, again, the registers of the Levitical genealogies were necessary in order that it might be known who were entitled to such and such allowances, as porters, as singers, as priests, and so on, because all these offices went by families: and, again, the payment of the tithes, first-fruits, etc., was dependent upon the different families of Israel being established each in his inheritance. Obviously, therefore, one of the most pressing wants of the Jewish community after their return from Babylon would be trusty genealogical records, and if there were any such in existence, the arrangement and publication of them would be one of the greatest services a person in Ezra's situation could confer. But further, not only had Zerubbabel (Ezra 3, 5, 6), and after him Ezra and Nehemiah (Ezra 2, 8;

Nehemiah 7, 8), labored most earnestly in the teeth of immense difficulties to restore the Temple and the public worship of God there to the condition it had been in under the kings of Judah, but it appears clearly from their policy, and from the language of the contemporary prophets, Haggai and Zechariah, that they had it much at heart to reinfuse something of national life and spirit into the bosom of the people, and to make them feel that they were still the inheritors of God's covenanted mercies, and that the Captivity had only temporarily interrupted, not dried up, the stream of God's favor to their nation. Now nothing could more effectually aid these pious and patriotic designs than setting before the people a compendious history of the kingdom of David, which should embrace a full account of its prosperity, should trace the sins which led to its overthrow, but should carry the thread through the period of the Captivity, and continue it, as it were, unbroken on the other side; and those passages in their former history would be especially important which exhibited their greatest and best kings as engaged in building or restoring the Temple, in reforming all corruptions in religion, and zealously regulating the services of the house of God. As regards the kingdom of Israel or Samaria, seeing it had utterly and hopelessly passed away, and that the existing inhabitants were among the bitterest "adversaries of Judah and Benjamin," it would naturally engage very little of the compiler's attention. These considerations explain exactly the design of that historical work which consists of the two books of Chronicles and the book of Ezra. For, after having in the first eight chapters given the genealogical divisions and settlements of the various tribes, the compiler marks distinctly his own age and his own purpose by informing us, in <sup><390></sup>1 Chronicles 9:1, of the disturbance of those settlements by the Babylonish Captivity, and, in the following verses, of the partial restoration of them at the return from Babylon (<sup><390></sup>1 Chronicles 9:2-24); and that this list refers to the families who had returned from Babylon is clear, not only from the context, but from its reinsertion, <sup><610></sup>Nehemiah 11:3-22, with additional matter evidently extracted from the public archives, and relating to times subsequent to the return from Babylon, extending to <sup><627></sup>Nehemiah 12:27, where Nehemiah's narrative is again resumed in continuance with <sup><610></sup>Nehemiah 11:2. Having thus shown the re-establishment of the returned families, each in their own inheritance according to the houses of their fathers, the compiler proceeds to the other part of his plan, which is to give a continuous history of the kingdom of Judah from David to his own times, introduced by the closing scene of Saul's life (<sup><600></sup> Nehemiah 10), which introduction is itself prefaced by a

genealogy of the house of Saul (<sup><1085></sup>Nehemiah 9:35-44), extracted from the genealogical tables drawn up in the reign of king Hezekiah, as is at once manifest by counting the thirteen or fourteen generations, from Jonathan to the sons of Azel inclusive, exactly corresponding to the fourteen from David to Hezekiah inclusive. This part of the plan extends from <sup><1085></sup>1 Chronicles 9:35, to the end of the book of Ezra; 1 Chronicles 15-22, 22-29; 2 Chronicles 13-15, 24-26, 29-31, and 35 are among the passages wholly or in part peculiar to the books of Chronicles, which mark the purpose of the compiler, and are especially suited to the age and the work of Ezra (q.v.).

**VI. Sources.** — It is evident that the Chronicles were compiled not only from former inspired writers, but, for the most part, from public records, registers, and genealogies belonging to the Jews. That national annals existed there can be no doubt. They are expressly mentioned, as in <sup><13724></sup>1 Chronicles 27:24. They contained an account of the most important events in the history of the Hebrews, and were generally lodged in the tabernacle or Temple, where they could most conveniently be consulted.

The following are the explicit *references* by the compiler himself to older memoirs or historical works:

**(1)** The book (**μyrbDj** *words or acts*) of Samuel the seer, the book of Nathan the prophet, and the book of Gad the seer (<sup><13929></sup>1 Chronicles 29:29). This cannot mean the inspired books of Samuel, because they do not contain the entire history of David ("his acts first and last"). It refers to a history of his own times written by Samuel, and to a continuation of it, embracing succeeding times, written by Nathan and Gad, from which it is probable that part of the contents of the present books of Samuel was drawn. *SEE NATHAN; SEE GAD.*

**(2)** The book of Nathan the prophet, the prophecy of Ahijah the Shilonite, and the visions of Iddo the seer (<sup><1409></sup>2 Chronicles 9:29). *SEE AHIJAH; SEE IDDO.*

**(3)** The book of Shemaiah the prophet, and of Iddo the seer *concerning genealogies*; or, as De Wette translates it, *after the manner of family-registers* (<sup><14215></sup>2 Chronicles 12:15). *SEE SHEMAIAH.*

**(4)** The *story*, or, rather, the *interpretation* (**vrđm** *midrash*) of the prophet Iddo (<sup><14132></sup>2 Chronicles 13:22).

- (5) The book of Jehu the son of Hanani, inserted in the book of the Kings of Israel (<sup><408></sup>2 Chronicles 20:34). *SEE JEHU.*
- (6) The history of Uzziah, by Isaiah the son of Amoz (<sup><407></sup>2 Chronicles 26:22).
- (7) The vision of Isaiah the prophet, in the book of the Kings of Judah and Israel (<sup><432></sup>2 Chronicles 32:32). *SEE ISAIAH.* (See Gesenius's *Commentar über den Jesaia; Einleit.* § 4.)
- (8) The sayings of the seers (<sup><439></sup>2 Chronicles 33:19). *SEE HOZAT.*
- (9) The interpretation of the book of the Kings (<sup><407></sup>2 Chronicles 24:27).
- (10) The book of the Kings of Judah and Israel (<sup><461></sup>2 Chronicles 16:11; 25:26; 27:7; 28:26; 35:27; 36:8). This could not have been our present books of Kings, but *public annals*, because, in several instances where the reader is referred to them for farther information, our books of Kings contain less than what is stated in the Chronicles.
- (11) The book of the Kings of Israel (<sup><408></sup>2 Chronicles 20:34).
- (12) The words or histories of the Kings of Israel (<sup><438></sup>2 Chronicles 33:18). It is probable that Nos. 10, 11, and 12 refer to the same historical work. *SEE KINGS (BOOKS OF).*
- (13) The Chronicles of King David (<sup><374></sup>1 Chronicles 27:24).
- (14) The Lamentations (<sup><485></sup>2 Chronicles 35:25). This, however, has been thought by some not to mean the Lamentations of Jeremiah which we now have, but other Lamentations, composed by the prophet on *the death of Josiah*, and long since lost. *SEE LAMENTATIONS.*

In addition to the above avowed documents, the compiler must have had others. Thus the lists of David's heroes (<sup><3110></sup>1 Chronicles 11:10-47), of those who came to him at Ziklag (<sup><3120></sup>1 Chronicles 12:1-22), of the captains, princes of the tribes, and officers of David's household (27), the number and distribution of the Levites, and the minute information given respecting divine worship (1 Chronicles 23-26), must have been derived from written sources not included in the *book of the Kings of Israel and Judah*. Some documents are mentioned by the compiler which he did not use. Thus a writing of Elijah, addressed to Jehoram, is spoken of in <sup><4012></sup>2 Chronicles 21:12. *SEE ELIJAH.*

In <sup><1300></sup>1 Chronicles 1:9, we have only a few references to the origin of the genealogical lists. Throughout most of this portion the compiler relied on registers, which he carefully followed, but does not definitely cite (yet see <sup><1307></sup>1 Chronicles 5:7, 17; 7:7, 9; 9:1). Although the genealogies of 1 Chronicles 1-2:2, are substantially the same as in Genesis, greatly abridged, and with the omission of nearly all the historical notices, these matters being already so well known as to render repetition unnecessary — a strong, because indirect argument for the authority of the Mosaic writings — yet the greater portion of those which follow is found nowhere else. Even in this abridgment of the older genealogies there is manifested much independence. In proof of this it is only necessary to observe some of the appended notices, e.g.: <sup><1315></sup>1 Chronicles 1:51, "Hadad died also," an addition to <sup><1033></sup>Genesis 36:39, it being inferred by Hengstenberg (*Genuin. of the Pentateuch*, 2:245) and others, from the latter passage, that Hadad was still living in the time of Moses. *SEE HADAD*. After <sup><1302></sup>1 Chronicles 2:2, the genealogical lists are interspersed with fuller details, and the work attains to more completeness and independence.

It has been inquired whether our present books of Samuel and Kings were among the sources whence the Chronicle writer drew his materials? The question is answered in the affirmative by De Wette, Movers, and Bleek; by Hävernick and others in the negative. The first-named critic adduces three arguments in favor of the hypothesis that the parallel accounts were derived from the earlier books, only one of which appears to us valid, viz., the certainty of the Chronist's having known the earlier books. After denying the force of all these arguments, Keil proceeds to adduce some positive grounds against the hypothesis that the books of Kings and Samuel were used as sources. The considerations adduced by him, however, are singularly wanting in validity (*Einleitung*, p. 480-482, Frcf. 1853). If the compiler of Chronicles knew the canonical books, why should it be thought that he abstained from using them? They would have facilitated his work. The most convincing proof that he both knew and used them is furnished by some forty parallels, which are often verbal. Thus, in <sup><1404></sup>2 Chronicles 1:14-17, there is a paragraph almost verbally coinciding with <sup><1105></sup>1 Kings 10:26-29. Again, 1 Chronicles <sup><1370></sup> 17 and <sup><1380></sup> 18 are in many places verbally parallel with 2 Samuel <sup><1070></sup> 7 and <sup><1080></sup> 8. Compare also <sup><1390></sup>1 Chronicles 19:1-20:1, with 2 Samuel 10-11; <sup><1400></sup>2 Chronicles 10:1-11:4, with <sup><1120></sup>1 Kings 12:1-24; <sup><14156></sup>2 Chronicles 15:16-18, with <sup><1153></sup>1 Kings 15:13-15; <sup><1420></sup>2 Chronicles 25:1-4, 1728, with <sup><1240></sup>2 Kings

14:1-6, 8-20; <sup><481></sup>2 Chronicles 33:1-9, with <sup><1210></sup>2 Kings 21:1-9; <sup><482></sup>2 Chronicles 33:21-25, with <sup><1219></sup>2 Kings 21:19-26, etc. Nor can all these coincidences be explained by a common use of the older documents, for in many of the passages, evidently abridgments, the compression or selection is identical. *SEE SAMUEL (BOOKS OF)*.

On the other hand, many particulars, more especially in the lives of David and Solomon, recorded in these books, are entirely passed over in the Chronicles, and in their stead are given notices of the state of religion and of public worship.

(1.) *The principal omissions in the Chronicles* are: The family scene between Michal and David (<sup><1033></sup>2 Samuel 6:20-23); David's kindness to Mephibosheth (<sup><1090></sup>2 Samuel 9); his adultery with Bathsheba (<sup><1012></sup>2 Samuel 11:2-12:25); his son Amnon's defilement of Tamar, and the rebellion of Absalom (2 Samuel 14-19); the revolt of Sheba (2 Samuel 20); the delivering up of Saul's sons to the Gibeonites (<sup><1020></sup>2 Samuel 21:1-14); the war with the Philistines (<sup><1015></sup>2 Samuel 21:15-17); David's psalm of thanksgiving, and last words (2 Samuel 22-23:7); Adonijah's attempted usurpation, and the anointing of Solomon (1 Kings 1); David's last will (<sup><1100></sup>1 Kings 2:1-9); Solomon's throne established by the punishment of his opponents (<sup><1123></sup>1 Kings 2:13-46); his marriage with Pharaoh's daughter (<sup><1100></sup>1 Kings 3:1); his wise decision (<sup><1036></sup>1 Kings 3:16-28); his officers, glory, and wisdom (<sup><1100></sup>1 Kings 4); his strange wives, and idolatry (<sup><1110></sup>1 Kings 11:1-40). The entire omission of the history of the kingdom of Israel, except that it was carried away captive by the Assyrians, as a punishment for its sins (<sup><1165></sup>1 Chronicles 5:25, 26), is noteworthy (see above, § 5).

(2.) *Matter peculiar to the Chronicles*. — The list of the heroes who came to David at Ziklag, and of the hosts who came to Hebron to make him king (<sup><1320></sup>1 Chronicles 12); David's preparation for building the Temple (<sup><1320></sup>1 Chronicles 22); the enumeration and order of the Levites and priests (<sup><1320></sup>1 Chronicles 23-26); the order of the army and its captains (<sup><1320></sup>1 Chronicles 27); David's directions in public assembly shortly before his death (<sup><1330></sup> <sup><1330></sup>1 Chronicles 28, 29); Rehoboam's fortifications, his reception of the priests and Levites who fled from the kingdom of Israel, his wives and children (<sup><1415></sup>2 Chronicles 11:5-24); Abijah's war with Jeroboam (2 Chronicles 13:3-20); the notice of Abijah's wives and children (<sup><1420></sup>2 Chronicles 13:21); Asa's works in fortifying his kingdom and his



victory over Zerah the Cushite (2 Chronicles 14:3-14); a prophecy of Azariah, which induced Asa to put down idolatry (<sup><4451></sup>2 Chronicles 15:1-15); the address of the prophet Hanani (<sup><4467></sup>2 Chronicles 16:7-10); Jehoshaphat's endeavors to restore the worship of Jehovah, his power and riches (<sup><4472></sup>2 Chronicles 17:2- 18:1); his instructions and ordinances as to judgment (<sup><4491></sup>2 Chronicles 19); his victory over the Ammonites and Moabites (<sup><4401></sup>2 Chronicles 20:1-30); his provision for his sons, and their death by his son and successor, Jehoram (<sup><4421></sup>2 Chronicles 21:24); Jehoram's idolatry and punishment (<sup><44211></sup>2 Chronicles 21:11-19); the death of the high-priest Jehoiada, and the apostasy of Joash (<sup><4445></sup>2 Chronicles 24:15-22); Amaziah's warlike preparations (<sup><4455></sup>2 Chronicles 25:5-10); his idolatry (<sup><4454></sup>2 Chronicles 25:14-16); Uzziah's wars, victories, and forces (<sup><4436></sup>2 Chronicles 26:6-15); Jotham's war with the Ammonites (<sup><4474></sup>2 Chronicles 27:4-6); Hezekiah's reformation and passover (<sup><4427></sup>2 Chronicles 29:3-31:21); his riches (<sup><4427></sup>2 Chronicles 32:17-30); Manasseh's captivity, release, and reformation (<sup><44311></sup>2 Chronicles 33:11-17).

**(3.)** *Matter more fully related in Chronicles.* — The list of David's heroes (<sup><4321></sup>1 Chronicles 12:11-47), of which the names (1 Chronicles 42-47) are wanting in <sup><4238></sup>2 Samuel 23:8, etc.; the removal of the ark from Kirjath-jearim to Mount Zion (1 Chronicles 13; 15:2-24; 16:4-43; comp. with <sup><4061></sup>2 Samuel 6); the candlesticks, tables, and courts of the Temple (<sup><4446></sup>2 Chronicles 4:6-9; comp. with <sup><4078></sup>1 Kings 7:38, 39); the description of the brazen scaffold on which Solomon knelt (<sup><4462></sup>2 Chronicles 6:12, 13, with <sup><4082></sup>1 Kings 8:22); in Solomon's prayer, the passage <sup><4464></sup>2 Chronicles 6:41, 42, from <sup><4327></sup>Psalms 132:7-9; the mention of the fire from heaven consuming the burnt-offering (<sup><4470></sup>2 Chronicles 7:1, etc.); the enlargement of the divine promise (<sup><4472></sup>2 Chronicles 7:12, 16, with <sup><4093></sup>1 Kings 9:3); Shishak's invasion of Judaea; the address of the prophet Shemaiah (<sup><4422></sup>2 Chronicles 12:2-8, with <sup><4142></sup>1 Kings 14:23); Amaziah's victory over the Edomites (<sup><4451></sup>2 Chronicles 25:11-16, with <sup><4247></sup>2 Kings 14:7); Uzziah's leprosy; its cause (<sup><4436></sup>2 Chronicles 26:16-21, with <sup><4215></sup>2 Kings 15:5); the passover under Josiah (<sup><4432></sup>2 Chronicles 35:2-19, with <sup><4221></sup>2 Kings 22:21, etc.).

**(4.)** Other peculiarities distinguishing the book of Chronicles, and fitting it for the altered circumstances in the time of its composition, are the substitution of modern and more common expressions for such as had become unusual or obsolete (comp. in the original <sup><4302></sup>1 Chronicles 10:12, with <sup><40812></sup>1 Samuel 31:12; <sup><43159></sup>1 Chronicles 15:29, with <sup><4066></sup>2 Samuel 6:16, etc.), particularly the substitution for the old names of places, those which



were in use in the writer's own day; thus, Gezer (<sup><1304></sup>1 Chronicles 20:4), instead of Gob (<sup><1218></sup>2 Samuel 21:18); Abel Maim, Abel on the water [Merom] (<sup><1404></sup>2 Chronicles 16:4), 'instead of Abelbeth-Maachah (<sup><1150></sup>1 Kings 15:20). So also the omission of geographical names which had become unknown, or had ceased to be of interest, as Helam (<sup><1006></sup>2 Samuel 10:16, 17), omitted in <sup><1317></sup>1 Chronicles 19:17; so also Zair (<sup><1281></sup>2 Kings 8:21; comp. with <sup><1209></sup>2 Chronicles 21:9). See particularly <sup><1044></sup>2 Samuel 24:4-8, compared with <sup><1208></sup>1 Chronicles 21:4. There is also the endeavor to substitute more definite expressions for such as were indefinite, and so possibly ambiguous (as 2 Chronicles 38:3; comp. with <sup><1203></sup>2 Kings 16:3; <sup><1021></sup>2 Chronicles 24:24, with <sup><1226></sup>2 Kings 22:16).

Other lists occur in Chronicles, which are given with considerable extension or in a different connection in the earlier books, e.g. the ancestors of David, <sup><1320></sup>1 Chronicles 2:10-12; comp. <sup><1049></sup>Ruth 4:19-22. Still other lists are peculiar to the Chronicles, as <sup><1328></sup>1 Chronicles 2:18-53; 3:16-24; 4:2-23, 34-43; 5:1-26, 33-36; 6:1-34. These latter genealogies are obviously transcribed from some register, in which were preserved the genealogies of the tribes and families drawn up at different times. This appears from the very different ages at which different genealogies terminate, indicating of course the particular reign when each was drawn up. Thus, e.g. the line of the high-priests (<sup><1330></sup>1 Chronicles 6:1-15) must have been drawn up during the Captivity; that in <sup><1336></sup>1 Chronicles 6:50-53, in the time of David or Solomon; those of Heman and Asaph, in the same chapter, in the time of David; that of the sons of Zerubbabel (<sup><1338></sup>1 Chronicles 3:19-24) as late at least as the close of the canon, and so on.

The same wide divergence in the age of other materials embodied in the books of Chronicles is also apparent. Thus the information in <sup><1300></sup>1 Chronicles 1, concerning the kings of Edom before the reign of Saul, was obviously compiled from very ancient sources. The same may be said of the incident of the slaughter of the sons of Ephraim by the Gittites, <sup><1372></sup>1 Chronicles 7:21; 8:13; and of the account of the sons of Shela, and their dominion in Moab, <sup><1320></sup>1 Chronicles 4:21, 22. The military census, of the tribes of Issachar, Benjamin, and Asher, in <sup><1370></sup>1 Chronicles 7, evidently formed part of the returns made to David (<sup><1249></sup>2 Samuel 24:9). The curious details concerning the Reubenites and Gadites in <sup><1330></sup>1 Chronicles 5, must have been drawn from contemporary documents, embodied probably in the genealogical records of Jotham and Jeroboam, while other records used by the compiler are as late as after the return from Babylon, such as <sup><1332></sup>1

Chronicles 9:2 sq.; <sup><1451></sup>2 Chronicles 36:20 sq.; and others, as 150201> Ezra 2 and 4:6-23, are as late as the time of Artaxerxes and Nehemiah. Hence it is further manifest that the books of Chronicles and Ezra, though put into their present form by one hand, contain, in fact, extracts from the writings of many different writers, which *were extant at the time the compilation was made*. For the full account of the reign of David, he made copious extracts from the books of Samuel the seer, Nathan the prophet, and Gad the seer (<sup><1329></sup>1 Chronicles 29:29). For the reign of Solomon he copied from "the book of Nathan," from "the prophecy of Ahijah the Shilonite," and from "the visions of Iddo the seer" (<sup><1409></sup>2 Chronicles 9:29). Another work of Iddo supplied an account of the acts, and the ways, and sayings of king Abijah (<sup><1412></sup>2 Chronicles 13:22); while yet another book of Iddo concerning genealogies, with the book of the prophet Shemaiah, contained the acts of king Rehoboam (2 Chrpnicles12:15). For later times the "Book of the kings of Israel and Judah" is repeatedly cited (<sup><1423></sup>2 Chronicles 25:26; 27:7; 32:32; 33:18, etc.), and "the sayings of the seers," or perhaps of Hozai (33:19); and for the reigns of Uzziah and Hezekiah "the vision of the prophet Isaiah" (26:22; 32:32). In other cases, where no reference is made to any book as containing farther information, it is probable that the whole account of such reign is transcribed. Besides the above-named works, there was also the public national record, called "book of the Chronicles" ( $\mu\text{ym}\text{h}\text{i}\text{y}\text{r}\text{b}\text{D}\text{i}\text{r}\text{p}\text{s}\text{e}$ ), mentioned in <sup><1623></sup>Nehemiah 12:23, from which doubtless the present books took their name, and from which the genealogies and other matters in them were probably derived, and which are alluded to as having existed as early as the reign of David, <sup><1374></sup>1 Chronicles 27:24. These "Chronicles of David" ( $\text{r}\text{y}\text{w}\text{E}\text{E}\text{I}\text{M}\text{I}\mu\text{ym}\text{h}\text{i}\text{y}\text{r}\text{b}\text{D}\text{i}\text{r}\text{p}\text{s}\text{e}$ ) are probably the same as those (the  $\text{d}\text{y}\text{w}\text{i}\text{d}\text{y}\text{r}\text{b}\text{D}$ ) above referred to, as written by Samuel, Nathan, and Gad. From this time the affairs of each king's reign were regularly recorded in a book called at first "the book of the acts of Solomon" ( $\text{h}\text{m}\text{b}\text{v}\text{j}\text{y}\text{r}\text{b}\text{D}\text{i}\text{r}\text{p}\text{s}\text{e}$  <sup><1114></sup>1 Kings 11:41), by the name of the king, as before of David, but afterwards in both kingdoms by the general name of chronicles, as in the constantly-recurring formula, "Now the rest of the acts ( $\mu\text{y}\text{r}\text{b}\text{D}$ ) of Rehoboam, Abijam, etc.; Jeroboam, Nadab, etc., are they not written in the book of the Chronicles of the kings of Judah" *or* "of Israel" (<sup><1148></sup>1 Kings 14:28; 15:7, etc.)? This continues to the end of Jehoiakim's reign, as appears from <sup><1245></sup>2 Kings 24:5; <sup><1408></sup>2 Chronicles 36:8. It was doubtless from this common source that the passages in the books of Samuel and Kings identical with the books of

Chronicles were derived. All these several works have perished, but the most important matters in them have been providentially preserved to us in the Chronicles.

**VII. Discrepancies and Contradictions.** — The credibility of the books of Chronicles has been greatly contested by rationalistic writers, but by none with more tenacity than De Wette, first in his *Beiträge zur Einleitung* (Halle, 1806, 1:1-132), and subsequently in the successive editions of his *Einleitung*, where he has brought together every sort of difficulty and alleged contradiction, many of which rest only on assumptions which would not be tolerated if applied to any other than a Biblical writer. It indeed cannot be denied that many difficulties do exist in this portion of Scripture, and not a few apparent contradictions between its statements and those of the other historical books, particularly as regards proper names and numbers; but these, even if they cannot be satisfactorily explained, scarcely warrant calling in question the sincerity or the credibility of the writer. Thus, for instance, it is objected that <sup><1306></sup>1 Chronicles 2:6 is a false combination of <sup><1351></sup>1 Kings 5:11 [4:31]; but nothing is more common than the recurrence of the same names in different families and tribes, and at different periods; and although Hävernick unnecessarily admits that some of the names in the two passages are identical, it would certainly indicate rare confusion on the part of the writer of the Chronicles to bring together times and persons so far apart from one another. Ethan the Ezrahite, of the family of Merari (<sup><1369></sup>1 Chronicles 6:29 [44]), was one of David's masters of song (<sup><1357></sup>1 Chronicles 15:17), and the author of <sup><1301></sup>Psalm 89. Heman, also an Ezrahite, and author of Psalm 88, was a leader of David's sacred choir (<sup><1357></sup>1 Chronicles 15:17), and it is utterly inconceivable that persons, as it would appear, so well known to the writer of the Chronicles, should so inconsiderately be reckoned among the posterity of Judah, and assigned to a time so long antecedent to that of David. *SEE HEMAN.*

There are, however, real difficulties, particularly in the genealogical tables, and also in various numerical statements, and these, it may be supposed, arose in a great measure from corruption of the text; for it is in such cases that there is the greatest facility for the rise and the perpetuation of false readings, the context affording little aid for their detection, or rectification if detected. The text of the Chronicles furnishes many instances of such corruptions, although in several cases, where it differs from the corresponding passages in the books of Samuel and of Kings, it is just as

possible that it shows the true reading. A remarkable case is <sup><1363></sup>1 Chronicles 6:13 [28], "And the sons of Samuel, the first-born Vashni and Abiah," comp. with <sup><1002></sup>1 Samuel 8:2, "Now the name of his first-born was Joel, and the name of his second Abiah." It is easy to see how this contradiction has arisen. The name Joel had fallen out of <sup><1363></sup>1 Chronicles 6:13, and some transcriber, seeing the necessity for some name after "the first-born," transformed, *ynVəw̄i* [*ve-hash-sheni*], "and the second," into a proper name, Vashni. The mistake is as old as the Sept. — ὁ πρωτότοκος Σανὶ καὶ Αβιά. The Syriac and Arabic read as in Samuel (*Jour. of Sac. Lit.* April, 1852, p. 198).

(1.) Passages where the readings in Chronicles are obviously corrupt; sometimes the work itself showing the erroneousess of the reading, e.g. <sup><485></sup>2 Chronicles 3:15; 4:5, compared with <sup><1075></sup>1 Kings 7:15, 26, etc.

(2.) Passages where the correct reading is that of the Chronicles. The father of Amasa is designated in <sup><1277></sup>1 Chronicles 2:17, "Jether, the *Ishmaelite*;" in <sup><1075></sup>2 Samuel 17:25, "Ithra, an *Israelite*." Examples of numerical statements: <sup><1804></sup>1 Chronicles 18:4, compared with <sup><1084></sup>2 Samuel 8:4; <sup><1398></sup>1 Chronicles 19:18, comp. with <sup><1008></sup>2 Samuel 10:18; <sup><1312></sup>1 Chronicles 21:12, with <sup><1043></sup>2 Samuel 24:13; <sup><485></sup>2 Chronicles 3:15, and <sup><1076></sup>1 Kings 7:16, with <sup><1257></sup>2 Kings 25:17, where the height of the "chapiters" on the brazen pillars, as given in the first two passages, is confirmed by <sup><262></sup>Jeremiah 52:22; <sup><4925></sup>2 Chronicles 9:25, compared with <sup><1046></sup>1 Kings 4:26; <sup><1311></sup>1 Chronicles 11:11, compared with <sup><1028></sup>2 Samuel 23:8; <sup><481></sup>2 Chronicles 26:1, 3, 8, etc. comp. with <sup><1251></sup>2 Kings 15:1, 6, etc.

(3.) Passages where the correct reading is doubtful: <sup><412></sup>2 Chronicles 2:2, 17 [18], comp. with <sup><1081></sup>1 Kings 5:30 [16]; <sup><480></sup>2 Chronicles 8:10, comp. with <sup><1023></sup>1 Kings 9:23; <sup><488></sup>2 Chronicles 8:18, comp. with <sup><1028></sup>1 Kings 9:28, etc. (On the numerical discrepancies, see Reinke, *Beiträge zur Erklärung des alt. Testamentes*, I, i.) *SEE NUMBER*. In Movers, Kennicott, and Gramberg, others may be found which are injudiciously brought forward as truly at variance; yet <sup><488></sup>2 Chronicles 8:18, compared with <sup><1028></sup>1 Kings 9:28; <sup><1320></sup>1 Chronicles 21:5, comp. with <sup><1049></sup>2 Samuel 24:9, where the numbers of Judah are different, and other places that might be quoted, present contradictions which evince that the text is corrupt. It is well known, although the cause has not fully hitherto been ascertained, that the text of the books of Samuel, Kings, and Chronicles is in a worse condition than that of the other inspired writings. Jerome (*Praef. ad Paral.*) speaks

of the Greek text of Chronicles as being hopelessly confused in his days, and assigns this as a reason why he made a new translation from the Hebrew. Many of the names and words that are differently written should be referred to this head. Some omissions and some interpolations also belong to it. But the principal contradictions relate to *numbers*. These seem to have been expressed in various ways; and copyists, having different methods of marking them, were naturally exposed to errors. Sometimes numbers were designated by *letters*, occasionally by *ciphers*, and again they were marked by *words*. *SEE ABBREVIATION*.

(4.) Passages erroneously regarded as contradictory: Between <sup><1483></sup>2 Chronicles 28:20, and <sup><1217></sup>2 Kings 16:79, there is no contradiction, as they relate to different stages of the war; and it is quite possible that the mercenary Tiglath-pileser from an ally became an opponent; a fact even intimated in <sup><1218></sup>2 Kings 16:18, by Ahaz's removal of a gallery, which might afford access to an enemy. Between <sup><3123></sup>1 Chronicles 11:23, "An Egyptian, a man of great stature, five cubits high, and in the Egyptian's hand was a spear like a weaver's beam," and <sup><1021></sup>2 Samuel 23:21, "An Egyptian, a goodly man, and the Egyptian had a spear in his hand," there is no contradiction; the one passage being more specific, but still in accordance with and its purport implied in the other. The Egyptian's noticeable appearance was his stature, with which also his spear corresponded. <sup><4818></sup>2 Chronicles 34:3-7, places the reformation under Josiah in the twelfth year of his age, while <sup><12218></sup>2 Kings 22:3, assigns to it the eighteenth; the former referring only to the beginning of the work, while the other passage points to some great progress in it, the rooting out of idolatry, as is required by <sup><4819></sup>2 Chronicles 35:19. Many other passages, which are usually adduced under this head, do not belong to it: e.g. <sup><4025></sup>2 Chronicles 9:25, compared with <sup><1026></sup>1 Kings 4:26; <sup><14212></sup>2 Chronicles 22:2, with <sup><12835></sup>2 Kings 8:26; <sup><3201></sup>1 Chronicles 21:1, with <sup><1801></sup>2 Samuel 24:1; <sup><3205></sup>1 Chronicles 21:5, with <sup><1809></sup>2 Samuel 24:9; <sup><3225></sup>1 Chronicles 21:25, with <sup><1824></sup>2 Samuel 24:24; <sup><14132></sup>2 Chronicles 13:2, with <sup><11510></sup>1 Kings 15:10; on the true mode of harmonizing which we refer to Davidson's *Sacred Hermeneutics*, p. 544-554, where they are resolved. A large class of the discrepancies in question, affecting the ages and reigns of the kings, is due simply to the mode of reckoning either (a) according to the civil as distinct from the sacred year, or (b) according to dates of association with the respective fathers on the throne (*Meth. Quart. Rev.*, Oct. 1856, p. 619 sq., where all these are reconciled). *SEE CHRONOLOGY*.

Many less important deviations are here passed over, as being referrible to the arbitrary choice of the compiler, such as omissions, additions, difference of order, change of style, etc. Most or all of the real difficulties, with respect to facts, will be examined under the several articles to which they relate. Many of the obscurities, and not a few discrepancies, are apparently insoluble, owing to the loss of the original data, which alone could serve to explain them. These are more numerous and formidable, perhaps, in the Chronicles than in any other book of Scripture; yet the discrepancies, even were there no satisfactory solution, cannot greatly affect the character of the writer of the Chronicles; for the probability as regards correctness will be found on the part of the later writer, who, having the earlier works before him, would not unnecessarily, in matters of fact and plain numerical statements, where differences and contradictions were so easily discernible, vary from the earlier accounts favored by the authority arising from age and prior acceptance. There can be no question, moreover, that many of the discrepancies are owing to the fault of copyists, while in some they are the result of the different views and designs of the respective writers, or the brevity of their statements. In proof, however, of the accuracy of the Chronicles, the following particulars are worthy of consideration:

**a.** The writer is exceedingly definite in his statements. Thus the time when it occurred to David to build the Temple of the Lord is indicated (<sup><1070></sup>2 Samuel 7:1), "It came to pass *when* (yK) the king sat in his house," etc., but more definitely stated in <sup><1370></sup>1 Chronicles 17:1 (rvak), "*as soon as* he sat," etc. (see Hengstenberg, *Christol.* 1:144, Berlin, 1854); while the omission of the words, "and the Lord had given him rest round about from all his enemies," removes the chronological difficulty in that statement. Of his accuracy, again, in the genealogical notices, the following example may suffice. In <sup><1321></sup>1 Chronicles 2:16, mention is made of two sisters of David, Abigail and Zeruah, the latter of whom was the mother of Joab, Abishai, and Asahel, who: are never designated after their father, but always after their more illustrious mother (<sup><1028></sup>2 Samuel 2:18; 21:17, etc.). Amasa is referred to as a blood relation of David (<sup><1094></sup>2 Samuel 19:14); according to <sup><1075></sup>2 Samuel 17:25, Amasa was a son of Abigail, and she sister of Zeruah, the mother of Joab; but the daughter of Nahash, not positively of Jesse, and thus perhaps only the half-sister of David. **SEE NAHASH;** Therefore it is that, in the genealogy of Jesse (<sup><1323></sup>1 Chronicles 2:13-17), she is not styled his daughter, but only referred to as the sister of David; a distinction

which does not at first sight strike the reader, and the force of which could not indeed be learned without the information furnished in the book of Samuel. So also <sup><4070></sup>2 Chronicles 7:7-10 explains the abbreviated statement (<sup><1086></sup>1 Kings 8:65), and the otherwise contradictory expression "the eighth day," <sup><1086></sup>1 Kings 8:66 — a proof how many of the discrepancies arise simply from the brevity of the statement.

**b.** The scrupulous exactness with which the writer excerpts from the original documents is vouched for by the fact of his sometimes retaining the very words," although involving expressions no longer applicable to his own time — a practice which, strange to say, has furnished ground to, assail his accuracy. Thus the Simeonites are said to possess the seats of the Amalekites in Mount Seir, dwelling there "unto this day" (<sup><1342></sup>1 Chronicles 4:42, 43), although, long prior to the composition of the history, they had been removed from all their possessions. So also, in the account of the removal of the ark to Solomon's Temple, it is added, "and there it is unto this day" (<sup><4493></sup>2 Chronicles 5:9).

**c.** But of more importance is the indirect confirmation given to several statements in the Chronicles by other passages of Scripture. Thus Hezekiah's preparations in fortifying Jerusalem when threatened by Sennacherib — his stopping the fountains and "the brook that ran through the midst of the land" (<sup><4431></sup>2 Chronicles 32:1-6), are fully confirmed by <sup><2728></sup>Isaiah 22:8-11. Again, <sup><1983></sup>Psalms 48:13, etc., probably refers to the victory of Jehoshaphat (2 Chronicles 20). A further reference to this victory of Jehoshaphat is found in <sup><2901></sup>Joel 4 [3]; the prophetic vision resting on this history, which is thus the foundation of the divine judgment on the enemies of the theocracy. (See Hävernick, *Einleitung*, II, 1:216.) In the reign of Jehoram the Philistines and Arabians invaded Judah, plundered the royal palace, and carried away the king's sons and wives (<sup><4216></sup>2 Chronicles 21:16, 17). To this incident the prophet Joel refers (Joel. 4:[3], 5, 6), where the Philistines are threatened for their plundering of the Lord's property and sale of the Israelitish captives; the same also in Amos 1:6. The Philistines again, in the time of Ahaz, invaded the south of Judah, and took several important cities (<sup><4238></sup>2 Chronicles 28:18). With this agrees the prophecy of <sup><2348></sup>Isaiah 14:28-32, which again finds its fulfillment in <sup><1288></sup>2 Kings 18:8.

It is important also to notice how the Chronicles form a commentary on various passages of the other books, and evince the accuracy of such



statements as at first sight seem to contain discrepancies. Thus, in <sup><1075></sup>2 Samuel 7:5, no reason is assigned why David should not build the house of the Lord; and in <sup><1077></sup>1 Kings 5:17 [3], in the message of Solomon to Hiram, an external reason only is assigned, as the heathen prince could not comprehend the deeper one. This, however, is given in David's communication first to Solomon (<sup><1218></sup>1 Chronicles 22:8), and afterwards to Israel in assembly (<sup><1318></sup>1 Chronicles 28:3). The addition, "But I have chosen Jerusalem, that my name might be there" (<sup><4466></sup>2 Chronicles 6:6, comp. with <sup><1086></sup>1 Kings 8:16), is exceedingly important: the choice of Jerusalem, as the center of the theocracy, was dependent on the choice of David to be ruler over Israel — the one was included in the other (2 Samuel 7). The truthfulness of the history may be said to be even attested by the names of the exiles born shortly before the restoration, from their so naturally reflecting the hopes which about that time must have been strongly entertained. Thus <sup><1319></sup>1 Chronicles 3:19, 20: Hananiah (*Jehovah's grace*); Berechiah (*Jehovah's blessing*); Hasadiah (*Jehovah's mercy*); and Jushabhesed (*mercy's return*).

**VIII.** *Exegetical Helps.* — The principal works introductory to these books specially are: Dahler, *De lib. Paralipomenôn auctoritate* (Argent. 1819, 8vo); Gramberg, *Die Chronik nach ihrem geschichtl. Charakter* (Halle, 1823, 8vo); Movers, *Unters. üb. d. Chronik* (Bonn, 1834, 8vo); Keil, *Versuch üb. d. Chronik* (Berl. 1833, 8vo); also De Wette, *Hist.-krit. Unters. üb. d. Bucher d. Chronik*, in his *Beitr. zur Kritik des A. T.* 1:1-152; and against this, Hertz's *Vers. z. Vertheid. d. Chronik* (Altona, 1822, 8vo). Compare the *Einleitungen* of De Wette, Eichhorn, Jahn, Hävernick, Keil, and especially Bleek (1860); also Davidson in Horne's *Introduct.* (new ed. 2:673-688); finally, the remarks by Gesenius, *Gesch. d. hebr. Sprache* (Lpz. 1815). **SEE INTRODUCTION.**

Express *commentaries* on Chronicles are few and defective; in the following list, the most valuable are indicated by an asterisk [\*] prefixed: Jerome, *Quaestiones* (in his *Opp. [Spuria]*, 3:789); Theodoret, *Quaestiones* (*Opp.* 1, pt. 1); Procopius, *Scholia* (in *Opp.* 8:1); Maurus, *Commentarii* (*Opp.*); Rashi and Kimchi's *Commentaries* (in Buxtorffii *Biblia Hebr.* 4); Sarcer, *Commentarius* (Basil, 1560, 4to); Strigel, *Commentarius* (Lips. 1583, 1591, fol.); \*Lavater, *Commentarius* (Ziir. 1573; Heidelberg, 1599, fol.); Leonhart, *Hypomnemata* (Erf. 1608, 1614, 8vo); Serrarius, *Commentaria* (Mogunt. 1609-10, 2 vols. fol.); Sanctius, *Commentarii* (Antw. 1624; Lyons, 1625, fol.); Bonfrore, *Commentarius*



(Tornaci. 1643, 2 vols. fol.); Jackson, *Annotationes* (Cambr. 1646, 2 vols. 4to); Beck, *Paraphrsasis Chaldaica cum notis* (Aug. Vind. 1680, 4to); Wilkins, *Rabbi Josephi Parsaphr. Chald.* (Cantab. 1717; Amsterd. 1725, 4to); Corn. a Lapide, *Lib. Paralip*, (in his *Commentaria*); Michaelis and Rambach, in the *Annotationes in Hagiogr*, 3:245 (Hal. 1720); \*Horsley, *Notes* (in the *Bibl. Crit.* 1); Jeitteles,  $\mu\text{WGr}\text{Ti}$  (Vienna, 1815, 8vo); Weisse,  $\mu\text{WGr}\text{Ti}$  (Prague, 1836, 8vo); Kenigsfeldt, *Annotationes* (Havn. 1839, 8vo); \*Bertheau, *Die Bücher der Chronik erklärt* (Lpz. 1854, 8vo, being Lief. 15 of the *Exeg. IHandb.*; also in English, Edinburgh, 1857, 8vo); Rahmer, *Commentar* (Thorn, 1866, 8vo, vol. 1). **SEE COMMENTARY.**

## Chronology,

the science which measures time by the succession of events that occur in the heavens or on the earth. Accordingly, chronology may be divided into two kinds, theoretical or technical, and practical or applied; in other words, into *mathematical* and *historical*. The former is, of course, the most trustworthy, as being the result of fixed laws; while the latter is, to a great degree, contingent and irregular. In this article we have to do only with Biblical dates and the method of their determination. **SEE ASTRONOMY.**

**I. Elements.** — The knowledge of the Hebrews in chronology rested altogether on appearances; not a trace of anything like a scientific view is to be found in their literature. The books of the Old Testament recognize none of the great areas which other nations have employed. Nor is it until the first book of the Maccabees that any such guide is found. Instead of these, the Hebrew writers usually employ more limited and local or national epochs. (See below.) Genealogical tables, indeed, are not wanting, but they are of little service for the general purposes of chronology. (See below.) Formerly great exactness was hoped for in the determination of Hebrew chronology. Although the materials were often not definite enough to fix a date within a few years, it was nevertheless expected that the very day could be ascertained. Hence arose unsoundness and variety of results, and ultimately a general feeling of distrust. At present critics are rather prone to run into this latter extreme. The truth, as might be expected, lies between these two extreme judgments. The character of the records whence we draw our information forbids us to hope for a perfect system. The Bible does not give a complete history of the times to which it refers; in its historical portions it deals with special and detached periods. The chronological information is, therefore, not absolutely continuous, although

often, with the evident purpose of forming a kind of connection between these different portions, it has a more continuous character than might have been expected. It is rather historical than strictly chronological in its character, and thus the technical part of the subject depends, so far as the Bible is concerned, almost wholly upon inference. *SEE HISTORY.*

In one particular, however, great care has usually been exercised in the Hebrew records, namely, the prevention of error by the neglect or accumulation of *fractional parts of a year* in the continuous series of generations, dynasties, or reigns. This has been systematically done (as in most other ancient chronologies) by adding these into the beginning of each successive number, i.e. by reckoning, in all cases, from a fixed point in the calendar, so that the years are always to be accounted "full" unless specified as current. Nevertheless, in consequence of the brief and sometimes double lines of series, beginning at various seasons of the year, confusion, or at least difficulty has often crept into the statements, which is enhanced by the fact that the rule here stated is not observed with absolute uniformity. All this is especially illustrated in the parallel lists of the kings of JUDAH *SEE JUDAH* and ISRAEL *SEE ISRAEL* (q.v.).

**1. Generations.** — It is commonly supposed that the genealogies given in the Bible are invariably continuous. When, however, we come to examine them closely, we find that many are broken, without being in consequence *technically* defective as Hebrew genealogies. A notable instance is that of the genealogy of our Savior given by Matthew, where Joram is immediately followed by Ozias, as if his son — Ahaziah, Joash, and Amaziah being omitted (<sup>4008</sup>Matthew 1:8). That this is not an accidental omission of a copyist is evident from the specification of the number of generations from Abraham to David, from David to the Babylonish Captivity, and from the Babylonish Captivity to Christ, in each case fourteen generations. Probably these missing names were purposely left out to make the number for the interval equal to that of the other intervals, such an omission being obvious and not liable to cause error. In Ezra's genealogy (<sup>4370</sup>Ezra 7:1-5) there is a similar omission, which in so famous a line can scarcely be attributed to the carelessness of a copyist. There are also examples of a man being called the son of a remote ancestor, as "Shebuel the son of Gershon [Gershom], the son of Moses" (<sup>4352</sup>1 Chronicles 26:24). So, in historical narratives, Jehu is called "the son of Nimshi" (<sup>4196</sup>1 Kings 19:16; <sup>4300</sup>2 Kings 9:20; <sup>4420</sup>2 Chronicles 22:7), as well as "the son of Jehoshaphat the son of Nimshi" (<sup>4000</sup>1 Kings 9:2, 14).

Laban is called "the son of Nahor" (<sup><01215></sup>Genesis 29:5), for grandson (28:2, 5; comp. 22:20-23). We cannot, therefore, venture to use the Hebrew genealogical lists to compute intervals of time except where we can prove each descent to be immediate, and where the length of each generation is given. *SEE GENEALOGY*. Ideler remarks that Moses reckons by generations (*Handbuch*, 1:506); but this is not the manner of Herodotus, who assumes an average of three generations to a century (2:142). There is no use of a generation as a division of time in the Pentateuch, unless, with some, we suppose that *r/D*, a "generation," in <sup><01516></sup>Genesis 15:16, is so used; those, however, who hold this opinion make it an interval of a hundred years, since it would, if a period of time, seem to be the fourth part of the 400 years of verse 13; most probably, however, the meaning is that some of the fourth generation should come forth from Egypt. *SEE GENERATION*.

## 2. Divisions of Time. *SEE TIME*.

(1.) *Hour*. — The hour is supposed to be mentioned in Daniel (3:6, 15; 4:16, 30 [Engl. 19, 33; 5:5]), but in no one of these cases is a definite period of time clearly intended by the Chald. term (h[*v*; at[*yi* aT[*v*]) employed. The Egyptians divided the day and night into hours like ourselves from at least B.C. cir. 1200 (Lepsius, *Chronologie der Eg.* 1:130). It is therefore not improbable that the Israelites were acquainted with the hour from an early period. The "sun-dial of Ahaz," whatever instrument, fixed or movable, it may have been, implies a division of the kind. *SEE DIAL*. In the N.T. we find the same system as the modern, the hours being reckoned from the beginning of the Jewish night and day. *SEE HOUR*.

(2.) *Day*. — For the civil day of 24 hours we find in one place (<sup><2784></sup>Daniel 8:14) the term *rqβδbr* [ , "evening-morning," Sept. *βυxθήμερον* (also in <sup><01125></sup>2 Corinthians 11:25, A. V. "a night and a day"). Whatever may be the proper meaning of this Hebrew term, it cannot be doubted here to signify "nights and days." The common word for day as distinguished from night is also used for the civil day, or else both day and night are mentioned to avoid vagueness, as in the case of Jonah's "three days and three nights" (<sup><0101></sup>John 2:1 [A. V. 1:17]; comp. <sup><0120></sup>Matthew 12:40). The civil day was divided into night and natural day, the periods of darkness and light (<sup><0005></sup>Genesis 1:5). It commenced with night, which stands first in the special

term given above. The night, **l y l i** and therefore the civil day, is generally held to have begun at sunset. Ideler, however, while admitting that this point of time was that of the commencement of the civil day among all other nations known to us which followed a lunar reckoning, objects to the opinion that this was the case with the Jews. He argues in favor of the beginning of deep night, reasoning that, for instance, in the ordaining of the Day of Atonement, on the 10th of the 7th month, it is said "in the ninth [day] of the month at even, from even unto even, shall ye celebrate (literally, *rest*) your Sabbath" (<sup><1232></sup>Leviticus 23:32); where, if the civil day began at sunset, it would have been said that they should commence the observance on the evening of the 10th day, or merely on the 10th day, supposing the word "evening" (**br [ ]**) to mean the later part of our afternoon. He cites, as probably supporting this view, the expression **μyBr [ h; ^yBe** "between the two evenings" used of the time of offering the passover and the daily evening sacrifice (<sup><1216></sup>Exodus 12:6; <sup><1416></sup>Numbers 9:3; 28:4); for the Pharisees, whom the present Jews follow, took it to be the time between the 9th and 11th hours of the day, or our 3 and 5 P.M., although the Samaritans and Karaites supposed it to be the time between sunset and full darkness, particularly on account of the phrase **vmV/hi a/bK]** "when the sun is setting," used in a parallel passage (<sup><1316></sup>Deuteronomy 16:6) (see *Handbuch*, 1:482-484). These passages and expressions may, however, be not unreasonably held to support the common opinion that the civil day began at sunset. The term "between the two evenings" can scarcely be supposed to have originally indicated a long period; a special short period, though scarcely point, the time of sunset, is shown to correspond to it. This is a natural division between the late afternoon, when the sun is low, and the evening, when his light has not wholly disappeared — the two evenings into which the natural evening would be cut by the commencement of the civil day, if it began at sunset. There is no difficulty in the command that the observance of so solemn a day as that of Atonement should commence a little before the true beginning of the civil day, that due preparation might be made for the sacrifices. In Judaea, where the duration of twilight is very short at all times, the most natural division would be at sunset. The natural "day" (**μ/y**) probably was held to commence at sunrise, morning-twilight being included in the last watch of the night, according to the old as well as the later division; some, however, made the morning-watch part of the day. **SEE DAY; SEE NIGHT.** Four natural periods, smaller than the civil day,

are mentioned. These are **br** [ , evening, and **rqB** morning, of which there is frequent mention, and the less usual **μyṛhx**," the two lights," as though "double light," noon, and **hl y** [hi t/xj } or — **yxj }** "half the night," midnight. No one of these with a people not given to astronomy seems to indicate a point of time, but all to designate periods, evening and morning being, however, much longer than noon and midnight. The night was divided into watches (**t/rmṽḥ**). In the O.T. but two are expressly mentioned, and we have to infer the existence of a third, the first watch of the night. (In <sup><212></sup>Lamentations 2:19, **t/rmṽḥivar** of course refers to, without absolutely designating, the first watch.) The middle watch (**hn/kyThi trmṽḥ**) occurs in <sup><177></sup>Judges 7:19, where the connection of watches with military affairs is evident: "And Gideon and the hundred men that [were] with him went down unto the extremity of the camp at the beginning of the middle watch; [and] they had but set the watchmen **μyṛmṽbi**" The morning watch (**rqBbi trmṽḥ**) is mentioned in <sup><2124></sup>Exodus 14:24, and <sup><9111></sup>1 Samuel 11:11; in the former case, in the account of the passage of the Red Sea; in the latter, in that of Saul's surprise of the Ammonites when he relieved Jabesh-gilead. Some Rabbins hold that there were four watches (Ideler, *Handbuch*, 1:486). In the N.T. four night-watches are mentioned, which were probably adopted from the Romans as a modification of the old system. All four occur together in <sup><4135></sup>Mark 13:35: **ὄψέ**, the late watch; **μεσονύκτιον**, midnight; **ἀλεκτροφωνία**, the cock-crowing; and **πρωί**, the early watch. **SEE WATCHES OF NIGHT.**

(3.) *Week* ([ **Wbv**; a hebdomad). — The Hebrew week was a period of seven days, ending with the Sabbath; therefore it could not have been a division of the month, which was lunar, without intercalation. But there was no such intercalation, since the Sabbath was to be every seventh day; its name is used for week, and weeks are counted on without any additional day or days. The mention together of Sabbaths and new moons proves nothing but that the two observances were similar, the one closing the week, the other commencing the month. The week, whether a period of seven days, or a quarter of the month, was of common use in antiquity. The Egyptians, however, were without it (with Dion Cassius, 37:19, comp. Lepsius, *Chronol. d. AEG.* 1:131, 133), dividing their month of 30 days into decades, as did the Athenians. The Hebrew week, therefore, cannot

have been adopted from Egypt; probably both it and the Sabbath were used and observed by the patriarchs. *SEE WATCHES OF NIGHT*

(4.) *Month* (j rj , vd20j , μymj; vdj ρ) — The months by which the time is measured in the account of the Flood may have been of 30 days each, possibly forming a year of 360 days, for the 1st, 2d, 7th, and 10th months are mentioned (<sup>(1083)</sup>Genesis 8:13; 7:11; 8:14, 4, 5). Ideler, however, contests this, arguing that as the water first began to sink after 150 days (and then had been 15 cubits above all high mountains), it must have sunk for some days ere the ark could have rested on Ararat, so that the second date must be more than 150 days later than the first (*Handbuch*, 1:69, 70, 478, 479). This argument depends upon the meaning of "high mountains," and upon the height of those "the mountains of Ararat" (8:4), on which the ark rested, questions connected with that of the universality of the Flood. *SEE DELUGE*. On the other hand, it must be urged that the exact correspondence of the interval to five months of 30 days each, and the use of a year of 360 days, in prophetic passages of both Testaments, are of no slight weight. That the months from the giving of the Law until the time of the Second Temple, when we have certain knowledge of their character, were always lunar, appears from the command to keep new-moons, and from the unlikelihood of a change in the calendar. These lunar months have been supposed to have been always alternately of 29 and 30 days. Their average length would of course be a lunation, or a little (44') above 29 1/2 days, and therefore they would in general be alternately of 29 and 30 days; but it is possible that occasionally months might occur of 28 and 31 days, if, as is highly probable, the commencement of each was strictly determined by observation; that observation was employed for this purpose is distinctly affirmed in the Babylonian Talmud of the practice of the time at which it was written, when, however, a month was not allowed to be less than 29, or more than 30 days in length. The first day of the month is called *vdj ρ* "new moon;" Sept. *νεομηνία*, from the root *vdj* ; *to be new*; and in speaking of the first day of a month this word was sometimes used with the addition of a number for the whole expression, "in such a month, on the first day," as *hZhip/YBi... . yvj Mhivdj Bi* "On the third new-moon ... . on that day" (<sup>(1201)</sup>Exodus 19:1); hence the word came to signify month, though then it was sometimes qualified (μymj; vdj ρ) The new-moon was kept as a sacred festival (q.v.). In the Pentateuch and Joshua, Judges and Ruth, we find but one month mentioned by a special name, the rest being

called according to their order. The month with a special name is the first, which is called *bybāh;vdj* (Sept., *μὴν τῶν νέων*), "the month of ears of corn," or "Abib," that is, the month in which the ears of corn became full or ripe, and on the 16th day of which, the second day of the feast of unleavened bread, ripe ears, *bybā*; were to be offered (<sup><R214></sup>Leviticus 2:14; comp. 23:10, 11, 14). This undoubted derivation shows how erroneous is the idea that *Abib* comes from the Egyptian *Epiphi*. In 1 Kings three other names of months occur, *Zif*, *wzi* or *wyzi* the second; Ethanim, *μηνίγα* the seventh; and Bul, *WB*, the eighth. These names appear, like that of Abib, to be connected with the phenomena of a tropical year. No other names are found in any book prior to the Captivity, but in the books written after the return the later nomenclature still in use appears. This is evidently of Babylonian origin, as the Jews themselves affirm. *SEE MONTH*.

(5.) *Year (hny)*. — It has been supposed, on account of the dates in the narrative of the Flood, as already mentioned, that in Noah's time there was a year of 160 days. These dates may indeed be explained in accordance with a year of 365 days. The evidence of the prophetic Scriptures is, however, decisive as to the knowledge of a year of the former length. The "time, times and a half" of Daniel (7:25; 12:7), where *time* means *year* (see 11:13), cannot be doubted to be equivalent expressions to the 42 months and 1260 days of Revelation (11:2, 3; 12:6), for  $360 \times 3\frac{1}{2} = 1260$ ; and  $30 \times 42 = 1260$ . We have also the testimony of ancient writers that such a year was known to some nations, so that it is probable that the year of Noah was of this length, whatever may have been that of the months referred to by Moses in the narrative of the Flood (q.v.).

The characteristics of the year instituted at the Exodus can be clearly determined, though we cannot absolutely fix those of any single year. There can be no doubt that it was essentially tropical, since certain observances connected with the produce of the land were fixed to particular days. It is equally clear that the months were lunar, each commencing with a new moon. It would appear, therefore, that there must have been some mode of adjustment. To ascertain what this was, it is necessary first to decide when the year commenced. On the 16th day of the month Abib, as already mentioned, ripe ears of corn were to be offered as first-fruits of the harvest (<sup><R214></sup>Leviticus 2:14; 23:10, 11). The reaping of the barley commenced the harvest (<sup><R210></sup>2 Samuel 21:9), the wheat following (<sup><R23></sup>Ruth 2:23). Josephus expressly says that the offering was of barley



(*Ant.* 3:10, 5). It is therefore necessary to find when the barley becomes ripe in Palestine. According to the observation of travelers, the barley is ripe, in the warmest parts of the country, in the first days of April. The barley-harvest therefore commences about half a month after the vernal equinox, so that the year would begin at about that tropical point were it not divided into lunar months. We may conclude that the nearest new moon about or after the equinox, but not much before, was chosen as the commencement of the year. Ideler, whom we have thus far followed as to this year, concludes that the right new moon was chosen through observation of the forwardness of the barley-crops in the warmer districts of the country (*Handbuch*, 1:490). There is, however, this difficulty, that the different times of barley-harvest in various parts would have been liable to cause confusion. It seems, therefore, not unlikely that the Hebrews adopted the surer means of determining their new-year's day by observations of heliacal risings or similar stellar phenomena known to mark the right time before the barley-harvest. Certainly the ancient Egyptians and the Arabs made use of such means. The method of intercalation can only have been that which obtained after the Captivity — the addition of a thirteenth month, whenever the twelfth ended too long before the equinox for the first-fruits of the harvest to be offered in the middle of the month following, and the similar offerings at the times appointed. This method would be in accordance with the permission granted to postpone the celebration of the Passover in the case of any one who was either legally unclean or journeying at a distance, for a whole month, to the 14th day of the second month (~~400~~ Numbers 9:9-13), of which permission we find Hezekiah to have availed himself for both the reasons allowed, because the priests were not sufficiently sanctified and the people were not collected (~~401~~ 2 Chronicles 30:1-3, 15). The later Jews had two beginnings to the year, or, as it is commonly, but somewhat inaccurately said, two years. At the time of the Second Temple these two beginnings obtained, the seventh month of the civil reckoning being Abib, the first of the sacred. Hence it has been held that the institution at the time of the Exodus was merely a change of commencement, and not the introduction of a new year; and also that from this time there were the two beginnings. The former opinion is at present purely hypothetical, and has been too much mixed up with the latter, for which, on the contrary, there is some evidence. *SEE YEAR.*

(6.) *Seasons.* — The ancient Hebrews do not appear to have divided their year into fixed seasons. We find mention of the natural seasons, /yqj



"summer," and **āṛj օ**"winter," which are used for the whole year (in <sup><421></sup>Psalm 24:17; <sup><348></sup>Zechariah 14:8; and perhaps <sup><1082></sup>Genesis 8:22). The former of these properly means the time of cutting fruits, and the latter that of gathering fruits; the one referring to the early fruit season, the other to the late one. Their true significations are, therefore, rather summer and autumn than summer and winter. There can be no doubt, however, that they came to signify the two grand divisions of the year, both from their use together as the two seasons, and from the mention of the "winter-house" (**āṛj bityBe**) and the "summer-house" (**/yDhi tyBe** <sup><3015></sup>Amos 3:15). The latter evidence is the stronger, since the winter is the time in Palestine when a palace or house of different construction would be needed from the light summer pavilion, and in the only passage besides that referred to in which the winter-house is mentioned, we read that Jehoiakim "sat in the winter-house in the ninth month;" that is, almost at mid-winter; "and [there was a fire] on the hearth burning before him" (<sup><242></sup>Jeremiah 36:22). It is probable, however, that "winter," or **āṛj օ** when used without reference to the year, as in <sup><1820></sup>Job 29:4, has its original signification. The phrase **uj օrq**"cold and heat," in <sup><1082></sup>Genesis 8:22, is still more general, and cannot be held to indicate more than the great alternations of temperature, which, like those of day and night, were promised not to cease (Ideler, *Handbuch*, 1:494). There are two agricultural seasons of a more special character than the preceding in their ordinary use. These are **[rž**, "seed-time," and **ryxq**; "harvest." Ideler makes these equal to the foregoing seasons when similarly used together; but he has not proved this, and the passage he quotes (Genesis *l. c.*) cannot be held to afford any evidence of the kind, until some other two terms in it are proved to be strictly correspondent. *SEE SEASON.*

**3. Festivals and Holy Days.** — Besides the Sabbaths and new-moons, there were four great festivals and a fast in the ancient Hebrew year, and a great celebration every seventh and fiftieth year. *SEE FESTIVAL.*

**(1.)** The Feast of the Passover (**j sP**) was properly only the time of the sacrifice and eating of the paschal lamb, that is, the evening, **uyBr [h; yBe** "between the two evenings" (<sup><18215></sup>Leviticus 23:5)-a phrase previously considered — of the 14th day of the first month, and the night following, the Feast of Unleavened Bread (**t/XMhigj j**) commencing on the morning of the 15th day of the month, and lasting seven days, until the 21st

inclusive. The 15th and 21st days of the month were Sabbaths, that is, holy days. *SEE PASSOVER.*

(2.) The Feast of Weeks (t/[bʷ;g] ), or Pentecost, was kept at the close of seven weeks, counted from the day inclusive following the 16th of the 1st month. Hence its name means the feast of seven weeks, as indeed it is called in Tobit (ἀγία ἑπτὰ ἑβδομάδων, 2:1). As the ears of barley as first-fruits of the harvest were offered on the 16th day of the 1st month, so on this day thanksgiving was paid for the blessing of the harvest, and first-fruits of wheat offered as well as of fruits; hence the names ryxQhigj i Feast of the Harvest, and μyrWKBhiμ/y, Day of the First-fruits. *SEE PENTECOST.*

(3.) The Feast of Trumpets, h[WʀT]μ/y (lit. *day of trumpet-sound*), also called h[WʀT]~/rkʒi~/tBvi, i.e. "a great festival of celebration by the sound of the trumpet," was the 1st day of the 7th month, the civil commencement of the year. *SEE TRUMPET.*

(4.) The Day of Atonement, μyrPκhiμ/y, was the 10th day of the 7th month. It was a Sabbath, that is, a holy day, and also a fast, the only one in the Hebrew year before the Babylonish Captivity. Upon this day the high-priest made an offering of atonement for the nation. This annual solemn rite seems more appropriate to the commencement than to the middle of the year; and the time of its celebration thus affords some evidence in favor of the theory of a double beginning. *SEE ATONEMENT (DAY OF).*

(5.) The Feast of Tabernacles, t/KSbigj i was kept in the 7th month, from the 15th to the 22d days inclusive. Its chief days were the first and last, which were Sabbaths. Its name was taken from the people dwelling in tabernacles, to commemorate the Exodus. It was otherwise called āysāh; gj i i.e. "the feast of gathering," because it was also instituted as a time of thanksgiving for the end of the gathering of fruit and of the vintage. *SEE TABERNACLES (FEAST OF).*

The small number and simplicity of these primitive Hebrew festivals and holy days is especially worthy of note. It is also observable that they are not of an astronomical character; and that when they are connected with nature, it is as directing the gratitude of the people to him who, in giving good things, leaves not himself without witness. In later times many holy

days were added. Of these the most worthy of remark are the Feast of Purim, or "Lots," commemorating the deliverance of the Jews from Haman's plot, the Feast of the Dedication, recording the cleansing and rededication of the Temple by Judas Maccabmeus, and fasts on the anniversaries of great national misfortunes connected with the Babylonish Captivity. These last were doubtless instituted during that period (comp. <sup><870></sup>Zechariah 7:1-5). *SEE PURIM; SEE DEDICATION.*

(6.) *Sabbatical and Jubilee Years.* — The sabbatical year, **hFmV]hi tniv]** "the fallow year," or possibly "year of remission," or **hFmiv]** alone, also called a "sabbath," and a "great sabbath," was an institution of strictly the same character as the Sabbath — a year of rest, like the day of rest. It has not been sufficiently noticed that as the day has a side of physical necessity with reference to man, so the year has a side of physical necessity with reference to the earth. Every seventh year appears to be a very suitable time for the recurrence of a fallow year, on agricultural principles. Besides the rest from the labors of the field and vineyard, there was in this year to be remission, temporary or absolute, of debts and obligations among the people. The sabbatical year seems to have commenced at the civil beginning of the year, with the seventh month. Although doubtless held to commence with the first of the month, its beginning appears to have been kept at the Feast of Tabernacles (<sup><8510></sup>Deuteronomy 31:10), while that of the jubilee year was kept on the Day of Atonement. This institution seems to have been greatly neglected, as indeed was prophesied by Moses, who speaks of the desolation of the land as an enjoying the sabbaths which had not been kept (<sup><834></sup>Leviticus 26:34, 85, 43). The seventy years' captivity is also spoken of in <sup><871></sup>2 Chronicles 26:21 as an enjoying sabbath; but this may be on account of the number being sabbatical, as ten times seven, which, indeed, seems to be indicated in the passage. After the lapse of seven sabbatical periods, or forty-nine years, a year of jubilee was to be kept, immediately following the last sabbatical year. This was called **I bē]hi tniv]** "the year of the trumpet," or **I bēy]** alone, the latter word meaning either the sound of the trumpet or the instrument itself, because the commencement of the year was announced on the Day of Atonement by sound of trumpet. It was similar to the sabbatical year in its character, although doubtless yet more important. In the jubilee year debts were to be remitted, and lands were to be restored to their former owners. It is obvious from the words of the law (<sup><8518></sup>Leviticus 25:8-11) that this year followed every seventh sabbatical year, so that the opinion that it was

always identical with a sabbatical year is untenable. There is a further question as to the length of each jubilee period, if we may use the term, some holding that it had a duration of fifty, but others of forty-nine years. The latter opinion does not depend upon the supposition that the seventh sabbatical year was the jubilee, since the jubilee might be the first year of the next seven years after. That such was the case is rendered most probable by the analogy of the weekly Sabbath, and the custom of the Jews in the first and second centuries B.C.; although it must be noted that, according to Maimonides, the jubilee period was of fifty years, the fifty-first year commencing a new period, and that the same writer mentions that the Jews had a tradition that after the destruction of the first Temple only sabbatical years, and no jubilee years, were observed (Ideler, *Handbuch*, 1:503, 504). The testimony of Josephus does not seem to us at all conclusive, although Ideler (*l. c.*) holds it to be so; for his language (ταῦτα πενήκοντα μὲν ἔστιν ἔτη τὰ πάντα, *Ant.* 3:12, 3) cannot be held to prove absolutely that the jubilee year was not the first year of a sabbatical period, instead of standing between two such periods. — It is important to ascertain when the first sabbatical year ought to have been kept; whether the sabbatical and jubilee periods seem to have been continuous; what positive record there is of any sabbatical or jubilee years having been kept; and what indications there are of a reckoning by such years of either kind.

1. It can scarcely be contested that the first sabbatical year to be kept after the Israelites had entered Canaan would be about the fourteenth (Jennings, *Jewish Antiquities*, bk. 3, cap. 9). It is possible that it might have been somewhat earlier or later; but the narrative will not admit of much latitude.
2. It is clear that any sabbatical and jubilee years kept from the time of Joshua until the destruction of the first Temple would have been reckoned from the first one, but it may be questioned if any kept after the return would be counted in the same manner: from the nature of the institutions, it is rather to be supposed that the reckoning, in the second case, would be from the first cultivation of the country after its reoccupation. The recorded sabbatical years do not enable us to test this supposition, because we do not know exactly the year of return, or that of the first cultivation of the country. The recorded dates of sabbatical years would make that next after the return to commence in B.C. 528, and be current in B.C. 527, which would make the first year of the period B.C. 534-3, which would not improbably be the first year

of cultivation; but in the case of so short a period this cannot be regarded as evidence of much weight.

**3.** There is no positive record of any jubilee year having been kept at any time. The dates of three sabbatical years have, however, been preserved. These were current B.C. 163, 135, and 37, and therefore commenced in each case about three months earlier than the beginning of these Julian years (Josephus, *Ant.* 12:9, 5; 13:8, 1; 14:16, 2; 15:1, 2; *War*, 1:2, 4; and 1 Macc. 6:49, 53).

**4.** There are some chronological indications in the O.T. that may not unreasonably be supposed to be connected with the sabbatical system. The prophet Ezekiel dates his first prophecy of those in the book "in the thirtieth year," etc., "which was the fifth year of king Jehoiachin's captivity" (~~3000~~Ezekiel 1:2); thus apparently dating in the former case from a Letter known era than that of Jehoiachin's, captivity, which he employs in later places, without, however, in general again describing it. This date of the 30th year has been variously explained; some, with Usher, suppose that the era is the 18th year of Josiah, when the book of the law was found, and a great passover celebrated (see Hävernicks, *Commentar über Ezech.* p. 12, 13). This year of Josiah would certainly be the first of the reckoning, and might be used as a kind of reformation-era, not unlike the era of Simon the Maccabee. Others suppose that the thirtieth year of the prophet's life is meant, but this seems very unlikely. Others again, including Scaliger (*De Emendatione Temporum*, p. 79, 218, ed. 1583) and Rosenmüller (*Schol.* in loc.), hold that the date is from the commencement of the reign of Nabopolassar. There is no record of an era of Nabopolassar; that king had been dead some years; and we have no instance in the O. Test. of the use of a foreign era. The evidence, therefore, is in favor of Josiah's 18th year, B.C. 623. There seems to be another reference to this date in the same book, where the time of the iniquity of Judah is said to be 40 years; for the final captivity of Judah (~~3400~~Jeremiah 3:30) was in the 41st year of this reckoning. In the same place (~~3405~~Ezekiel 4:5, 6) the time of the iniquity of Israel is said to be 390 years, which sum, added to the date of the captivity of this part of the nation, B.C. 720, goes back to B.C. 1111. This result leads to the indication of possible jubilee dates; for the interval between B.C. 1111 and B.C. 623-2 is 488-9 years, almost exactly ten jubilee periods; and it must be remembered that the seventy weeks of the prophet Daniel seem to indicate the use

of such a great cycle. It remains to be asked whether the accounts of Josiah's reformation present any indications of celebrations connected with the sabbatical system. The finding of the book of the Law might seem to point to its being specially required for some public service. Such a service was the great reading of the Law to the whole congregation at the Feast of Tabernacles in every sabbatical year (<sup>-1610</sup>Deuteronomy 31:10-13). The finding of the book was certainly followed by a public reading, apparently in the first month, by the king to the whole people of Judah and Jerusalem, and afterwards a solemn passover was kept. Of the latter celebration is it said in Kings, "Surely there was not holden such a passover from the days of the Judges that judged Israel, nor in all the days of the kings of Israel, nor of the kings of Judah" (<sup>-1272</sup>2 Kings 23:22); and in Chronicles, "There was no passover like to that kept in Israel from the days of Samuel the prophet; neither did all the kings of Israel keep such a passover as Josiah kept" (<sup>-1258</sup>2 Chronicles 25:18). The mention of Samuel is remarkable, since in his time the earlier supposed date (B.C. 1111) falls. It may be objected that the passover is nowhere connected with the sabbatical reckoning; but these passovers can scarcely have been greater in sacrifices than at least one in Solomon's reign, nor is it likely that they are mentioned as characterized by greater zeal than any others whatever, so that we are almost driven to the idea of some relation to chronology. *SEE SABBATICAL YEAR; SEE JUBILEE.*

**4. A Eras.** — There are indications of several historical seras having been used by the ancient Hebrews, but our information is so scanty that we are generally unable to come to positive conclusions. Some of these possible aeras may be no more than dates employed by writers, and not national meras; others, however, can scarcely have been used in this special or individual manner from their referring to events of the highest importance to the whole people. *SEE EPOCH.*

**(1.)** The Exodus is used as an aera in <sup>-1008</sup>1 Kings 6:1, in giving the date of the foundation of Solomon's Temple. This is the only positive instance of the occurrence of this sera, for we cannot agree with Ideler that it is certainly employed in the Pentateuch. He refers to <sup>-1291</sup>Exodus 19:1, and <sup>-0638</sup>Numbers 33:38 (*Handbuch*, 1:507). Here, as elsewhere in the same part of the Bible, the beginning of the Exodus-year — not, of course, the actual date of the Exodus (see *Regnal years*, below) — is used as the point whence time is counted; but during the interval of which it formed the

natural commencement it cannot be shown to be an aera, though it may have been, any more than the beginning of a sovereign's reign is one. *SEE EXODE.*

(2.) The foundation of Solomon's Temple is conjectured by Ideler to have been an aera. The passages to which he refers (<sup><1090></sup>1 Kings 9:10; <sup><480></sup>2 Chronicles 8:1) merely speak of occurrences subsequent to the interval of 20 years occupied in the building of the Temple and the king's house, both being distinctly specified; so that his reading ("Zwanzig Jahre, nachdem Salomo das Haus des Herrn erbaute") leaves out half the statement, and so makes it incorrect (*Handb.* l. c.). It is elsewhere stated that the building of the Temple occupied seven years (<sup><1065></sup>1 Kings 6:37, 38), and that of Solomon's house thirteen (<sup><1000></sup>1 Kings 7:1), making up the interval of twenty years. *SEE TEMPLE.*

(3.) The aera once used by Ezekiel, and commencing in Josiah's 18th year, we have discussed above. *SEE JOSIAH; SEE EZEKIEL.*

(4.) The aera of Jehoiachin's captivity is constantly used by Ezekiel. The earliest date is the 5th year (<sup><3000></sup>Ezekiel 1:2), and the latest the 27th (<sup><3247></sup>Ezekiel 24:17). The prophet generally gives the date without applying any distinctive term to the aera. He speaks, however, of "the fifth year of king Jehoiachin's captivity" (<sup><3000></sup>Ezekiel 1:2), and "the twelfth year of our captivity" (<sup><3300></sup>Ezekiel 33:21), the latter of which expressions may explain his constant use of the sera. The same aera is necessarily employed, though not as such, where the advancement of Jehoiachin in the 37th year of his captivity is mentioned (<sup><1250></sup>2 Kings 25:27; <sup><2423></sup>Jeremiah 52:31). We have no proof that it was used except by those to whose captivity it referred. Its first year was current B.C. 598, commencing in the spring of that year. *SEE JEHOIACHIN.*

(5.) The beginning of the seventy years' captivity does not appear to have been used as an aera; but the destruction of Jerusalem by the Babylonians is occasionally referred to for chronological purposes (<sup><3400></sup>Ezekiel 40:1). *SEE CAPTIVITY.*

(6.) The return from Babylon does not appear to be employed as an aera; it is, however, reckoned from in Ezra (3:1, 8), as is the Exodus in the Pentateuch. *SEE EZRA.*



(7.) The aera of the Seleucidme is used in the first and second books of Maccabees. *SEE SELEUCUS.*

(8.) The liberation of the Jews from the Syrian yoke in the first year of Simon the Maccabee is stated to have been commemorated by an aera used in contracts and agreements (1 Macc. 13:41). The years 1, 2, and 3 on the coins ascribed to Simon, *SEE MONEY; SEE SHEKEL*, are probably of this aera, although it is related that the right of coining money with his own stamp was not conceded to him until somewhat later than its beginning (15:6), for it may be reasonably supposed either that Antiochus VII confirmed privileges before granted by his brother Demetrius II (comp. 15:5), or that he gave his sanction to money already issued (*Encycl. Brit.*, 8th ed., s.v. Numismatics, p. 379, 380). *SEE MACCABEES.*

(9.) *Regnal Years.* — By the Hebrews regnal years appear to have been counted from the beginning of the year, not from the day of the king's accession. Thus, if a king came to the throne in the last month of one year, reigned for the whole of the next year, and died in the first month of the third year, we might have dates in his first, second, and third years, although he governed for no more than thirteen or fourteen months. Any dates in the year of his accession before that event, or in the year of his death after it, would be assigned to the last year of his predecessor and the first of his successor. The same principle would apply to reckoning from aeras or important events, but the whole stated lengths of reigns or intervals would not be affected by it.

**II. Data.** — The historical part of Hebrew chronology is not less difficult than the technical. The information in the Bible is indeed direct rather than inferential, although there is very important evidence of the latter kind; but the present state of the numbers makes absolute certainty in some cases impossible. In addition to this difficulty, there are several gaps in the series of smaller numbers which we have no means of supplying with exactness. When, therefore, we can compare several of these smaller numbers with a larger number, or with independent evidence, we are frequently prevented from putting a conclusive test by the deficiencies in the first series. Lately some have laid great stress upon the frequent occurrence of the number 40, alleging that it and 70 are vague terms equivalent to "many," so that "40 years" or "70 years" would mean no more than "many years." *Primâ facie* this idea would seem reasonable, but on a further examination it will be seen that the details of some periods of 40 years are given, and show that



the number is not indefinite where it would at first especially seem to be so. Thus the 40 years in the wilderness can be divided into three periods: 1. From the Exodus to the sending out of the spies was about one year and a quarter (1 year, 1+x [2?] months, <sup><OR00></sup>Numbers 9:1; 10:11; comp. ver. 29, showing it was this year, and 13:20, proving that the search ended somewhat after midsummer); 2. The time of search, 40 days (<sup><OR35></sup>Numbers 13:25); 3. The time of the wandering until the brook Zered was crossed, 38 years (<sup><OR24></sup>Deuteronomy 2:14)-making altogether almost 39½ years. This perfectly accords with the date (yr. 40, m. 11, d. 1) of the address of Moses after the conquest of Sihon and Og (<sup><OR03></sup>Deuteronomy 1:3, 4), which was subsequent to the crossing of the brook Zered. So, again, David's reign of 40 years is divided into 7 years 6 months in Hebron, and 33 in Jerusalem (<sup><OR21></sup>2 Samuel 2:11; 5:5; <sup><OR04></sup>1 Chronicles 3:4; but <sup><OR21></sup>1 Kings 2:11, 7 years, omitting the months, and 33). This, therefore, cannot be an indefinite number, as some might conjecture from its following Saul's 40 years, and preceding Solomon's. The last two reigns, again, could not have been much more or less from the circumstances of the history. The occurrence of some round numbers, therefore, does not warrant our supposing the constant use of vague ones. *SEE NUMBER.*

The attempt to "correct" or improve the Hebrew chronology by means of the data lately deciphered from the Egyptian and Assyrian inscriptions has been a favorite method of late, as was in previous times a similar comparison with the relics of ancient records in heathen authors. But, unfortunately, these statements are so discrepant with one another, and the results vary so widely, as to be of very little practical value for such a purpose. The hieroglyphical data are too fragmentary and disconnected, as well as too uncertainly translated hitherto, to afford any definite chronological chain; and the cuneiform legends do not rise so early as the disputed part of Biblical chronology. *SEE EGYPT; SEE ASSYRIA.*

## Picture for Chronology 1

**1.** *From Adam to Abram's departure out of Haran.* — All the numerical data in the Bible for the chronology of this interval are comprised in two genealogical lists in Genesis, the first from Adam to Noah and his sons (<sup><OR03></sup>Genesis 5:3 to the end), and the second from Shem to Abram (<sup><OR10></sup>Genesis 11:10-26), and in certain passages in the same book (<sup><OR05></sup>Genesis 7:6, 11; 8:13; 9:28, 29; 11:32; 12:4). The Masoretic Hebrew text, the Septuagint Version, and the Samaritan Pentateuch greatly differ,

as may be seen by the following table, while the parallel [accounts of Josephus (*Ant.* 1:3, 3, and 4, 9; 6, 5; 7, 1) do not exactly tally with any of them. The Latin Vulgate strictly conforms to the Hebrew. The principal various readings are given between brackets, and the numbers which are *combined* from statements in the text are enclosed in a parenthesis. In this period there are a number of serious difficulties.

(1.) The number of generations in the Sept. is one in excess of the Hebrews and Samar, on account of the "Second Cainan," whom the best chronologers are agreed in rejecting as spurious. He is found elsewhere only in some copies at ~~1~~1 Chronicles 1:17, and in ~~1~~Luke 3:36. Josephus, Philo, and the earlier Christian writers appear, however, to have known nothing of him, and it is therefore probable either that he was first introduced by a copyist into the Gospel and thence into the Sept., or else that he was found in some MSS. of the Sept. and thence introduced into the Gospel, and afterwards into all other copies of the Sept. *SEE CAINAN.*

(2.) The remarkable discrepancies in nearly all the names as to the respective ages before and after the birth of the eldest son, while the totals given generally agree, has occasioned greater variety in the schemes of different Biblical chronologers than any or all other causes whatever. As no two of the lists correspond throughout, and as a high degree of antiquity undoubtedly belongs to them all, each has had its advocates as the true original. The cardinal importance of the subject demands a clear, full, and impartial examination of the arguments that bear upon their authority severally, as well as upon the accuracy of particular numbers. As a preliminary, it must be noted that the variations are the result of design, not accident, as is evident from the years before the birth of a son and the residues agreeing in their sums in almost all cases in the antediluvian generations, the exceptions, save one (Lamech), being apparently the result of necessity that lives should not overlap the date of the Flood (comp. Clinton, *Fasti Helln.* 1:285). We have no clew to the date or dates of the alterations, except that we can trace the Sept. form to the 1st century of the Christian aera, if not higher, and the Hebrews to the 4th century; if the Samar. numbers be as old as the text, we can assign them a higher antiquity than what is known as to the Hebrews. The little acquaintance most of the early Christian writers had with Hebrew makes it impossible to decide, on their evidence, that the variation did not exist when they wrote; the testimony of Josephus is here of more weight, but in his present text it shows contradiction, though preponderating in favor of the Sept. numbers.

A comparison of the lists would lead us to suppose, on internal evidence, that they had first two forms, and that the third version of them originated from these two. This supposed later version of the lists would seem to be the Samar., which certainly is less internally consistent, on the supposition of the original correctness of the numbers, than the other two. The cause of the alterations is most uncertain. It has indeed been conjectured that the Jews shortened the chronology, in order that an ancient prophecy that the Messiah should come in the sixth millenary of the world's age might not be known to be fulfilled in the advent of our Lord. The reason may be sufficient in itself, but it does not rest upon sufficient evidence. It is, however, worthy of remark, that in the apostolic age there were hot discussions respecting genealogies (~~scrip~~ Titus 3:9), which would seem to indicate that great importance was attached to them, perhaps also that the differences, or some difference, then existed. The different proportions of the generations and lives in the Sept. and Hebrews have been asserted to afford an argument in favor of the former. At a later period, however, when we find instances of longevity recorded in all versions, the time of marriage is not different from what it is at the present day, although there are some long generations. A stronger argument for the Sept., in view of the unity of the human race, is found in the long period required from the Flood to the Dispersion and the establishment of kingdoms. This supposition would, however, require that the patriarchal generations should be either exceptional or represent periods. For the former of these hypotheses we shall see there is some ground in the similar case of certain generations, just alluded to, from Abraham downwards. With respect to probability of accuracy, arising from the state of the text, the Hebrews certainly has the advantage. There is every reason to think that the Rabbins have been scrupulous in the extreme in making alterations; the Sept., on the other hand, shows signs of a carelessness that would almost permit change, and we have the probable interpolation of the post-diluvian Cainan. If, however, we consider the Samar. form of the lists as sprung from the other two, the Sept. would seem to be earlier than the Heb., since it is more probable that the antediluvian generations would have been shortened to a general agreement with the Heb., than that the post-diluvian would have been lengthened to suit the Sept.; for it is obviously most likely that a sufficient number of years having been deducted from the earlier generations, the operation was not carried on with the later. It is noticeable that the stated sums in the post-diluvian generations in the Samar. generally agree with the computed sums of the Heb., and not with those of the Sept.,

which would be explained by the theory of an adaptation of one of these two to the other, although it would not give us reason for supposing either form to be the earlier. The general presumption, on external grounds, would certainly be in favor of the Hebrews, both as being unquestionably the original from which the others (except perhaps the Samar., which, singularly enough, is the least probable, on other considerations, of all) are known to have been translated — and a version can never rise higher in authority than its source; and also because of the manifestly greater state of purity in which this text has been transmitted to us, in comparison with either of the others. *SEE SEPTUAGINT; SEE SAMARITAN PENTATEUCH.* The text of Josephus is too corrupt in its numbers to be at all relied upon, as may be seen from the slightest comparison of the sums in the title of the chapters with the detailed contents, having doubtless been tampered with by readers who used only the Sept. or Vulg. versions.

There can be no question that the author or last redactor of the book of Genesis intended that the narrative should be connected by this continuous series of time-marks. Jewish and Christian chronographers accepted the statements unquestioned, and held that the series of years of the world thus formed, from the creation of the first man to the death of Joseph, accorded with the truth of facts. The import and the authority of the numerical statements were to them unimpeachable; the only question was that which related to their genuine form. And supposing the inquirer to have decided in favor of the Greek text, even so there are diversities to be discussed, for the Sept. has various readings of some of the numbers both before and after the Flood; in particular, while most of the copies have a second Cainan after Arphaxad, with a descent of 130 years, this addition is ignored by other copies and by important authorities (see Browne, *Ordo Saecl.* § 307, and note; Mill, *On the Descent and Parentage of the Savior*, p. 143 sq.). These considerations will account for the enormous discrepancy which appears in the estimates formed by different chronologists of the number of years contained in the book of Genesis. The Hebrew numbers, from Adam to Terah's 70th year, make 1656 *plus* 292 years; the Sept., with its various readings, 2242 or 2262 *plus* 942, or 1042, or 1072, or 1172; the Samaritan, 1307 *plus* 942. This last, however, need not come into consideration, since it is well understood that the Samaritan text, here as elsewhere, is merely fabricated from the Greek (Hengstenberg, *Auth. des Pent.* 1, 32 sq.); and those who treat it as an independent authority (e.g. Lepsius, *Chronol. der AEG.* p. 397 sq.) only show themselves ignorant of

the results of criticism on this subject. Of course the Sept., in one or more of its enumerations, would be followed by those early inquirers who had access to that text only; the earliest extant estimate, by Demetrius, an Alexandrine Jew of the third century B.C. (quoted from Alexander Polyhistor by Eusebius, *Praep. Evang.* 9:21, 12), makes the interval from Adam to the birth of Abraham 2262 *plus* 1072. Josephus certainly did not follow the Sept.; his numbers in the generations before and after the Flood have been forced into conformity with the Greek by a later and unskillful hand, which betrays itself by leaving its work incomplete (Browne, *Ordo Saecul.* § 319-321). As the chronology of Dr. Hales (which some still accept as authoritative) professes to be based on the Sept., rectified by the aid of Josephus, it ought to be known that the text of this author, besides having been palpably vitiated in this portion of it (*Ant.* 1:3, 4; 6, 5), swarms with gross inconsistencies, caused, it would seem, by his adopting, without reflection, statements belonging to different chronological systems (see Niebuhr, *Geschichte Assurs u. Babels*, p. 347 sq.). Of the Christian writers of the first three centuries Origen alone knew Hebrew, and he first leaves the Sept.; but only in part; Jerome, the learned Hebraist, declares for "the Hebrew verity," and as his recension of the old italic version forms the basis of the Sixtine Vulgate, which a canon of Trent declares, under anathema, to be canonical and infallible, the Hebrew chronology is virtually perpetuated in the churches of the Roman obedience. The Greek Church still holds by the Sept. Our own popular Bible chronology (Usher's, which Bishop Lloyd attached to the margin of our Bibles) follows the Hebrew. During the last century there has been a disposition, in some of our own and the Continental writers, to abandon the Hebrew for the Sept., chiefly prompted by the wish to enlarge the period before Abraham, so as to allow more time for the growth of nations after the Flood, and (more recently) to facilitate the "connection of sacred and profane chronology" in the earliest ages of mankind, especially with respect to Manetho's Egyptian chronology. The question of probability and inducement — to enlarge on the part of the Alexandrine Jews (comp. Bunsen, *AEg. St.* 5:68), to contract on the part of the Masoretes — is discussed in Browne's *Ordo Saeculorum*, § 308 sq.; and the artificial processes by which the Sept. numbers are formed from the Hebrew, and not *vice versa*, have been exposed by the same writer, *ib.* § 313 sq., and further in *The Cycles of Egyptian Chronology*, § 72 (Arnold's *Theological Critic*, 2:145 sq.). The fundamental importance of the subject in Biblical chronology requires a more exact and detailed examination than we find in the Dictionaries of

Smith and Kitto, from which the preceding investigations are chiefly taken, as are also portions of subsequent discussions in this article.

**(a.)** *General Internal Evidence.* — It is a noticeable fact that in the antediluvian portion the Hebrews is the only list (unless we except that of Josephus, which has no independent value) in which every number is corroborated by the corresponding one in some one or other of the rest; while in the post-diluvian line, after the exclusion of the second Cainan, it stands almost alone: the preponderance of evidence from this method of comparison is therefore about balanced. Again, it is a most suspicious circumstance in the Samar. that its numbers, where there is any variation, regularly lessen the period prior to parentage, as the lineage descends, by removing the irregular hundred years before the Flood, and annexing it to the ages below that point; while the Sept. (and Josephus) attain a similar uniformity by adding one hundred years to the deficient numbers throughout; whereas the Hebrews exhibits no such marks of gradation, but presents a natural irregularity in this respect, although the numbers, on the whole, decrease as the period of longevity contracts; while, on the other hand, if either of the other lists be assumed as the prototype, no possible reason can be assigned or imagined for the arbitrary enlargement or diminution here and there of a particular number. The briefer scheme of the Hebrew post-diluvian genealogy is also exactly sustained by the sum 367 (i.e. the birth of Abram 292 years from the Deluge +75 years to his departure from Haran) definitely given by Josephus, in opposition to his own magnified numbers in detail, although the weight of this argument is affected by the existence of various readings of that aggregate in his text. We must not omit to observe that those who espouse the schedule transmitted by the Sept. and Josephus, as affording the longer space between the Creation and the Deluge for the extensive propagation of the antediluvian race, and also after the Flood for the dissemination of mankind into powerful nations in the earliest times, herein only defeat their own argument; for it is obvious that, so long as the entire length of each patriarch's life remains unchanged, by whatever amount the period prior to marriage is augmented, just so much time is taken from the remainder for procreation: the earlier the age of paternity, the greater will naturally be the increase of population in a given number of generations. — The rapid advance in adolescence after the Deluge, so marked in the Hebrews numbers, was doubtless providential for the purpose of replenishing the earth as speedily as possible after that catastrophe.

**(b.) Individual Discrepancies.** — In addition to the post-diluvian Cainan noticed above, the following names appear to furnish decided proof of the superior trustworthiness of the Hebrews list (see the conclusive treatise of Michaelis on this subject, translated in the *Amer. Bib. Repos.*, 2d ser., 6:114 sq.; also some judicious remarks by Dr. Pond in the *Meth. Quart. Review*, July, 1867).

[1.] In the cases of Adam and Seth, the addition of 100 years to their age before paternity disturbs the average ratio between the season of growth and the total life, which in man, as in other animals, is a well-established proportion. These two patriarchs passed nearly one quarter of their lives childless, although their immediate successors were blessed with offspring when they had advanced but about one tenth to one twelfth in life. Was the command to “increase and multiply and fill the earth” so much less urgent in the first centuries of the world than subsequently? In the numbers assigned to the first two generations, moreover, the various readings found in the text of Josephus nearly destroy the support which it gives to the Sept., leaving the balance of evidence decidedly in favor of the tallying numbers in the Hebrews and Samar.; and in the next three generations there is at least an equipoise between the authorities, which are arrayed in the same manner.

[2.] The Hebrews numbers in the case of Jared are sustained by all the other lists except the Samar., which not only deducts the century from his minority, but also arbitrarily curtails his subsequent years by a different amount (25 years), evidently in order to force the total life into conformity with the plan of gradual reduction below the length of the preceding generation. In the next name, that of Enoch, the Hebrews and Samar. again appear in unison against the Sept. and Josephus, the testimony of the last being impaired by the corrupt state of his numbers at this point.

[3.] The numbers given under Methuselah and Lamech, however, most decisively betray, according to the settled laws of internal criticism, marks of intentional corruption in all but the Hebrews list. Not only are the years of each of the others totally unsupported by one another, where they differ from this, under both these names, and also embarrassed by various readings of a glaring character, but a comparison of them with the date of the Deluge shows unmistakably that they were altered so as to place the demise of these two patriarchs “high and dry” beyond the reach of this event. Those who have sneeringly remarked that, according to the Hebrew



chronology of Usher, "Methuselah was drowned in Noah's Flood by act of British Parliament" (which sanctioned that prelate's scheme by authorizing its insertion in the margin of the English Bible), are not only incorrect in that particular (for Methuselah [q.v.], according to the Hebrews numbers, died a full month before the Deluge began), but they reason uncritically, inasmuch as so palpable an objection only shows the honesty of the Masoretic editors, who allowed it to remain upon the face of their text, when they might, by a slight alteration, so quietly have obviated it. The ingenious tinkers of the Samar. and Greek chronologies, on the contrary, have carefully attempted to remove this stumbling-block from the way of their version by a violent modification of the numbers in question, docking off here, and splicing on there, to suit circumstances. Yet, like forgers usually, they have, after all, fallen into confusion, and convicted themselves by their own traces; the Samar. and most of the readings of the Greek copies do but make the year of the death of these patriarchs coincide with that of the Flood, while the very suspicious fact remains that the lives of these two alone (besides that of Jared in the Samar.) are abbreviated not only in comparison with the longer and more difficult dates of the other lists, but suddenly, as if for a special purpose, between instances of greater longevity immediately before (excluding Enoch, who was translated alive) and after. The Hebrews list can alone be defended at this point on critical grounds.

[4.] The general agreement in greater age assigned to the post-diluvian patriarchs by the Samar. and Greek lists is not more difficult to explain to the advantage of the Hebrews. If the former be the original form, no reason can be assigned for the change; but if the latter be assumed as giving the genuine numbers, it is easy to perceive how readily they may have been augmented in order to swell the primitive aera of repopulation after the Flood into a nearer conformity with the extravagant mythical periods of early heathen histories. With the Egyptians, among whom the Sept. is known to have originated, the influence of which may plainly be traced in the present account of Josephus (and possibly, through some indirect channel, that of the Samar. also), this temptation would be peculiarly strong. The internal evidence here, however, it must be confessed, is rather in favor of the Samar. numbers, corroborated as they are throughout as to the age of paternity by those of the Sept. and (but less accurately) Josephus; and we might even be inclined to adopt them, as consistent in gradation with those preferred in the antediluvian portion, did not the

manifest want of authority in the non-Hebrew schemes for that part cast a strong doubt of accuracy over them in this part likewise. This suspicion is confirmed by the want of harmony between the Samar. and Sept. as to the post-diluvian ages after paternity, the latter list conforming in this respect quite closely to the Hebrews. If we turn to the evidence of ancient records and tradition, we find the numbers of the Sept. confirmed rather than those of the Hebrew. The history and civilization of Egypt, as well as of Assyria and Babylonia, reach to a time about as early as the Hebrew date of the Flood. Moreover, the concurrent evidence of antiquity carries the origin of Gentile civilization to the Noachian races. On the acceptance, therefore, of the Hebrew numbers we must place (as we easily may) the dispersion of nations, *SEE ETHNOLOGY*, very soon after the Deluge. Important aid in this approximation of sacred with profane chronology is afforded by the considerable extension of the Biblical period of the Judges, noticed below, beyond that fixed by Usher.

(3.) An important rectification of the last generation is required in all the lists. According to them, it would appear that Terah was 70 years old at Abram's birth. "Terah lived seventy years, and begat Abram, Nahor, and Haran" (<sup><0113></sup>Genesis 11:26). It is afterwards said that Terah went from Ur of the Chaldees to Haran, and died there at the age of 205 years [Samar. 145] (<sup><0113></sup>Genesis 11:31, 32); and the departure of Abram from Haran to Canaan is then narrated (comp. <sup><400></sup>Acts 7:4), his age being stated to have been at that time 75 years (<sup><0113></sup>Genesis 12:1-5). Usher therefore conjectures that Terah was 130 years old at Abram's birth (205- 75 130), and supposes the latter not to have been the eldest son, but mentioned first on account of his eminence, as is Shem in several places (<sup><0052></sup>Genesis 5:32; 6:10; 7:13; 9:18; 10:1), who yet appears to have been the third son of Noah, and certainly not the eldest (<sup><0121></sup>Genesis 10:21). To this it has been objected, however, that it seems scarcely probable that if Abram had been born to his father at the age of 130 years, he should have asked in wonder, "Shall [a child] be born unto him that is a hundred years old? and shall Sarah, that is ninety years old, bear?" (<sup><0177></sup>Genesis 17:17). But the force of this objection is almost entirely obviated when it is considered that Terah had previously had a son, whereas Abraham at the time of his observation was altogether childless. It is better, therefore, to adopt this arrangement, than to make an arbitrary change in the numbers, as the Samar. apparently has done.

2. *From Abram's departure out of Haran to the Exodus.* — The length of this period is stated by Paul as 430 years from the promise to Abraham to

the giving of the Law (<sup><8817></sup>Galatians 3:17), the first event being held to be that recorded in <sup><0111></sup>Genesis 12:1-5. The same number of years is given in Exodus (<sup><0124></sup>Exodus 12:40, 41), where the Hebrew reads, “Now the sojourning of the children of Israel who dwelt in Egypt [was] four hundred and thirty years. And it came to pass at the end of the four hundred and thirty years, even the self-same day it came to pass, that all the hosts of the Lord went out from the land of Egypt.” Here the Sept. and Samar. add after “in Egypt” the words “and in Canaan,” while the Alexandrian and other MSS. of the former also add after “the children of Israel” the words “and their fathers.” It seems most reasonable to regard both these additions as glosses; if they are excluded, the passage appears to make the duration of the sojourn in Egypt 430 years, but this is not an absolutely certain conclusion. The “soj<sup>o</sup>urning” might well include the period after the promise to Abraham, while that patriarch and his descendants “sojourned in the land of promise as [in] a strange country” (<sup><8109></sup>Hebrews 11:9), for it is not positively said “the sojourning of the children of Israel in Egypt,” but “who dwelt in Egypt.” As for the very day of close being that of commencement, it might refer either to Abraham’s entrance or to the time of the promise. A third passage is the divine declaration to Abraham of the future history of his children: “Know of a surety that thy seed shall be a stranger in a land [that is] not their’s, and shall serve them; and they shall afflict them four hundred years; and also that nation, whom they shall serve, will I judge; and afterward shall they come out with great substance” (<sup><0153></sup>Genesis 15:13, 14; comp. <sup><4106></sup>Acts 7:6, 7). The four hundred years cannot be held to be the period of oppression without a denial of the historical character of the narrative of that time, but can only be supposed to mean the time from this declaration to the Exodus. It is also noticeable that after the citation given above the events of the whole sojourn are repeated, showing that this was the period spoken of, and perhaps, therefore, the period defined (<sup><0155></sup>Exodus 15:15, 16) as “the fourth generation.”

But the question, From what point of time are these years reckoned? has been variously answered, and chronological schemes vary accordingly. Some, as the Sept., Josephus, the Jewish Chronology, and most Christian writers, assign the period to the entire sojourn in Canaan and Egypt, beginning either with the Call of Abraham (Genesis 12), or the Promise (15); others date it from the close of the period during which the Promises were made (Perizonius, Schöttgen); some (as Bengel) from the birth of

Jacob; while numerous recent writers give the whole period to the sojourn in Egypt, reckoned from the descent of Jacob and the patriarchs into that country (see Knobel, in loc.; Browne, *Ordo Seec.* § 284-288). The genealogy of Moses is inconsistent with so long an interval as 430 years between Jacob's 130th and Moses' 80th year; for we learn that between Levi and Moses were only two descents — indeed, by the mother's side (Joehebed, "daughter" of Levi), only one; and as the sum of the lives of Levi, Kohath, and Amram is 137+133+137, it follows that from the birth of Levi to the birth of Moses must be considerably less than 407 years. So also the other genealogies, in which (with one exception, and that only apparent) we constantly arrive at contemporaries of Moses in the 4th, 5th, and 6th descent from the twelve patriarchs (Browne, *Ordo Seec.* § 284-288). Hence we must measure this interval of 430 years (~~<BIB7>~~Galatians 3:17) from the call of Abraham, in his 76th year (~~<BIB4>~~Genesis 12:4), after the death of Terah (~~<BIB6>~~Acts 7:4; ~~<BIB2>~~Genesis 11:32), to the Exodus.

The narrative affords the following data, which we place under two periods — that from Abram's leaving Haran to Jacob's entering Egypt, and that from Jacob's entering Egypt to the Exodus.

<b>(a.)</b> Age of Abram on leaving Haran	75 yrs.	
Age of Abram at Isaac's birth		100
Difference	25	
Age of Isaac at Jacob's birth	60	
Age of Jacob on entering Egypt	130	
Total	<b>215</b>	
<b>(b.) (1.)</b> Age of Levi on entering Egypt		cir. 45
Residue of his life	92	
Oppression after the death of Jacob's sons ( <del>&lt;BIB5&gt;</del> Exodus 1:6, 7 sq.)	?	
Age of Moses at Exodus	80	
Total	172	
<b>(2.)</b> Age of Joseph on Jacob's entering Egypt		39
Residue of his life	71	
Oppression	?	
Age of Moses at Exodus	80	
Total	151	

These data make up at least 387 or 366 years, to which some addition must be made, since it appears that all Joseph's generation died before the oppression commenced, and it is probable that it had begun some time before the birth of Moses. The sum we thus obtain cannot be far different from 430 years, a period for the whole sojourn that these data must thus be held to confirm.

The genealogies relating to the time of the dwelling in Egypt, if continuous, as there is much reason to suppose that some are, do not seem repugnant to this scheme; but, on the other hand, only one of them, that of Joshua, in 1 Chronicles (<sup><13073></sup>1 Chronicles 7:23, 25, 26, 27), *if a succession*, can be reconciled with the opinion that dates the 430 years from Jacob's entering into Egypt. Another important historical point of evidence is the increase of the Israelites from the few souls who went with Jacob into Egypt, and Joseph and his sons, to the six hundred thousand men who came out at the Exodus. At the former date the following are enumerated: "besides Jacob's sons' wives," Jacob, his twelve sons and one daughter (13), his fifty-one grandsons: and one granddaughter (52), and his four great-grandsons, making, with the patriarch himself, seventy souls; (<sup><04418></sup>Genesis 46:8-27).

**SEE JACOB.** The generation to which children would be born about this date may thus be held to have been of at least 51 pairs, since all: are males except one, who probably married a cousin. This computation takes no account of polygamy, which was certainly practiced at the time by the Hebrews. This first generation must, except there were at the time other female grandchildren of Jacob besides the one mentioned (comp. <sup><04417></sup>Genesis 46:7), have taken foreign wives, and it is reasonable to suppose the same to have been constantly done afterwards, though probably in a less degree. We cannot, therefore, found our calculation solely on these 51 pairs, but must allow for polygamy and foreign marriages. These admissions being made, and the especial blessing which attended the people borne in mind, the interval of about 215 years does not seem too short for the increase. — On the whole, we have no hesitation in accepting the 430 years as the length of the interval from Abram's leaving Haran to the Exodus.

**3. From the Exodus to the Foundation of Solomon's Temple.** — There is but one passage from which we obtain the length of this period as a whole (see Walther, in Baumgarten's *Sammlungen*, 1748, 2, 313-488). It is that in which the Foundation of the Temple is dated in the 480th (Heb.), or 440th (Sept.) year after the Exodus, in the 4th year 2d month of Solomon's

reign (<sup><100></sup>1 Kings 6:1). This sum we have first to compare with the detailed numbers. These are as follows:

- (a.) From the Exodus to the death of Moses, 40 years.
- (b.) Leadership of Joshua,  $7+x$  years.
- (c.) Interval between Joshua's death and the First Servitude,  $y$  years.
- (d.) Servitudes and rule of Judges until Eli's death, 430 years.
- (e.) Period from Eli's death to Saul's accession,  $20+z$  years.
- (f.) Saul's reign, 40 years.
- (g.) David's reign, 40 years.
- (h.) Solomon's reign to Foundation of Temple, 3 years. Sum,  $580+x+y+z$  years. It is possible to obtain approximatively the length of the three wanting numbers.

(1.) Joshua's age at the Exodus was at least 20 years (<sup><044></sup>Numbers 14:29, 30), and at his death, 110; therefore the utmost length of his rule must be  $110 - (20 + 40) = 50$  years. The duration of Joshua's government is limited by the circumstance that Caleb's lot was apportioned to him in the 7th year of the occupation, and therefore of Joshua's rule, when he was 85 years old, and that he conquered the lot after Joshua's death. Caleb cannot be supposed to have been a very old man on taking his portion, and it is unlikely that he would have waited long before attacking the heathen, who held it, to say nothing of the portion being his claimed reward for not having feared the Anakim who dwelt there, a reward promised him of the Lord by Moses and claimed of Joshua, who alone of his fellow-spies had shown the same faith and courage (<sup><044></sup>Numbers 14:24; <sup><013></sup>Deuteronomy 1:36; <sup><0346></sup>Joshua 14:6 *ad fin.*; 15:13-19; <sup><0709></sup>Judges 1:9-15, 20). The least length of Joshua's rule would be about 10 years. Josephus (*Ant.* v. 1, 29) fixes it midway between these limits, or at 25 years, which may be adopted as the probable length.

(2.) The interval between Joshua's death and the First Servitude is limited by the history of Othniel. After Joshua there is the time of the elders who overlived him, then a period of disobedience and idolatry, a servitude of 8 years, deliverance by Othniel the son of Kenaz, the nephew of Caleb, and rest for 40 years, until Othniel's death. He was already a warrior when Caleb conquered his lot; he lived to deliver Israel from the Mesopotamian oppressor, and died at the end of the subsequent 40 years of rest. Supposing Othniel to have been 30 years old at the time of his first exploits, and 110 years at his death, then  $110 - (30 + 18 + 8 + 40) = 24$  years

would remain for the interval in question. Josephus (*Ant.* 6:5, 4) reasonably fixes it at 18 years, which cannot be far from correct.

(3.) The residue of Samuel's judgeship after the 20 years from Eli's: death, ending with the solemn fast and victory at Mizpeh, can scarcely have much exceeded 20 years; Josephus (*Ant.* 6:13, 5) assigns it a length of 12 years. Samuel must have been still young at the time of Eli's death, and he died near the close of Saul's reign (~~1~~ Samuel 25:1; 28:3). If he were 20 years old at the former date, and judged for 12 years after the victory at Mizpeh, he would have been near 85 years old (20+20+12 +32=84) at his death, which appears to have been a long period of life at that time. We thus arrive at the following numbers for the various portions of this period:

### YEARS. YEARS.

Wandering in the Desert.	<b>40</b>	Fifth Servitude	<b>18</b>
Joshua's Rule	<b>25</b>	Jephthah's Judgeship	<b>6</b>
Surviving Elders	<b>18</b>	Ibzan's Judgeship	<b>7</b>
First Servitude	<b>8</b>	Elon's Judgeship	<b>10</b>
Othniel's Judgeship	<b>40</b>	Abdon's Judgeship	<b>8</b>
Second Servitude	<b>18</b>	Sixth Servitude	<b>40</b>
Ehud's Judgeship (including Shamgar's)	<b>80</b>	Samson's Judgeship	<b>20</b>
.	.	Eli's Judgeship.	<b>40</b>
Third Servitude	<b>20</b>	Seventh Servitude	<b>20</b>
Barak's Judgeship	<b>40</b>	Samuel's Judgeship	<b>12</b>
Fourth Servitude	<b>7</b>	Saul's Reign	<b>40</b>
Gideon's Judgeship	<b>40</b>	David's Reign	<b>40</b>
Abimelech's Reign	<b>3</b>	Solomon's first years	<b>3</b>
Tola's Judgeship	<b>23</b>	Total	<b>618</b>
Jair's Judgeship	<b>22</b>	.	

Two independent large numbers seem to confirm this result. One is in Paul's address at Antioch of Pisidia, where, after speaking of the Exodus and the 40 years in the desert, he adds: "And when he had destroyed seven nations in the land of Chanaan, he divided their land unto them by lot. And



after that he gave [unto them] judges about the space of four hundred and fifty years, until Samuel the prophet. And afterward they desired a king” (~~443B~~ Acts 13:19, 20, 21). This interval of 450 years maybe variously explained—as commencing with Othniel’s deliverance and ending with Eli’s death, a period which the numbers of the earlier books of the Bible, if added together, make 442 years; or as commencing with the First Servitude, 8 years more, which would be exactly 450 years; or with Joshua’s death, which would raise these numbers by about 18 years; or again, it may be held to end at Saul’s accession; which would raise the numbers given respectively by about 32 years. However explained, this sum of 450 years supports the authority of the detailed numbers as forming an essentially correct measure of the period; and the precise coincidence with one of the foregoing modes of computation seems to show that it was that which Paul adopted. The other large number occurs in Jephthah’s message to the king of the Children of Ammon, where the period during which Israel had held the land of the Amorites from the first conquest either up to the beginning of the servitude from which they were about to be freed, or up to the very time, is given as 300 years (~~0712B~~ Judges 11:26). The above detailed numbers, including the uncertain periods, would make these intervals respectively 344 and 362 years. Here, therefore, there appears to be an agreement, although not positive, since the meaning might be either three centuries, as a vague sum, or about 300 years. So far as the evidence of the numbers goes, we must decide in favor of the longer interval, from the Exodus to the building of the first Temple, in preference to the period of 480 or 440 years.

The evidence of the genealogies has been held by some to sustain a different conclusion. These lists, as they now stand, would, if of continuous generations be decidedly in favor of an interval of about 300, 400, or even 500 years, some being much shorter than others. It is, however, impossible to reduce them to consistency with each other without arbitrarily altering some, and the result, with those who have followed them as the safest guides, has been the adoption of the shortest of the numbers just given, about 300 years. The evidence of the genealogies may therefore be considered as probably leading to the rejection of all numerical statements, but as perhaps less inconsistent with that of 480 or 440 years than with the rest.

The statement in ~~1K01~~ 1 Kings 6:1, is accepted by Hillel, the author of the modern Jewish chronology, who makes the 480 years one of the elements

for the construction of his Mundane aera; by Usher also, by Petavius, who, however, dates the period from the Exode, and by many others. In more recent times, Hengstenberg (*Authentie des Pentateuchs*, 2, 23 sq.), Hofmann (in the *Studien u. Kritiken*, 1838), Thenius (*On* <sup><1000></sup>1 Kings 6:1), Tiele (*Chronol. des A. T.*), Gehringer (*Ueber die biblische AËre*), Niebuhr (*Gesch. Assurs u. fab.*), uphold the statement as historical. But though this measure, by bridging over the interval from Moses to Solomon, enables the chronologist, when he has formed his mundane series down to the Exode, to assign the year *anno mundi* of 4 Solomon and so of 1 David, or, having traced the reckoning B.C. up to 1 Solomon, to give the year B.C. of the Exode, the whole tract of time occupied by the Judges is still loose at either end, and needs much management to define its bearings. For the items actually enumerated, being (even if the entire 40 years of Eli and the 20 years of the Ark at Kirjath-Jearim be included in the 390 of the Judges)  $47+390+43=480$ , no room is left for Joshua and the elders, Samuel and Saul. Accordingly, the chronologists who accept this measure are obliged to resort to violent expedients — the assumption that some of the servitudes were contemporary, and others, which it is clearly impossible to exalt above the rank of ingenious conjectures. But the number 480 is, in fact, open to grave suspicion. The Sept. has instead of it 440. Josephus takes no notice of either, and on various occasions makes the interval 592, 612, and 632 years; the early Christian chronographers also ignore the measure — thus Theophil. Antioch. reckons 498 to 1 David; Clem. Alex. to 1 Saul, 490; Africanus, 677 years. Paul's enumeration, in <sup><4138></sup>Acts 13:18-21, also proves at least this, that Jews in his time reckoned the interval in a way which is inconsistent with the statement in <sup><1000></sup>1 Kings 6:1. He gives from the Exode to 1 David  $40+450+40=530$ ; therefore to 4 Solomon, 573 years. Paul's term of 450 years is evidently the interval from the First Servitude to the end of those 20 years of the Ark, <sup><902></sup>1 Samuel 7:2 (composed of  $390+40+20$ ). Clinton (*Fasti Hell.* 1, 312) dates the 450 from the partition of lands (47th after Exode), *assumes* 20 years for Joshua and the elders, and another term of 12 years between the 20 years of the Ark (<sup><902></sup>1 Samuel 7:2) and the 40 years which he gives entire to Saul, thus making the sum 612 years. It remains only to state that the text in <sup><1000></sup>1 Kings 6:1, cannot be impugned on strictly critical grounds, excepting the various reading in the Sept.; the other versions and the Heb. MSS. are uniform in their testimony: that date, therefore, must be summarily rejected as an early interpolation, as is done by most modern chronologers. For a further examination of the period in question, *SEE JUDGES*. For the value

of Egyptian dates of the Exode, see below. (See also in the *Stud. a. Kritiken*, 1863, 4.)

**4. From the Foundation of Solomon's Temple to its Destruction.** — We have now reached a period in which the differences of chronologers are no longer to be measured by centuries, but by tens of years and even single years, and towards the close of which almost perfect accuracy is attainable. The most important numbers in the Bible are here generally stated more than once, and several means are afforded by which their accuracy can be tested. The principal of these tests are the statement of kings' ages at their accessions, the double dating of the accessions of kings of Judah in the reigns of kings of Israel and the converse, and the double reckoning by the years of kings of Judah and of Nebuchadnezzar. Of these tests the most valuable is the second, which extends through the greater part of the period under consideration, and prevents our making any very serious error in computing its length. The notices of kings of Egypt and Assyria, contemporary with Hebrew sovereigns during this period, are also of importance, and are likely to be more so, when, as we may expect, the chronological places of all these contemporaries are more nearly determined. All records, therefore, tending to fix the chronologies of Egypt and Assyria, as well as of Babylonia, in these times, are of great value, from their bearing on Hebrew chronology. At present the most important of such records is Ptolemy's Canon, from which no sound chronologer will venture to deviate. In the Biblical statements the number and importance of inconsistencies has usually been much exaggerated, since several supposed disagreements depend upon the non-recognition of the mode of reckoning regnal years from the commencement of the year, and not from the day of the king's accession; still a few difficulties cannot be resolved without the supposition that numbers have been altered by copyists. Many of the dates are reckoned from a joint accession of several of the kings with their respective fathers, and a few are even posthumous. Two interregna in the kingdom of Israel; have generally been supposed, and none others are necessary; namely, one of 11 years, between Jeroboam II and Zachariah, and the other of 8 years, between Pekah and Hoshea. The former supposition might seem to receive some support from; the words of the prophet Hosea (10:3, 7, and perhaps 15), which, however, may only imply a lax government, and the great power of the Israelite princes and captains, as an absolute anarchy. The following table exhibits the length of this period as thus adjusted, according to the double line of kings; for the

details of the chronology, *SEE ISRAEL (KINGDOM OF)*; *SEE JUDAH (KINGDOM OF)*.

	<b>JUDAH</b>	<b>YEARS</b>
Solomon (residue)	37	
Rehoboam	17	
Abijah	3	
Asa	41	
Jehoshaphat	25	
Jehoram II	3	
Ahaziah II	1	
<b>Synchronism</b>	<b>90</b>	
Athaliah	6	
Jehoash I	40	
Amaziah	20	
Uzziah	52	
Jotham	16	
Ahaz	14	
Hezekiah (beginning)	6	
<b>Synchronism</b>	<b>253</b>	
Hezekiah (residue)	23	
Manasseh	55	
Amon	2	
Josiah	31	
Jehoahaz II	0	
Jehoiakim	11	
Jehoiachin	0	
Zedekiah	10	
<b>Babylonian Captivity</b>	<b>385</b>	

#### **ISRAEL — YEARS**

Jeroboam I	21
Nadab	1
Baasha	23
Elah	1
Zimri	0

Tibni	4	
Omri (alone)	7	
Ahab	20	
Ahaziah I	1	
Jehoram I.	12	
<b>Synchronism</b>	<b>90</b>	
Jehu	28	
Jehoahaz I	16	
Jehoash II	16	
Jeroboam II	41	
Interregnum	11	
Zachariah	1	
Shallun	1	
Menahem	10	
Pekahiah	2	
Pekah	20	
Interregnum	8	
Hoshea		9
<b>Assyrian Captivity..</b>	<b>253</b>	

**Total**                      **422 years of duration of Temple.**

The gross sum total of the regnal years of Judah, to the year of the Assyrian Captivity, is 260, as the numbers stand in the text; of the Ten Tribes, 243; but, as they may be corrected by synchronal data, only 257 and 238 years respectively. This deficit of 19 years has been by most chronologists taken to imply that the two gaps in the Israelite succession, which are brought to light by the synchronisms, were intervals of anarchy, filled up (as above) by interregna — one of 11 years, between the death of Jeroboam II, in 27 Uzziah and the accession of Zachariah, in 88 Uzziah; the other, of 8 years, between the death of Pekah, in 4 Ahaz, and the accession of Hoshea, in the 12th of the same reign. But later writers prefer to liquidate the reckoning by assuming an error in the regnal years of Jeroboam II and Pekah. Thus Ewald, making the difference 21 years, gives these kings 53 and 29 years respectively, instead of 41 and 20 (*Gesch. des Volkes Isr.* 3. 1, p. 261313); Thenius (*Die BB. der Konige*, p. 346), by a more facile emendation, makes the numbers 51 and 30 (an for am, and for b); J. V. Gumpach (*Zeitrech. d. Bab. u. Assy.*), though reducing the total amount to 241 years, gives Pekah 29 years and retains the 41 of Jeroboam;

Lepsius (*Chronol. der AEG.*) makes the reigns 52 and 30; and Bunsen, *AEgyptens Stelle*, bk. 4, p. 381, 395, 402) makes Jeroboam reign 61 years, and retains for Pekah his 20 years. Movers (*Die Phonizier*, 2:1, 153), by a peculiar method of treatment, reduces the reigns of Israel to 233 years, and brings the reigns of Judah into conformity with this sum by making Jehoram co-regent with Jehoshaphat 4 years, Uzziah with Amaziah 12, and Jotham with Uzziah 11 years. How arbitrary, and therefore unjustifiable, such reduction of numbers is, must be evident to every critical eye. The supposition of co-regencies is only allowable in order to explain the apparent discrepancies in some of the kings' years, but in no case are they suffered to disturb the length of reigns, as given in the text. See each name in its alphabetical place in this Cyclopaedia. (See Wolff, in the *Theol. Stud. u. Krit.* 1858, 4).

**5. From the Destruction of Solomon's Temple to the Return from Babylon.** — The determination of the length of this period depends upon the date of the return to Palestine. The decree of Cyrus leading to that event was made in the first year of his reign (<sup>4500B</sup>Ezra 1:1), which, if it date from his conquest of Babylon (q.v.), as determined by Ptolemy's Canon, would be B.C. 538; but the decree in question appears to date from his personal superseding of "Darius the Mede" (q.v.) at Babylon, B.C. 536, where the edict was evidently issued. **SEE CYRUS.** Others date the decree from the earlier point, and suppose that so great a migration must have occupied much time; they therefore allow two years as not too long an interval for its complete accomplishment after the promulgation of the decree.

Another method of arriving at the time in question is by means of fixing the termination of the so-called "70 years' captivity." Two numbers, held by some to be identical, must here be considered. One is the period of 70 years, during which the tyranny of Babylon over Palestine and the East generally was to last, prophesied by Jeremiah (25), and the other, the 70 years of the city's overthrow and utter depopulation (<sup>1432E</sup>2 Chronicles 36:21; <sup>2700E</sup>Daniel 9:2). The commencement of the former period is plainly the 1st year of Nebuchadnezzar (as viceroy), and 4th (according to <sup>2700E</sup>Daniel 1:1, the 3d complete) year of Jehoiakim (<sup>2250E</sup>Jeremiah 25:1), B.C. 606, when the successes of the king of Babylon began (46:2), and the miseries of Jerusalem (25:22); and its conclusion will be the fall of Babylon (ver. 26). The famous 70 years of captivity would seem to be the same period as this, since it was to terminate with the return of the captives (<sup>2290E</sup>Jeremiah 29:10). The second period of 70 years dates from the burning

of the Temple, late in B.C. 588 (<sup>3601</sup>Ezekiel 40:1), and terminates with its complete reconstruction, some time in B.C. 517 (<sup>3615</sup>Ezra 6:15). The two passages in Zechariah, which speak of such an interval as one of desolation (1:12), and during which fasts connected with the captivity had been kept (7:5), are quite reconcilable with this explanation. These two passages are of the 2d and 4th years of Darius Hystaspis, in whose 6th year the Temple was finished.

The details of this period are made up of the following Babylonian reigns, from profane sources:

Nebuchadnezzar (viceroysip)	—	18
Nebuchadnezzar (residue)	26—	27
“Evil-Merodach”	2—	2
Nerikolassar	4—	4
“Belshazzar,” vice Nabonned	17—	17
<i>Capture of Babylon</i>		68
“Darius the Mede,” or Cyaxare	2—	2.
<b>Cyrus’s Decree</b>		<b>70</b>
Cyrus (residue)		6
“Ahasuerus,” or Cambyses	8	
“Artaxerxes,” or Smerdis	0	
“Darius,” i.e. Hystaspis (beginning)	5	
<b>Temple rebuilt</b>		<b>70</b>

6. From this point downward, the coincidence with Grecian and Roman annals becomes so clear, to the junction with the Christian aera, that there can be no doubt respecting the chronology as a whole. The prophetic period of Daniel’s “Seventy Weeks” (q.v.) covers this period, and accurately sketches the outline of Jewish history. The details will be considered under the special heads to which they belong, e.g. *SEE DANIEL; SEE EZRA; SEE NEHEMIAH; SEE MACCABEES; SEE JESUS; SEE ACTS*, etc.

**III. Synchronisms with Profane Annals.** — There are a number of leading dates which may be regarded as more or less settled by a comparison of the foregoing Biblical statements with those found in classical, Judaeo-ecclesiastical, and monumental history.



**1. *The Deluge.*** — The Flood, according to the foregoing adjustments, would end near the close of B.C. 2515, and would have begun near the close of B.C. 2516. It is most reasonable to suppose the Noachian colonists to have begun to spread not long after the Flood; scriptural intimations, as commonly interpreted, assign their dissemination to the beginning of the second century after that event. If the Division at Peleg's birth be really the same as the Dispersion (q.v.) after the building of the Tower of Babel, this supposed interval would not necessarily have to be lengthened, for the text of the account of the building of the Tower does not absolutely prove that all Noah's descendants were concerned in it, and therefore some may have previously taken their departure from the primeval settlement. *SEE PELEG.* The chronology of Egypt, derived from the monuments and Manetho, is held by some to indicate for the foundation of its first kingdom a much earlier period than would be consistent with this scheme of approximative Biblical dates; but other and more careful authors greatly reduce these computations (see J. C. K. Hofmann, *AEgyptische u. Isr. Zeitrechnung*, Nordl. 1847, 8vo). The Assyrians and Babylonians have not been proved, on satisfactory grounds, to have reckoned back to so remote a time as the Egyptians; but the evidence of their monuments, and the fragments of their history preserved by ancient writers, as in the case of the Egyptians, cannot well be reconciled with the short interval preferred by Usher. The most cautious calculations, based upon independent historical evidence, points to no earlier period than the middle of the 25th century B.C. as the time of the foundation of kingdoms, although the chronology of Egypt reaches to about this period (Osburn, *Monumental Hist. of Egypt*, p. 634, concludes that Menes founded the Egyptian empire at Memphis in B.C. 2429), while that of Babylon and other states does not greatly fall short of the same antiquity, although the Assyrian empire was much later (Layard, *Babylon and Nineveh*, p. 531, dates, according to the latest conclusions from the inscriptions, the reign of the first Ninevite king, Derceto, from B.C. 1250). *SEE NOAH.*

**2. *The Exodus.*** — Arguments founded on independent evidence afford collateral means of deciding which is the most probable computation from Biblical evidence of the date of this event. A comparison of the Hebrew calendar with the Egyptian has led a late writer (Poole, *Horoe AEgyptiacoe*, p. 217) to the following result: The civil commencement of the Hebrew year was the new-moon nearest to the autumnal equinox; and

at the approximative date of the Exodus obtained by the reckoning given above, we find that the Egyptian vague year commenced at or about that point of time. This approximative date, therefore, falls about the time at which the vague year and the Hebrew year, as dated from the autumnal equinox, nearly or exactly coincided in their commencements. It may reasonably be supposed that the Israelites in the time of the oppression had made use of the vague year as the common year of the country, which, indeed, is rendered highly probable by the circumstance that they had to a considerable extent and in no very private manner-adopted Egyptian religious customs (~~צבחה~~ Joshua 24:14; ~~צבחה~~ Ezekiel 20:7, 8), the celebrations prescribed by which were kept according to this year. When, therefore, the festivals of the Law rendered a year virtually tropical necessary, of the kind either restored or instituted at the Exodus, it seems most probable that the current vague year was fixed under Moses. If this supposition be correct, we should expect to find that the 14th day of Abib, on which fell the full-moon of the Passover of the Exodus, corresponded to the 14th day of a Phamenoth, in a vague year commencing about the autumnal equinox. — It has been ascertained by computation that a full moon fell on the 14th day of Phamenoth, on Thursday, April 21st, in the year B.C. 1652. A full moon would not fall on the same day of the vague year at a shorter interval than 25 years before or after this date, while the triple coincidence of the new moon, vague year, and autumnal equinox could not recur in less than 1500 vague years (*Encyclopaed. Brit.*, 8th. ed., s.v. Egypt, p. 458). The date thus obtained is but four years earlier than Hales's, and the interval from it to that of the Foundation of Solomon's Temple, B.C. 1010, would be 642 years, or only six years in excess of that previously obtained from the numerical statements in the Bible. This coincidence is at least remarkable, although the want of exact correspondence in the dates detracts considerably from the force of the argument based upon this comparison.

### *SEE EXODE.*

Setting aside Usher's preference for the 480 years of ~~צבחה~~ 1 Kings 6:1, as resting upon evidence far less strong than the longer computation, we must mention the principal reasons urged by Bunsen and Lepsius in support of the Rabbinical date (see Bunsen, *Bibelwerk*, 1, pp. 211, 231, 223 sq.; Lepsius, *Chronol. der Aegypter*, 1, 314 sq.). The reckoning by the genealogies, upon which this date rests, we have already shown to be unsafe. Several points of historical evidence are, however, brought forward by these writers as leading to or confirming this date. Of these the most

important is the supposed account of the Exodus given by Manetho, the Egyptian historian. placing the event at about the same time as the Rabbinical date. This narrative, however, is, on the testimony of Josephus (*Apion*, 1:14; also 26, etc.), who has preserved it to us, wholly devoid of authority, being, according to Manetho's own showing, a record of uncertain antiquity, and of an unknown writer, and not part of the Egyptian annals. An indication of date has also been supposed in the mention that the name of one of the treasure-cities built for Pharaoh by the Israelites during the' oppression was Raamses (~~Exodus~~ Exodus 1:11), probably the same place as the Rameses elsewhere mentioned, the chief town of a tract so called. *SEE RAMESES*. This name is the same as that of certain well-known kings of Egypt of the period to which by this scheme the Exodus would be referred. If the story given by Manetho be founded on a true tradition, the great oppressor would have been Rameses II, second king of the 19th dynasty, whose reign is variously assigned to the 14th and 13th centuries B.C. It is further urged that the first king Rameses of the Egyptian monuments and Manetho's lists is the grandfather of this king, Rameses I, who was the last sovereign of the 18th dynasty, and reigned at the utmost about 60 years before his grandson. It must, however, be observed, that there is great reason for taking the lower dates of both kings, which would make the reign of the second after the Rabbinical date of the Exodus, and that in this case both Manetho's statement must be of course set aside, as placing the Exodus in the reign of this king's son, and the order of the Biblical narrative must be transposed, that the building of Raamses should not fall before the accession of Rameses I. The argument that there was no king Rameses before Rameses I is obviously weak as a negative one, more especially as the names of very many kings of Egypt, particularly those of the period to which we assign the Exodus, are wanting. It loses almost all its force when we find that a son of Aahmes, Amosis, the head. of the 18th dynasty, variously assigned to the 17th and 16th centuries B.C., bore the name of Rameses, which name, from its meaning (*son of Ra*, or the sun, the god of Heliopolis, one of the eight great gods of Egypt), would almost necessarily be a not very uncommon one, and Raamses might therefore have, been named from an earlier king or prince bearing the name long before Rameses I. The history of Egypt presents great difficulties to the reception of the theory together with the Biblical narrative, difficulties so great that we think they could only be removed by abandoning a belief in the historical character of that' narrative; if so, it is obviously futile to found an argument upon a minute

point, the occurrence of a single name. The historical difficulties on the Hebrean side, in the period after the Exodus, are on this view not less serious, and have induced Bunsen to antedate Moses's war beyond Jordan, and to compress Joshua's rule into the 40 years in the wilderness (*Bibelwerk*, p. 228 sq.), and so, we venture to think, to forfeit his right to reason on the details of the narrative relating to the earlier period. This compression arises from the want of space for the Judges. The chronology of events so obtained is also open to the objection brought against the longer schemes, that the Israelites could not have been in Palestine during the campaigns in the East of the Pharaohs of the 18th, 19th, and 20th dynasties, since it does not seem possible to throw those of Rameses III earlier than Bunsen's date of the beginning of the conquest of western Palestine by the Hebrews (see the Duke of Northumberland's paper in Wilkinson's *Anc. Egypt.* 1, 77-81). There does not, therefore, appear to be any good reason for abandoning these definite statements of the Hebrew records in favor of the yet crude and conflicting constructions of synchronal dates from the Egyptian monuments (see Kenrick's *Egypt under the Pharaohs*, vol. 2). *SEE EGYPT.*

**3. Rehoboam and Shishak.** — The Biblical evidence for this synchronism is as follows: Rehoboam came to the throne in B.C. 973. The invasion of Shishak took place in his fifth year, or B.C. 969. Shishak was already on the throne when Jeroboam fled to him from Solomon (<sup><1114></sup>1 Kings 11:40). This event happened during the building of Millo, etc., when Jeroboam was head of the workmen of the house of Joseph (<sup><1117></sup>1 Kings 11:27). The building of Millo and repairing of the breaches of the city of David was after the building of the house of Pharaoh's daughter, that was constructed about the same time as Solomon's house, the completion of which is dated in his 24th year (<sup><1101></sup>1 Kings 6:1, 37, 38; 7:1; <sup><1481></sup>2 Chronicles 8:1, where 3+20=10+13). This building is recorded after the occurrences of that year of Solomon, for Pharaoh's daughter remained in Jerusalem until the king had ended building his own house, and the Temple, and the wall of Jerusalem round about (<sup><1101></sup>1 Kings 3:1), and Millo was built after the removal of the queen (ix. 24); therefore, as Jeroboam was concerned in this building of Millo and repairing the breaches, and was met "at that time" (11:29) by Ahijah, and in consequence had to flee from the country, the 24th or 25th year is the earliest possible date. Thus Shishak appears to have come to the throne at most 21 or 22 years (40-23 [or 24] +4) before his expedition against Rehoboam. An inscription at the quarries of Silsilis,

in Upper Egypt, records the cutting of stone in the 21st year of Sheshonk I, or Shishak, for constructions in the chief temple of Thebes, where we now find a record of his conquest of Judah (Champollion, *Lettres*, p. 190, 191).

On these grounds we may place the accession of Shishak at B.C. cir. 990. The evidence of Manetho's lists, compared with the monuments, would place this event within a few years of this date, for they do not allow us to put it much before or after B.C. 1000, an approach to correctness which at this period is very valuable. *SEE SHISHAK.*

**4. Josiah and Pharaoh Necho.** — The death of Josiah can be clearly shown on Biblical evidence to have taken place in the 21st year before that in which the Temple was destroyed — that is, in the Jewish year from the spring of B.C. 609 to the spring of 608. Necho's first year is proved by the Apis tablets to have been the Egyptian vague year, either January, B.C. 609-8, or probably B.C. 610-09. The expedition in opposing which Josiah fell (<sup>2Kings</sup>2 Kings 23:29) cannot reasonably be dated earlier than Necho's second year, B.C. 609-8 or 608-7. *SEE NECHO.*

**5. Jehoiakim and Nebuchadnezzar.** — In <sup>Jeremiah</sup>Jeremiah 25:1. the first year of Nebuchadnezzar coincides, wholly or in part, with 4 Jehoiakim; <sup>2Kings</sup>2 Kings 24:12, the epoch of Jeconiah's captivity and of Zedekiah's reign lies in 8 Nebuchadnezzar; *ibid.* 25, 8, the 11th of Zedekiah, the 5th month, 10th day, lies in 19 Nebuchadnezzar; and <sup>Jeremiah</sup>Jeremiah 52:31, the 37th of Jeconiah, 12th month, 25th day, lies "in the year that Evil-merodach began to reign." From these synchronisms it follows demonstrably that, in this reckoning, Nebuchadnezzar has 45 years of reign, two years more than are assigned to him in the Astronomical Canon, where his reign of 43 years begins AE Nab. 144=B.C. .604; consequently, that his reign in the Jewish reckoning bears date from the year B.C. 606 (Browne, *Ordo Soecl.* § 151-171, 438). Hence it results that the year of the taking of Jerusalem and destruction of the Temple is B.C. 588. Those chronologists who, not having carefully enough collated and discussed the testimonies, accept unquestioned the year B.C. 604 as *that* first year of Nebuchadnezzar which coincides with 4 Jehoiakim, place the catastrophe two years later, B. C. 586. With this latitude for difference of views, the synchronism 1 Nebuchadnezzar=4 Jehoiakim=B.C. 606 or 604, has long been generally taken by chronologists as the connecting link between sacred and profane annals, the *terminus a quo* of the ascending reckoning. *SEE NEBUCHADNEZZAR.*

**6. Hezekiah's Synchronisms.** — In ~~2~~<sup>12183</sup> 2 Kings 18:13; 19:9, it appears that Sennacherib, king of Assyria, and Tirhakah, king of Ethiopia, were both contemporary with Hezekiah, and at the 14th year of his reign. Now, in the recently-recovered Armenian version of Eusebius's *Chronicle*, we have it on the authority of Berossus (quoted from Polyhistor) that from Sennacherib to Nebuchadnezzar were 88 years (the names and numbers are given, and agree with the expressed sum); this account places the accession of Sennacherib at B.C. 692, which is 20 years later than the lowest date that the Biblical numbers will allow for 14 Hezekiah. Accordingly, Niebuhr (*Kl. histor u. philol. Schriften*, 1:209) proposed to strike out that number of years from the 55 assigned to Manasseh; then the interval to 4 Jehoiakim = Nebuchadnezzar, would be  $15+35+2+31+3=86$ . Since Niebuhr's time an important Assyrian monument of the time of Sennacherib, interpreted by Rawlinson and Hincks, informs us that the invasion of Judaea, which in the book of Kings is said to have been in the 14th of Hezekiah, took place in Sennacherib's third year. Hence the interval to 4 Jehoiakim becomes 86 years. Of itself this does not prove much, and Ewald, 3. 364; Thenius, p. 410; Bunsen, 4:398, retain the Biblical number, which also the younger Niebuhr (*Gesch. Assrs u. Babels*, p. 99-105) learnedly upholds against his father's objections. With the assistance, too, of the Canon, and of the extract from Abydenus's account of the same times, it is not difficult to bring the statements of Berossus into conformity with the Biblical numbers, as by Browne (*Ordo Sceclorum*, § 489 sq.), Brandis (*Rerum Assyriarum tempora emendata*, p. 40 sq.; retracted, however, in his later work, *Ueber den hist. Gewinn aus der Entziff. der Assyr. Inschr.* p. 46, 73), and in the work just cited of the younger Niebuhr. On the other hand. Lepsius (*Konigs-Buch der Eggypter*), Movers (*Die Phonizier*, 2:1, 152 sq. [Whose arguments A. v. Gutschmid, *Rhein. Ms.*, 1857, thinks unanswerable]), Scheuchzer (*Phul u. Nabonassar*), and J. v. Gumpach (*Abriss der bab.-assy. Gesch.* p. 98 sq.): contend for the reduced numbers. **SEE TIRHAKAH.**

The Tirhakah in question is undoubtedly the Tarkos, Tarakos of Manetho's 25th dynasty, in which, according to the uncorrected numbers, his reign begins 1704 (Africanus), 183 or 188 (Eusebius in Gr.); 185, 187, or 195; (Eusebius Armen.) before Cambyses, B.C. 525; the extremes, therefore, are B.C. 695 and 718 for his epoch. But we are not dependent on the lists for the time of this king *Tahark a*. The chronology of the 26th dynasty had already been partially cleared up by funerary inscriptions (now in the

museums of Florence and Leyden), which, by recording that the deceased, born on a given day, month, and year of Neko II, lived so many years, months, and days, and died in a given year, month, and day of Amosis, enabled us to measure the precise number of years (41) from the epoch of the one king to the epoch of the other (Bockh, *Manetho*, p. 729 sq.); and now it is placed beyond further question by Mariette's discovery of a number of inscriptions, in each of which the birth, death, day of funeral, and age of an Apis are recorded in just the same way (see Mariette's own account, *Renseignement sur les 64 Apis, trouves dans les souterrains du Seraphum-Bulletin Atrcheol. de l'Athen. Frangais*, Oct., 1855; and the selection from these by Lepsius, *On the 22d Dynasty*, translated by W. Bell, 1858). There remains only a slight doubt as to the epoch of Cambyses; whether with the canon this is to be referred to B.C. 525 (the usual date), or with De Rouge to 527, for which Von Gumpach also contends, or 528, with Dr. Hincks (*On the Age of the 26th Dynasty*), or even 529 (Bockh, *Manetho*, p. 739 sq.). The main result is, that Psametik I began it to reign 138 years before the epoch of Cambyses, therefore B.C. 663 (or at most three years earlier). Now Mariette (No. 2037) records that an Apis born 26 Taharka, died 20 Psametik I, 12th month, 20th day; its age is not given. As the Apis was not usually allowed to live more than 25 years, though some of the inscriptions record an age of 26, years, on this, as an extreme supposition, the interval from 1 Taharka to 1 Psametik will be at most 31 years, and the highest possible epoch for Tirhakah (B.C. 697). This result, in itself, is not necessarily opposed to the Biblical date for 14 Hezekiah; for in the narrative itself, while a "Pharaoh, king of Egypt," is mentioned, 18:21, this Tirhakah is styled "king of Ethiopia," and he seems to appear on the scene as an unexpected enemy of Sennacherib (Niebuhr, *ut sup.* p. 72 sq. 173, 458). He may have reigned in Ethiopia long before he became king of Egypt; though, on the other hand, it is clear that this originally Ethiopian dynasty was contemporaneous in its lower part with the 26th, a Saite dynasty of Lower Egypt, and probably in its upper part with the preceding Saite dynasty, as Lepsius makes it. The real difficulty, however, consists in this, that the "So (~~aws~~), king of Egypt," whose alliance against Assyria was sought by Hoshea in his 5th or 6th year (~~1270~~ 2 Kings 17:4), can be no other than one of the two predecessors of Tirhakah, Sebek I or II, to the first of whom Manetho gives 8 (v. r. 12), to the other 14 years of reign. Thus, at the earliest, the former would begin to reign B.C. 723, which is at least one year too low for the Biblical date. As a conjectural remedy for this "desperate state of things," Von Niebuhr, p.



459, suggests that the 50 years of the 25th dynasty were possibly not continuous; failing this, either an error must be assumed in the canonry somewhere between its 28th and its 123d year, both of which are astronomically attested, or else the reign of Manasseh must be reduced. On the whole, it seems best to wait for further light from the monuments. At present these attest the 12th year of Sebek II, but give no dates of his predecessor; the genealogical connection of the two and of Taharka is unknown; of Bocchoris, the only occupant of the preceding dynasty, no monument has been discovered, and but scanty and precarious traces of the Tanite kings of the 23d dynasty, the last of whom, Zet, may even be the Sethos whom Herodotus, 2:141, makes the hero of the miraculous defeat of Sennacherib's army. Indeed, ~~23912~~ Isaiah 19:2; 30:4, both seem to imply that Zoan. (Tanis) was at that time the residence of the Pharaoh of Lower Egypt. Here is ample scope for conjecture, and also for discoveries, which may supersede all necessity for conjecture. *SEE SO.*

The mention of "Merodach-Baladan, son of Baladan, king of Babylon," apparently in or not long after 14 Hezekiah (~~12712~~ 2 Kings 20:12), forms yet another synchronism in this reign. For Sennacherib's inscription records his defeat of this Babylonian king in his first year; a Marudakh-Baldan appears in Polyhistor's extract from Berosus as king in Babylon early in Sennacherib's reign, but with circumstances which make it extremely difficult to make out the identity of the three persons with each other, and with either the *Mar'dok* Empad, who in the Canon reigns in Babylon from 721 to 709, or the *Mesesi Mord lk* of the same document, from 692 to 688. *SEE MERODACH BALADAN.* Here it may be sufficient to mention that Dr. Hincks (*Trans. of Royal Irish Academy*, vol. 22, 364), retaining the 55 years of Manasseh, proposes to solve the difficulty by placing Sennacherib's invasion of Judaea in Hezekiah's 25th instead of his 14th year, at the date 701 B.C.; Hezekiah's illness remains at its earlier date. Bunsen, tacitly adopting this construction, makes 3 Sennacherib fall in 24 Hezekiah, and imagines that the invasion which terminated disastrously to the Assyrian king was a second, in Hezekiah's 28th year, on which latter occasion it was that Tirhakah came to the relief of Jerusalem (*AEg. St. b.* iv, p. 505). Retaining for this Egyptian king an epoch B.C. 712, which is plainly disproved by the Apis inscriptions (see above), he makes it possible for So Sevek II to have been contemporary with Hoshea. It must be owned that the received chronology of Hezekiah's reign is beset with difficulties on the side both of Egypt and of Assyria and Babylon. But from neither

have we as yet all the facts we need, and the fuller and clearer information which is confidently expected from the cuneiform inscriptions, in particular, will probably make much bright that is now dark. Colonel Rawlinson indeed regards it as “now generally admitted that there were two invasions of Palestine during the reign of Hezekiah; the first in B.C. 701, when Sennacherib overran the country and exacted a heavy tribute, as stated in the inscriptions and ~~2~~2 Kings 18:13-16, and the second some thirteen or fourteen years later, which ended in the discomfiture of the Assyrians” (*London Athenoem*, August 22, 1863, p. 247 b). But the learned antiquarian has ignored the fact that the same inscriptions do not speak of two invasions, and the Bible expressly identifies those here assumed as distinct. Indeed, the paper in which this and other wholesale changes of the Biblical numbers are advocated contains in itself abundant evidence of the precaicious elements upon which the whole system of reconstructed Assyrian chronology, as drawn from the monuments, is based; and we feel only the more confirmed by its perusal in the belief that we cannot safely correct the definite and consecutive dates of the Biblical accounts by means of such vague and incoherent data. At least the attempt is yet evidently premature, and we are justified, by the changes which these decipherers and collaters of the cuneiform legends are constantly obliged to make in their own computed results, in waiting until they have arrived at some settled and consistent chronology before we adopt it as the basis for rectifying the established points of Scriptural history. *SEE SENNACHERIB.*

In connection with this discussion, a passage of Demetrius Judaeus has been deemed important (Von Gumpach, *ut sup.* p. 90, 180). He seems to have put forth a chronological account of the Biblical history, from which Eusebius, *Praep. Ev.* 9:21, 29, gives — quoting it from Polyhistor — what relates to the patriarchs and Moses; another passage, preserved by Clem. Alex. *Strom.* 1, § 141, is a summary of the period elapsed from the captivity of the Ten Tribes to his own times. Its substance is as follows: From Sennacherib’s invasion of Judah to the last deportation from Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar, 128 years 6 months; from the captivity of the Ten Tribes to Ptolemy IV (Philopator), 473 years 9 months (so we must read for 573); from Nebuchadnezzar’s deportation from Jerusalem, 338 years 3 months. As the epoch of Ptolemy IV in the Canon is B.C. 222 (24th October), this gives for Nebuchadnezzar’s “last deportation” B.C. 560 (July); for Sennacherib’s invasion, B.C. 688 (Jan.); and for the

captivity of Samaria, B.C. 695 (Jan.). But unless we are prepared to set aside the Astronomical Canon, at least its dates for Nebuchadnezzar and Evilmerodach, the captivity under Nebuchadnezzar, whether it be that in his 19th year (11th Zedekiah), or “the last,” in his 23d year, ~~2430~~ Jeremiah 52:30, cannot fall so low as B.C. 560. That the final deportation is meant is plain from the exact correspondence of the sum with the Biblical items — Hezekiah, 15; Manasseh, 55; Amon, 2; Josiah, 31; Jehoiakim, 3; Nebuchadnezzar, 22=128 years. The 6 months over are perhaps derived from the 3 of Jehoahaz and 3 of Jeconiah. M. v. Niebuhr, *ut sup.* p. 102 sq., sets himself to solve the difficulty; but the whole matter may easily be explained by an error in the ordinal of the Ptolemy referred to. Set the goal at Ptolemy III (Euergetes)=B.C. 247, Oct.; then we have for the captivity of the Ten Tribes, 720 (Jan.); for Sennacherib in Judaea, 713 (Jan.); for the deportation in 23 Nebuchadnezzar, 585 (July); and consequently 589 for the destruction of the Temple — very nearly in accordance with the date for the last, assigned by Clement of Alexandria, B.C. 588, *Strom.* 1, § 127. In fact, the chronological statements in this portion of the *Stromata* swarm with numerical errors, and a careless scribe might easily misread **TETAPTOY** for **TOYPITOI**. Be that as it may, it is a great mistake to suppose that Demetrius or any other Jew, of his or later times, can be competent to rule a question of this kind for us. He may have been, as M. v. Niebuhr thinks, “a sensible writer” (though others, judging from the fragments preserved by Eusebius, may fairly think otherwise); that “he may have handed down good materials” is just possible; the probability is that he gives us the results of his own inquiries, confined to the text of the sacred books, except that he gathered from the Astronomical Canon the year corresponding to 23 Nebuchadnezzar, the last recorded in the sacred books. *SEE HEZEKIAH.*

**7.** An argument tending to lower the whole time of the kings, and the date of the building of Solomon’s Temple, has been deduced from some ancient data of Tyrian chronology. Josephus (c. *Ap.* 1:17) announces that the building of the Temple lies 143 years 8 months before the founding of Carthage; he gives this on the authority of Menander of Ephesus, meaning his own summation of that author’s enumeration of reigns professedly copied from public monuments. In proof, he quotes the reznal numbers of the kings from Hironi, the friend of Solomon, to Pygmalion inclusive, eleven in all, making a sum (not however expressed) of 177 years 8 months. He adds., from his author, “It was in the seventh year of

Pygmalion that Elisha led from Tyre, and founded Carthage in Libya;” and from himself “The sum of years from the reign (epoch) of Hirom to the founding of Carthage is 155 years 8 months; and since it was in 12 Hirom that the Temple was built, the time from thence to the founding of Carthage is 143 years 8 months.” (The interval, as the numbers stand in the text, is, in fact, 177 years 8 months, *minus* 12 of Hirom and 40 of Pygmalion, i.e. only 125 years 8 months: it does not concern us here to consider how the missing 18 years may be restored; the number, 143 years 8 months, given twice by Josephus, is not affected by errors that may have crept into the details.) Now the founding of Carthage is placed by Timaeus (Dion. Hal. 1:74) 38 years before 01. 1, i.e. B.C. 814-13; by Trogus (Justin, 18:6) 72 years before the building of Rome, i.e. B.C. 825. Niebuhr (the father), accepting the date B.C. 814-13 as indisputable, deduces for the building of Solomon’s Temple the year B.C. 957-56 (*Lect. on Anc. Hist.* 3:159); Movers (*Die Phonizier*, 2:1, 140 sq.), preferring the other, gets the date B.C. 969. Again, Josephus (*Ant.* 8:3, 1), after stating that 11 Hirom is 4 Solomon, and the year of the building of the Temple, adds (probably from Menander) that the year in question was 240 years from the building of (New) Tyre. It does not appear that he found the 11 or 12 Hirom expressed by Menander or Dios as answering to the 4 Solomon. Probably he obtained the synchronism from his own investigation of the various places in 2 Samuel, 1 Kings, and 1 Chronicles, where Hiram is mentioned; but the number 240 is probably Tyrian. Now Trogus (Justin, 18:3) states that Tyre was founded by the Sidonians in the year before the fall of Troy. Among the numerous ancient dates assigned to that event, one is B.C. 1208 (Ephorus, followed by *the Parian Chron.* and other authorities). But B.C. 1209-240=969, precisely the year which resulted from the former argument. Such is the twofold proof given by Movers, accepted by J. v. Gumpach and others, and highly applauded by A. v. Gutschmid (in the *Rhein. Museum*, 1857). On the other hand, it should be considered — 1. That between the flight of Elisa, in Pygmalion’s seventh year, which is the goal of these 143-4 years, and the founding of the city, there certainly occurred a train of events (the settlement in *Byrsa=Bozrah*, and the growth around it of the *Magalia=Ma’hal*, which eventually became the NewTown, *Kartharasa-Carthage*) which implies a considerable tract of time; and, 2. That as the ancient dates of the fall of Troy vary over a range of about 180 years, Timaeus placing it at 1333, Herodotus at 1270, Eratosthenes at 1183, Aretinus, 1144, besides intermediate dates (Muller, *Fragmenta Chronol.* § 17), the 240 years may

be so measured as to fall near enough to the time given to 4 Solomon by the usual chronology. It has generally been received hitherto that the Era of Tyre dates from cir. B.C. 1250, and there seems to be no sufficient reason to the contrary (Bunsen, 4:280 sq.). The concurrence of the two lines of argument in the year B.C. 969 is one of those coincidences which are so perpetually occurring in chronological combinations that the practiced inquirer at last pays little heed to them. In fact, it may only imply that Justin's author got from Menander the date 384 Tyre = 7 Pygmalion, mistakenly, as by Josephus, identified with 1 Carthage; and having also obtained from the same or some other source the year equivalent to 1 Tyre, would so arrive at his datum for 1 Carthage, or, *vice versa*, from the latter would rise to the former. And, after all, when we inquire what is the worth of Josephus as a reporter, and, supposing him accurate, what is the value of the Tyrian annals, the answer is not of necessity unfavorable to the claims of the Biblical chronology of the kings of Judah and Israel. Furnished, as this is, by an annalistic series incomparably more full and exact than any profane records of the same times which have come to us at second hand, it is not to be impeached by any but clear contemporary monumental evidence (such as Mariette's Apis records); and if the entire Hebrew tale of years from 4 Solomon to 11 Zedekiah is to be materially lowered on the scale of the series B.C., this can only be done by proving some capital error in the Astronomical Canon. *SEE TYRE.*

**8.** In fact, an attempt has lately been made in this direction, which, if successful, must set our Biblical chronology adrift from its old bearings. It is contended by Mr. Bosanquet (*Readjustment of Sacred and Profane Chronology*, Lond. 1853) that a lower date than 604-606 B.C. for the accession of Nebuchadnezzar is imperatively demanded by the historical connection of that event with the famous "Eclipse of Thales;" which, according to Herodotus (1:74, 103), occurring during a pitched battle between the Medes and Lydians, was the occasion of a peace, cemented by marriages, between Cyaxares and Halyattes, after which, as Herodotus seems to imply, the former turned his arms against Assyria, and, in conjunction with Labynetus (the Nabopolassar of Berosus and the Canon), took and destroyed Nineveh. The dates assigned by the ancients to that eclipse lie between O1.48 and 50. Kepler, Scaliger, and Sir Isaac Newton made it B.C. 585; Baily (*Philos. Trans.*, 1811) and Oltmanns (*Schr. der Berlin. Akad.* 1812-13) found it 30th Sept. B.C. 610, which date was accepted by Ideler, Saint-Martin, and most subsequent writers. More

recently it has been announced by Mr. Airy (*Philos. Mag.* 1853) and Mr. Hind (*Athenaum*, Aug. 1857), as the result of calculation with Hansen's improved tables, that in the eclipse of 610 the moon's shadow traversed no part of Asia Minor, and that the only suitable one is that of 28th May, B.C. 585, which would be total in Ionia, Lydia, Lycia, Pamphylia, and part of Cilicia. It has, indeed, been contended by Mr. Adams that the tables need a further correction, the effect of which (as Mr. Airy remarked, *Athenaum*, Oct. 1859) would be such as to render the eclipse of 585 inapplicable to the recorded circumstances; but it appears that the astronomerroyal no longer entertains any doubts on this point, having quite recently (see *Athen.* Sept. 1861) expressed his "unaltered conviction that the tables of Hansen give the date of the great solar eclipse, which terminated the Lydian war, as the most reliable records of antiquity placed it, in the year 585 B.C." Indeed, however the astronomical question may ultimately be decided, it would appear, from all that is known of the life of Thales, that he could hardly have predicted an eclipse in Ionia so early as B.C. 610 (Roth, *Gesch. unserer obendlandischen Philosophie*, 2:98). But that the "Eclipse of Thales" occurred at the conjuncture indicated by Herodotus rests only on his testimony, and in this he might easily be mistaken. Either he may have confounded with the eclipse predicted by Thales an earlier one occurring during the war of Cyaxares and Halyattes—possibly that of 610, for no locality is mentioned, and there is nothing to forbid our seeking the battle-field in some suitable situation (e.g. with Niebuhr, p. 508, in Atropatene, or with Von Gumpach, *Zeitrechnung der Bab. u. Assyr.* p. 94, in Armenia); or, he may have assigned to that earlier war what really took place during a later war of the Medes and Lydians under *Astyages* and Halyattes. The latter supposition is not without support of ancient authors. Cicero (*de Divinat.* 1:50), from some lost authority, places the eclipse, without date or mention of the war, under *Astyages*. Pliny (H. N. 2:9), giving the date 01. 48.4=B.C. 585, says, also without mention of the war, that the eclipse occurred in the reign of Halyattes (this lasted, in the usual chronology, from B.C. 620 to 563). Solinus (100:15, 16) assigns 01. 49.1 as date of eclipse and battle, but (c. 20) he speaks of the war as between Halyattes and *Astyages*. From Eudemus, a much earlier author, Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* 1:14, § 65) gives the date of the eclipse "about 01. 50," with the addition that it was the time of the war between *Cvaxares* and Halyattes — in which Eudemus, if more than the date be his, merely repeats Herodotus; but the addition is as likely to be Clement's own. The Eclipse of Thales, therefore; is by no means so cardinal an event as has

been assumed; and to uphold the loose statement of Herodotus, in connection with the earlier date B.C. 610, is as precarious a proceeding as is the attempt to urge it with the lower, and, in all probability, authentic date, B.C. 585, to the subversion of the received chronology. Mr. Bosanquet, however, holds that from the testimony of this eclipse there is no escape; and supporting by this the arguments described under the above heads, together with others derived from new combinations, he does not hesitate to interpose “25 years of Scythian rule in Babylon” between Nabopolassar and Nebuchadnezzar, thereby lowering the epoch of the latter from B.C. 604 to 579. The effect of this is to bring the destruction of the Temple to B.C. 560; Sennacherib’s 3d and Hezekiah’s 14th year to 689; and the 4th of Solomon to 989 or 990. Of course this involves the necessity of extensive changes in the history and chronology of the lower portion of the 6th century B.C. Thus Cyrus is made into two persons of the name; the first, beginning to reign in Persia B.C. 559, succeeded by Cambyses as viceroy 535 (which is made the 1st year of Evil-merodach), and as king, B.C. 529, together with a second Cyrus as joint-king of Media in 13 Cambyses = B.C. 523. The length of reign of this Cyrus II is not assigned; he disappears from Mr. B.’s table, together with Cambyses, who, with Smerdis between, is followed at 516 by Darius Hystaspis as king, which Darius had become viceroy in Babylon and Media in B.C. 521. It should be remarked that this “readjustment” of the chronology is proposed with a view to a fulfillment of Daniel’s Prophecy of the Seventy Weeks (*Chronol. of the Times of Daniel, Ezra, and Nehemiah*, 1 318) — namely, the predicted seventy years of desolation reach from the destruction of the Temple, B.C. 560 to B.C. 490; the date of Daniel’s prophecy in the first Babylonian year of Darius Hystaspis, then “62 Years old” (~~2000~~ Daniel 6:1), is made B.C. 493, whence to the birth of Christ, which the author places (wrongly) in B.C. 3, are the seventy times seven years foretold; also this year 493 is itself the goal of an earlier period of 490 years, reckoned from B.C. 983, Mr. B.’s date of the dedication of Solomon’s Temple. So extensive a refashioning of the history will hardly be accepted on the strength of the alleged proofs, especially as the prophecy of Daniel in question is itself susceptible of a better chronological solution. This view was boldly followed out, in ignorance or scorn of all Gentile chronology, by the framers of the Jewish Mundane AEra. Assuming that a period of 490 years *must* reach from the destruction of the first Temple to that of the second, which latter they set at A.D. 69 (a year too early), they obtained for 19 Nebuchadnezzar = 11 Zedekiah, the year B.C. 422 (which, in



profane chronology, lies in the reign of Darius Nothus). On like grounds Lightfoot does not hesitate to place the first year of Cyrus 490 years before the Passion, for which his date is A.D. 33. "From this year [B.C. 458] to the death of Christ are 490 years; and there is no cause, because of doubtful records among the heathen, to make a doubt of the fixedness of the time, which an angel of the Lord had recorded with so much exactness" (*Harmony of the Old Testament. in Works*, 1, 312). A late noile writer (Duke of Manchester, *Daniel and his Times*, 1845), with the like end in view, identifies the Darius of Ezra, Haggai, and Zechariah, and of ~~Zechariah~~ Daniel 8:1 (made different from him of 6:1), with Darius Nothus; and, in order to this result, sets himself to show that the founder of the Persian monarchy, whom the Greeks call Cyrus, is in fact Nebuchadnezzar I (the Nabopolassar of the Canon), for the "Persians" and the "Chaldeans" are the same people; his son Cambyses is the Nebuchadnezzar of the Bible, destroyer of the Temple; Belshazzar is the last king of the Cyrus dynasty at Babylon; his conqueror, "Darius the Mede," ~~Zechariah~~ Daniel 6:1, is Darius Hystaspis; and the Biblical Koresh, the restorer of the Jews (and Cyrus of Xenophon, altogether different from him of Herodotus and Ctesias), is a satrap, or feudatory of Xerxes and Artaxerxes. Strange to say, this wild speculation, with its portentous conglomeration of testimonies, sacred and profane, ancient and modern, genuine and spurious (conspicuous among these the "Philo" and "Megasthenes" of the impudent forger Annius of Viterbo), has not only been gravely listened to by scholars of Germany, but has found among them zealous advocacy and furtherance (Ebrard in *the Theol. Studien u. Kritiken*, 1847; Metzke, *Cyrus der Grunder des Pers. Reiches war nicht der Befreier der Juden sondern der Zerstorere Jerusalems*, 1849). **SEE SEVENTY WEEKS**. It should, however, be remarked, that the identification of Ezra's Darius with D. Nothus has commended itself (still with a view to Daniel's prophecy) to more than one eminent writer. Proposed by Scaliger, it is advocated by the late Dr. Mill (in his *Treatise on the Descent and Parentage of our Savior*, 1842, p. 153). **SEE DARIUS**.

### 9. *Apocryphal: Books of the Old Testament.* —

(1.) The Book of *Tobit* (q.v.) contains an outline of Assyrian history (from the deportation of the Ten Tribes to the fall of Nineveh), to which the moral fiction is attached (Browne, *Ordo Sccl.* p. 555, note; Niebuhr, *Gesch. Assurs.* p. 100, note; comp. Fritzsche, *Das Buck Tobi.* 1853, p. 14 sq.; Ewald, *Gesch. des V. Isr.* 4:233 sq.). To treat it as a narrative of facts,

and apply it to purposes of chronological proof, as some, even recent, writers have done (e.g. Von Gumpach, *Babyl. Zeitr.* p. 138), is quite to mistake its character. —

(2.) As regards the Book of *Judith* (q.v.), it is surprising that any one conversant with history and criticism should fail to see that this is not a record of facts, but a religious, quasi-prophetical allegory (*Ordo Stecl.* p. 556, note; Fritzsche, *Das B. Judith*, p. 123 sq.; Ewald, *Gesch. des V. Israel*, 4:541. See' also Movers in the *Bonn. Zeitschr. fur kathol. Theologie*, 1835, p. 47). Niebuhr, acknowledging this (*u. s.* p. 212-285), nevertheless finds in its dates, according to the Lat. version, a background of historical truth with reference to the times of Nebuchadnezzar. V. Gumpach (*u. s.* p. 161 sq.) maintains its historical character, and applies it to his own purposes with extraordinary confidence (see also Scholz, *Enl. in die heil. Schriften*, 1845). —

(3.) In the books of *Maccabees* (q.v.) the years are regularly counted, under the name ἔτη τῆς Βασιλείας τῶν Ἑλλήνων, meaning the sera of the Seleucidae, beginning in the autumn of B.C. 312; except that in the first book the epoch is made 1 Nisan of that year, while in the second book it is 1 Tisri of the following year, B. C. 311, i.e. eighteen months later. This, which has been sufficiently proved by earlier writers (see Ideler, *Hdb. der Chronol.* 1:531 sq.; *Ordo Soecl.* § 440-42), is contested on inadequate grounds by Von Gumpach (*Zwei chronol. Abhandl.* 1854).

**IV. New Testament Chronology.** The Gospels and Acts of the Apostles have (with one exception, ~~☞~~ Luke 3:1) no express dates; in the absence of these, combinations, more or less probable, are all that the chronologist has to go by.

**1.** For the *Nativity* (q.v.), the exterior limit is furnished by the death of Herod (~~☞~~ Matthew 2:1, 19; ~~☞~~ Luke 1:5), the year of which event, as it is nowhere named by Josephus or any other extant historian, has to be determined by various circumstances. These are the mention of an eclipse of the moon not long before it (*Ant.* 17:6, 4 fin.), which, by calculation, can only have been that of March 12-13, B.C. 4; the length of Herod's reign, together with the recorded date of its commencement (*Ant.* 17:8, 1; comp. 14:14, 5; 16, 4), and of that of his sons — Archelaus (*Ant.* 17:13, 3; comp. *War*, 2:7, 3), the consular year of whose deposal is given by Dion Cass. 55.; Herod Philip (*War*, 18:4, 6, length of reign and year of death); for

Herod Antipas, Josephus (*Ant.* 18:7, 2) gives the date of deposal, but not length of reign'; this, however, is known from coins (Eckhel, *Doct.* ~~4088~~ *Numbers* 3:489) to have reached his 43d year. All these indications point to B.C. 4, not long before the Passover, as the time of Herod's death. **SEE HEROD.** Those who would imputrn this conclusion urge other, discrepant statements in Josephus, or call in question either the fact of the eclipse or its calculated date, or contend that the death of Herod could not have taken place so soon after it. The inducement is that our Lord's age may not exceed thirty years at the time of his baptism, 1:c. at the earliest in the 15th year of Tiberius, for if this note of time is to be taken strictly, the earliest date for the Nativity should be the year B.C. 3. The *year being* supposed to be known, it is attempted to approximate to the *day* by calculating the order of the sacerdotal cycle, and finding at what time in the, given year "the course of Abijah" (~~4005~~ Luke 1:5) entered upon office. The starting-point for the reckoning is furnished by a Jewish tradition (*Mishna*, 3:298, 3), and it is assumed that the conception of John the Baptist ensued at the expiration of Zechariah's week of service, and the Annunciation five months later (~~4023~~ Luke 1:23-26, 36; but in the Church calendars six months). Here it should be observed that we have no reason to suppose the ancients to have been in possession of the true date, either year or day. Having ascertained, as they supposed, the year and day of the Baptism, they counted back 30 years to the Nativity (see a paper by H. Browne, on S. *Clemens Alex. on N.T. Chronology* in the *Journal of Classical and Sacred Philology*, 1854, 1:327 sq.). Also, it would be well that all such considerations as the "fitness of things" prescribing a particular year, or day of the year, for this or any other event of sacred history, should be banished from chronological investigations. **SEE JESUS.**

**2.** Luke's date, "15th of Tiberius" (~~4001~~ Luke 3:1), interpreted by the rule of the imperial annals (and also of the canon), would denote the year beginning August A.D. 28, and ending in the same month of A.D. 29. Referred to the current consular year, it might mean either A.D. 28 or 29. Taken in the Jewish sense, it might be the year beginning either 1 Nisan or 1 Tisri A.D. 28, or even 1 Tisri A.D. 27. The hypothesis of a dating of the years of Tiberius from an epoch earlier by three years than the death of Augustus has, however, been generally adopted from the 16th century downward, and is demanded (see: Strong's *Gr. Harmony*, p. 342 sq.) by the age of Jesus at his baptism (30 years), added to the length of his ministry (3 years), as compared with the date of the Crucifixion (see

below). In A.D. 11, Tiberius appears to have assumed the government of the provinces, and from this time his reign would naturally be reckoned by the Jews (see Jarvis, *Introd.* p. 229 sq.). This would give Luke's date of John's mission B.C. 27. *SEE TIBERIUS.*

3. The note of time (~~Ant.~~ John 2:10) connected with the *Passover after the Baptism* points, if the "forty and six years" are reckoned from Herod's announcement of his purpose in his eighteenth year (*Ant.* 15:11, 1) to A.D. 27; if from the actual commencement, after all the materials were provided, it may denote either A.D. 28, or 29, or 30, according to the length of time supposed to be spent in preparation. But here, again, besides discrepant statements in Josephus as to the epoch of Herod's reign, it chances that the earlier account of the same proceedings (*War*, 1:21, 1) dates this undertaking of Herod in *his fifteenth* year. It does indeed admit of proof, even from the context, that the 15th year is too early; but it may, plausibly enough, be urged by those who wish to do so, that, if Josephus is wrong in the one statement, he is just as likely not to be right in the other. *SEE TEMPLE.*

4. The *Crucifixion* (q.v.) certainly cannot be placed earlier than A.D. 28, in which year the 15th of Tiberius began, and it has never been proposed by inquirers of any note to place it later than A.D. 33. The astronomical element of the question — namely, that in the year of the Passion the 14th of Nisan fell on a Friday — if it be rigorously applied, i.e. according to a definite rule of Jewish usage and the results of strict lunar calculation, indicates only one of the six years mentioned, viz. A.D. 29, in which 14 Nisan was 18th March and Friday. If a certain laxity as to the rule be allowed, the 14th Nisan may *possibly* have fallen on 3d April, Friday, in A.D. 33. But if, in compliance with the apparent import of the first three Gospels, without explanation from the fourth, it is contended that the Crucifixion took place on the day after the Passover, the year may have been A.D. 30, in which the 15th Nisan fell on Friday, 7th April, or A.D. 33, in which it was (in strictness) Friday, 3d April. Lastly, if it be maintained that the Jewish Passover-day was regulated, not by actual observation of the moon's phases, but by cycles more or less faulty, any year whatever of the series may be available in one form or other of the hypothesis. *SEE PASSOVER.*

*Ancient testimony*, if that is to have weight in this question on the supposition that the year was known, either by tradition or by access to

public records (the *Acta Pilati*, to which the ancients so confidently appeal), certainly designates the Passover of the year 29, *cos. duobus Geminis*, the 15th proper year of Tiberius. In the Western Church the consent to this year is all but general; in the Eastern, the same year is either named or implied in the two earliest extant testimonies, Clem. Alex. (*Strom.* 1:21, § 101-143; see *Journ. of Class. and Sac. Philol. u. s.*) and Julius Africanus. **SEE JESUS.**

**5.** In the *Acts*, the mention of *the death of Herod Agrippa* (12:23), interposed between an arrival of Paul at Jerusalem and his return thence to Antioch (11:30; 12:25), would yield a firm resting-point for that portion of the narrative, viz. Easter, A.D. 44 (Josephus, *Ant.* 18:8, 2; comp. 19:5, 1; *War*, 2:11, 6), could we be certain that the death of Agrippa took place soon after, or even in the same year with the Easter mentioned 12:3, 4. (The time of Agrippa's death is determinable with high probability to the beginning of August of that year.) But as it is possible that the writer, after his narrative of the acts of this king, thought fit to finish off all that he had to say about him before going on with the narrative about Paul and Barnabas it may be that their mission to Jerusalem, and return, after the martyrdom of James and deliverance of Peter, took place before the year 44. It might even be inferred from 11:26 (ἦτις ἐγένετο ἐπὶ Κλαυδίου), that the prophecy, of Agabus was delivered before, or quite in the beginning of A.D. 41, as the famine is known to have prevailed at Rome during the first two years of Claudius (A.D. 41, 42; Dion Cass. 60:11), but that it appears not to have been felt in Judaea till after the death of Agrippa, in the procuratorship of Cuspius Fadus and Tiberius Alexander (A. D. 45-47; Josephus, *Ant.* 20:2, 5; 5, 2). Conclusive reasons for assigning this second visit of Paul to Jerusalem to the year 44 must be sought elsewhere. (See Lehmann, in the *Stud. u. Knit.* 1858, 2.) **SEE AGRIPPA.**

**6.** In <sup><RB></sup>Galatians 1:2, Paul speaks of two visits to Jerusalem, the one (<sup><RB></sup>Galatians 1:18) "after three years" (viz. from his conversion), the other (<sup><RB></sup>Galatians 2:1) "fourteen years afterward" (διὰ δεκατεσσάρων ἐτῶν). The first of these is evidently that of <sup><RB></sup>Acts 9:26; that the other must be the second of those mentioned in the Acts, viz. that of 11, 12, has been understood by many, and probably would have been by all, could it have been made to square with their chronology. The argument, restricted from irrelevant issues, lies in a very narrow compass. To make good his assertion (i. 11 sq.) that he received not his gospel and commission from

Peter, or any other man, but direct from Christ himself, the apostle begins to enumerate the *occasions on which alone he saw and conversed with the other apostles at Jerusalem*. Now, if the visit <sup><R11></sup>Galatians 2:1, be not that of <sup><4112></sup>Acts 11:12, it must be later (no one wishes to put it earlier); but, if so, then it would seem he has not enumerated *all* the occasions on which he saw the other apostles. It is hardly satisfactory (comp. Meyer *on Galatians* p. 41) to allege (with Wieseler, *Chronol. des apost. Zeittaters*, p. 180) that the apostle, not writing a history, is not bound to recite all his visits to Jerusalem, or (with Ewald, *Gesch.* 6:50) that he is concerned to enumerate only those visits which he made for the purpose of conferring with the apostles. His intention is plainly to state that he had no intervening opportunity of consulting them. Accordingly, Schleiermacher (*Einleit. ins N.T.* p. 569), Neander (*Pflanz. u. Leit.* 1:188 of the 4th ed.), De Wette (*Komm. in loc.*), Meyer (*u. s.* p. 47), find the conclusion inevitable that Luke was misinformed in saying that Paul went up to Jerusalem as related in <sup><4113></sup>Acts 11:30, because the apostle himself declares that between his first visit, which can be no other than that of 9:26, and the other, which can only have been that to the council, as related in Acts 15, there was none intermediate. But, in fact, the circumstances of the visit, <sup><R11></sup>Galatians 2:1, are perfectly compatible with those of Acts 11, 12, the only difficulty being that which is supposed to lie in the chronology; nor, on the other hand, is the discrepancy between Galatians 2, 1 sq., and Acts 15, such that it is difficult to see how they can relate to the same fact, although the incongruity in the latter case has been deemed by Baur (*Paulus*, p. 120 sq.) so great as to furnish an argument in support of his position that the Book of Acts is the work, not of a companion of Paul but of some much later hand (in the second century). Wieseler, to evade this conclusion, gives up the assumed identity of <sup><R11></sup>Galatians 2:1, with Acts 15, and labors to show that it was the visit of 18:22, a hypothesis which needs no discussion, unless we are prepared to say that the apostle was not even present at the council, Acts 15; for that a council was held is not denied, even by those who contend that the account given of it in the Acts is not authentic; and, if Paul was present at it, it is impossible to explain his passing it by in silence, as if it had no bearing upon the point which he is concerned to substantiate. The time of Acts 12 being defined to A.D. 44, a term of 17 years, the sum of the 3 and the 14, supposed to be consecutive, would lead to A.D. 27, which cannot possibly be the year of Paul's conversion; and, if both terms are supposed to be dated from the same epoch, it would follow that the conversion took place A.D. 30, a date still too early for those who assign

the Crucifixion to that or to a later year. But it is not too early if the year of the Passion be A.D. 29; and it is in exact accordance with the most ancient traditions recorded by ecclesiastical writers, according to which the martyrdom of Stephen took place within a year after the Ascension, and Paul's conversion, which clearly was not much later, in the year after the Ascension, i.e. in this year 30 (Browne, *Ordo Soecl.* § 102). On the other hand, this date of Paul's conversion is equally compatible with the reference of the second visit in question to Acts 15, which took place A.D. 47; the reckoning of the 14+3 years of Galatians 1 being in that case continuous from the conversion in A.D. 30. On either view, however, there is clearly an error in the ordinary chronology, which brings down the conversion to A.D. 34 and yet dates the visit of Acts 11 in A.D. 44, and that of Acts 15 in A.D. 46; a system which there is other and independent reason to suspect (see *Meth. Quart. Review*, July, 1850, p. 500). **SEE PAUL.** The chronological difficulty, which would present itself as soon as the ancient date of the Passion was abandoned for a later year, has induced the conjecture, seemingly as early as the *Chron. Pasch.* p. 436, ed. Bonn, that for 14 should be read 4 ( $\Delta\text{IA}' \Delta''$  for  $\Delta\text{I} \text{I} \Delta''$ ); see Meyer *u. s.* p. 49. On this supposition the conversion might be assigned to A.D. 37, the first visit to A.D. 40, the second to A.D. 44. With this would accord the note of time <sup><4712></sup>2 Corinthians 12:2, according to the *ancient* date of that epistle, viz. A.D. 54, that year being 14 years after the date so assigned to the first visit and the trance (<sup><44717></sup>Acts 17:17). But there is no need of this conjectural emendation, for the vision of <sup><4712></sup>2 Corinthians 12:2 (which is distinguished from that of <sup><44217></sup>Acts 22:17, by the fact that the apostle was forbidden to divulge the revelations of the former, whereas he relates what was said to him in the latter) may naturally have happened during the ten years which he spent in his native neighborhood (<sup><48121></sup>Galatians 1:21; comp. <sup><4712></sup>2 Corinthians 12:24, 25).

**7.** The mention of Gallio (18:12) would furnish a note of time, were the date of his proconsulate in Achaia on record. We can only conjecture that it was through the interest of his brother Seneca, who, disgraced and in exile from 41 to 48, thereafter stood in the highest favor with Claudius and Agrippina, that Gallio was presently made consul (luffect) and then proconsul of Achaia, (Pliny, *H. N.* 31:33; comp Senec. *Ep.* 105). So the date would be not earlier than 49, and not much later. **SEE GALLIO.**

**8.** The decree of Claudius for the expulsion of all Jews from Rome (18:2) is mentioned by Suetonius in a well-known passage (*Claud.* 25), but



neither dated nor placed in any discoverable order of time (Dion Cass. 60:6, relates to merely restrictive measures taken or contemplated in the beginning of the reign). If, as is likely, it formed part of a general measure for the expulsion of the “astrologers” (*Chaldoei, mathematici, astrologi*), its date may be as late as A.D. 52, in which year a severe statute of this nature was enacted (“De mathematicis Italia pellendis factum SC. atrox et irritum,” Tacit. *Ann.* 12:52). But Zonaras (p. 972, ed. Reimar), in the summary compiled from Dion Cass., places an expulsion of the astrologers from Italy immediately after the elevation of Agrippina, A.D. 49, and before the arrival of Caractacus at Rome, A.D. 50; and in Tacitus (u. s. 22) we find Agrippina, just after her marriage, accusing her rival Lollia of dealings with Chaldaeans and Magi. It is not likely that any general severe measure against the Jews would be taken while the younger Agrippa, a special favorite of Claudius, was still at Rome, as he certainly was. to the end of 48, when he succeeded his uncle Herod as king of Chalcis (Josephus, *Ant.* 20:5, 2; 7, 1.; *War.* 2; 14, 4, where for *ἑπτακαιδέκατον* we must read *ἕννεακαίδ.*). The insurrectionary movements in Judaea early in A.D. 49 may have been connected with the decree as cause or effect (*Ant.* 20:5, 3, 4). All these indications point to the year 49, and it is remarkable that that is the year named by Orosius (*Hist.* 7:6, “ninth year of Claudius”), from some lost source of intelligence (“ut Josephus tradit,” he says; but that is a mistake). *SEE CLAUDIUS.*

**9.** The year of the *recall of Felix* and appointment of Festus as his successor (~~AD~~ Acts 24:27) is not on record, and the arrival of *Paul at Rome*, in the spring of the following year, has been assigned to every one of the years, from A.D. 56 to 63 inclusive. The earliest is that given by the ancients, and is advocated by Browne, in *Ordo Soeclorum*, § 108 sq. But one principal argument there used is not tenable. From the statement of Josephus (*Ant.* 20:8, 9), that Felix, on his return to Rome, escaped condemnation upon the charges laid against him before Nero chiefly through the influence of his brother Pallas, whose consideration with that emperor was “just then at its highest” (*μάλιστα δὴ τότε διὰ τηῆς ἔχων ἐκεῖνον*), combined with the fact, related by Tacitus (*Ann.* 13:14, 15), of Pallas’s removal from his office at the head of *the fiscus* shortly before the death of Britannicus, who had nearly completed his 14th year, and with the latter part of the statement in Sueton. (*Claud.* 27), that Britannicus was born “vigésimo imperil die inque secundo consulatu” (=A.D. 42), Browne inferred that not long before Feb., A.D. 56, Pallas had ceased to be at the

height of imperial favor; consequently the recall of Felix could not be placed later than the summer of A.D. 55. This must be rejected; for Tacitus (*u. s.* 15) evidently places the death of Britannicus *early* in 55, the events of which year begin at ch. 11 and end with ch. 25; therefore the former part of Suetonius's statement is alone true that Britannicus was born on the 20th day of the reign of Claudius, =13th Feb., A.D. 41. Dion Cassius, indeed, mentions the birth under the second year (60:10), but not until he has expressly returned to the former year (τῷ προτέρῳ ἔτει). Hence it is clear that if the date of Pallas's loss of office is decisive for the date of his brother's recall, this must have occurred, at latest, in 54, before the death of Claudius (13th Oct. of that year), and no part of the procuratorship of Felix would have been under Nero; a result totally incompatible with the narrative of Josephus (*Ant.* 20:8; *War.* 2:13). On the other hand, it is hard to say at what conjuncture in Nero's time Pallas could be said to have been held thus at his highest estimation. At the very beginning of the reign it is noted of him that his arrogance had excited the emperor's disgust (*Tacit. Ann.* 13:2); within a month or two he is removed from the *fiscus*; about a year later, when impeached, together with Burrus, his reputation for insolence stood in the way of his acquittal (*Tacit. u. s.* 23); as the ally of Agrippina he was an object more of fear than of favor; and his great wealth caused his removal by death, A. D. 62, as his longevity seemed to preclude the hope of the emperor's otherwise possessing it (*Ann.* 14:65). This affords strong reason to suspect that in this matter of Pallas's influence, exercised on behalf of his brother, Josephus was misinformed. Of very material circumstances relative to Felix he certainly was ignorant, unless we are to suppose that Tacitus, on the other hand, had no documentary warrant for the very circumstantial account which he gives under the year 52 (*Ann.* 12:54); how Felix had then been sometime governor of Judaea ("jam pridem Judaea impositus"), holding a divided command with Cumanus, the latter being over the Galileans, while Felix was over the Samaritans ("ut huic Galilaeorum natio, Felici Samaritae parent"). He may have mistaken the nature of this divided rule; in fact, there is reason to believe that Felix held a military command, as Suetonius relates (*Claud.* 28: "Felicem legionibus et alis provinciseque Judaeas imposuit"), and Victor (in the *Epitome*, p. 361: "Felicem legionibus Judaeae praefecit"). Of that associated government, and of Felix's equal share in the wrongs of which Cumanus was accused, Josephus is ignorant; but what he says of Pallas and Felix is far more suitable to that earlier conjuncture, as described by Tacitus, than to the later occasion to which he refers it. At that time, viz.

when Cumanus was deposed, “Felix would certainly have suffered for the wrongs done by him to the Jews but for the intercession of his brother Pallas, whom the emperor [Claudius] at that very time held in the highest consideration;” for that Pallas just then had reached the pinnacle of his commanding influence, Tacitus shows in the preceding recital of the public honors decreed to him, and by him recorded as the crowning glory of his life in his own epitaph (Pliny Ep. 7:29; 8:6). Even in the account Josephus gives of that earlier conjuncture (in which he speaks only of Cumanus and the final hearing before Claudius, *Ant.* 20:6, 3), he mentions the “very great exertions made by the emperor’s *freedmen* and friends for Cumanus and the *Samaritans*.” The absence of dates, of which Josephus is not sparing when he has them, of itself implies that his materials for the account of Felix were scanty; and the way in which Burrus is introduced, after the passage relating to Pallas (*Ant.* 20:8, 9), strengthens the suspicion raised by the conflicting account in Tacitus, that the Jewish historian in this paragraph is mixing up, with his recital of what took place on the recall of Felix, occurrences of an earlier time. Certainly the accompanying notice (παιδαγωγός), “he was the tutor of Nero,” is more apposite to that earlier conjuncture in the time of Claudius (A.D. 52), when Nero was barely fourteen years old. It might still, in some sense, be notable as the ground of Burrus’s influence in the beginning of Nero’s reign, when he and Seneca are spoken of having charge of the imperial youth (“rectores imperatoriae juventae,” Tacit. *Ann.* 13:2); but the description is very strange when referred to the year 61, the last of Burrus’s life, especially as this is not the first mention of him. *SEE FELIX.*

**10.** The argument for the year 61, as the date of Paul’s arrival at Rome, is thus put by Wieseler (*Chronologie des Apost. Zeitalters*, p. 66 sq.). The narrative of Josephus (*Ant.* 20:8; *War*, 2:13), from Nero’s accession (13th Oct., A.D. 54) to the defeat of the “Egyptian,” implies at least two years; this impostor, claiming to be another Moses, would of course make his appearance at the Passover, i.e. at the earliest, that of A.D. 57. That this must have been at least a year before Paul’s arrest is implied in the tribune’s expression, “before these days” (~~4213~~ Acts 21:38); therefore the earliest possible date for this arrest is A.D. 58, Pentecost; the “two years” of 24:27, gives A.D. 60 as the *earliest possible* date for the arrival of Festus, and the spring of 61 for the apostle’s arrival at Rome. The *latest possible* is given by the liberty allowed Paul (~~4231~~ Acts 28:31), for the Neronian persecution began July, A.D. 64. The extreme date hence

resulting is limited by further considerations. Pallas and Burrus were living and influential men at the time when Felix was recalled; but Pallas died in the latter half, and Burrus in the first or second month of A.D. 62; consequently Felix arrived in 61 at latest. But Paul was delivered to the *one* praefect of the praetorian guards, τῷ στρατοπεδάρχῳ, who must therefore be Burrus, before and after whom there were *two*. As Burrus died Jan. or Feb., and Paul arrived May or June, the year could not be 62, and the latest possible date would be A.D. 61. Latest possible and earliest possible thus coinciding, the date, Wieseler thinks, is demonstrated. To this it is objected, and justly, that τῷ στρατοπεδάρχῳ of necessity means no more than the praefect concerned (Meyer, *Komm. in Apostelgesch.*, p. 19; Lange, *Apost. Zeit.* 2:9). In favor of the later date (A.D. 62), it is urged that on the hearing before Nero of the complaints relative to Agrippa's building overlooking the Temple (Josephus, *Ant.* 20:8,10, 11; *War.* 2:14, 1), the Jews obtained a favorable judgment through the influence of Poppaea, "Nero's wife." But Poppaea was married May, 62, and undoubtedly Festus's successor, Albinus, was at Jerusalem in the Feast of Tabernacles of the same year (Josephus, *War.* 6:5, 3). Hence it is argued that unless Josephus's expression, "at that time" (κατὰ τὸν καιρὸν τοῦτον, *Ant.* 20:8, 11), is taken with undue latitude, Festus cannot have entered upon the province earlier than A.D. 61 (Meyer, *u. s.*). Ewald (*Gesch.* 6:44) also urges the ἀκωλύτως, "no man forbidding him," of Acts 28, fin., for this year 62, and calls attention to the circumstance that the imperial rescript, rescinding the Jewish isopolity, obtained by the Greeks of Caesarea through the influence of Burrus (Josephus, *Ant.* 20:8-9), is spoken of as something recent in the beginning of the rebellion (spring of A.D. 66); indeed (in *War.* 2:14, 4), it seems as if the rescript had but just then reached Caesarea. Ewald surmises that the death of Festus and of Burrus may have retarded the process. But the fact may be (as was suggested above) that Josephus in that passage has confused some exercise of Burrus's influence in behalf of the Caesarean Greeks, in the time of Claudius, or early in the time of Nero, with the much later matter of the rescript, which would officially pass through Burrus's hands as secretary for the East (τάξιιν τὴν ἐπὶ τῶν Ἑλληνικῶν ἐπιστολῶν πεπιστευμένος), and the operation of which may have been delayed through the influence of Poppaea (who died Aug., A.D. 65). That Poppaea is spoken of as Nero's "wife," on the occasion above mentioned, may be merely euphemistic anticipation: this woman ("diu pellex, et adulteri Neronis, mox mariti potens," *Tacit. Ann.* 14:60) may have befriended the

Jews in the former capacity (at any time after A. D. 58, *Ann* 13:45). In fact, the marriage could not have taken place at the time when she is said to have aided them, unless it be possible to crowd the subsequent occurrences of Josephus (*Ant.* 20:8, 11 and 9, 1) into the space of three or four months (Browne, *Ordo Soecl.* p. 122). Nor can any certain inference be drawn from the narrative in Josephus (*Life*, 3) of certain priests whom Felix had sent to be tried at Rome, and for whom Josephus, after his own 26th year, which was complete A.D. 64, was enabled, through the good offices of “Caesar’s wife,” Poppae, to obtain their liberty. The men had been prisoners three years at least, and, for aught that appears, may have been so seven or eight years or more. That they were obscure and insignificant persons is evident from the fact that Ismael and Helkias, whom the “devout” Poppaea, two years before, had graciously detained at her court, appear to have made no intercession for their release. *SEE NERO.*

But Wieseler (p. 99), after Anger (*De temp. in Act. Ap. ratione*, p. 106), has an argument to which both attach high importance, derived from the notice of a Sunday (~~Act~~ Acts 20:7), the twelfth day after leaving Philippi, which departure was “after the days of Azyma” (15-21 Nisan), and, indeed, very soon after, for the apostle “hasted, if it were possible, to reach Jerusalem for the Pentecost” (verse 16); and of the 43 days which he had before him from 22 Nisan to the day of Pentecost, the days specified or implied in the narrative (Acts 20, 21), amount to 35 to the landing at Caesarea (comp. Chrysost. *in Act. Hor.* 45:2), leaving but eight days for the stay there (ἡμέρας πλείους, 21:10) and the journey to Jerusalem. Wieseler concludes that the departure from Philippi was on the 23d Nisan, which, being twelve days before the Sunday at Troas, would be Wednesday, consequently the 15th Nisan fell on a Tuesday. According to his method of Jewish calendar reckoning, from A.D. 56 to 59 inclusive, the only year in which 15th Nisan would fall on a Tuesday would be 58, which is his date for Paul’s arrival at Jerusalem. Were it worth while, the argument might be claimed for the year 55 (the date assigned by the ancients), in which year the day of true full moon = 15 Nisan was 1st April and Tuesday. But, in fact, it proves nothing; the chain is no stronger than its weakest link, and a single “perhaps” in the reckoning is enough to invalidate the whole concatenation. *SEE PASSOVER.*

On the whole, it seems that, if not in the Acts (q.v.), then neither in the history of the times from other sources, have we the means of settling this

part of the chronology with absolute certainty. Josephus in particular, from whom are derived the combinations which recent German writers deem so unanswerable, is discredited in this part of the history (written probably from his own resources and the inaccurate recollections of his boyhood) by the infinitely higher authority of Tacitus, who drew his information from the public records. Only, in whatever degree, it is probable that Paul's first residence at Corinth commenced A.D. 49 (§ 8, above), in the same it is probable that the arrest at Jerusalem belongs to the year 55, six years being sufficient, as nearly all inquirers are agreed, for the intermediate occurrences. Then, if the arrival at Rome took place, as the ancients say, in the second year of Nero, it will be necessary (with Petavius) to refer the "two years" (διετία, 24:27) to the term of Felix's (sole) procuratorship. *SEE CORINTHIANS (EPISTLES TO).*

That the two years' imprisonment, with which the narrative in the Acts ends, did not terminate in the apostle's death, but that he was set at liberty, and suffered martyrdom under Nero at a later time, appears to have been the unanimous belief of the ancients (see the testimonies in Browne's *Ordo Soecl.* § 130). Indeed, in no other way is it possible to find a place for the three pastoral epistles, and especially to account for statements in the Second Epistle to Timothy (q.v.). Wieseler's forced explanations have satisfied and can satisfy no one. (See also Lange, *Apostol. Zeitalter*, 2, 386 sq., and Huther, in Meyer's *Krit. exeg. Komm.* p. 25 sq. Meyer himself, *Ronzerbr.* Einleit, p. 12 sq., owns that the three pastoral epistles "stand or fall together," and that, if they be genuine, the conclusion is inevitable; which he turns into an argument against their genuineness.) But if, after his release, the apostle visited not only Spain (as Ewald admits, *Gesch.* 6, 631, on the unquestionable testimony of Clemens Romans 100 5), but Greece and Asia, as is clear from the Epistles to Timothy and Titus, scant room is left for these movements between the late dates assigned; with almost one consent, by recent German writers, to the close of the first imprisonment (A.D. 63 and 64), and the year 65 or 66, which the ancients give as the date of Paul's martyrdom. So far, therefore, it is more probable that the first imprisonment ended in one of the years 58-60. Another consideration points the same way: when Poppsea's influence was established (A.D. 58-65), which, after she became a proselyte or θεοσεβής (i.e. at least as early as 61), was freely used in favor of the Jews, it would certainly have been invoked against the apostle by his enemies (comp. Ewald, 6:621); and, even if he escaped with life, his confinement would not have been of the

mild character described in the concluding verse of the Acts, more especially as his “bonds in Christ were manifest in all the palace” (praetorium), (<sup>3013</sup>Philippians 1:13), and among his converts were some “of Caesar’s household” (4:22).

We may add that if the Narcissus (q.v.) of <sup>5613</sup>Romans 16:11, was the celebrated freedman of Claudius, the Epistle to the Romans (q.v.), written shortly before the apostle’s last visit to Jerusalem, cannot be placed so late as A.D. 58 or 59, for Narcissus died very soon after Nero’s accession (Tacit. Ann. 13:1). *SEE PAUL.*

**V. Results.** — The following table exhibits at one view the Julian or calendar years of the most important Biblical events from the Creation, and also the Vulgar or Christian AEra, according to the preceding investigations (for a complete and self-verifying tabular construction of all the Scriptural dates, with their adjustment to’ each other and the demands of history, and the authority upon which it rests, see the *Meth. Quart. Review*, October, 1856, p. 601-638). In cases where it is uncertain whether an event occurred in the latter part of one Julian year or in the beginning of the next, the earlier number is set down, and has a star prefixed. In the centuries adjacent to the birth of Christ, many events affecting Palestine are inserted from the Apocrypha, Josephus, and other sources, in addition to those properly Biblical.

A.M. B.C.

1	4172	Creation of Adam.
*131	4042	Birth of Seth.
*236	3937	Birth of Enos.
*326	3847	Birth of Cainan.
*396	3777	Birth of Mahalaleel.
*461	3712	Birth of Jared.
*623	3550	Birth of Enoch.
*688	3485	Birth of Methuselah.
*875	3298	Birth of Lamech.
*931	3242	Death of Adam.
*988	3185	Translation of Enoch.
*1043	3130	Death of Seth.
1058	3115	Birth of Noah.
*1141	3032	Death of Enos.



*1231	2937	Death of Cainan.
*1291	2882	Death of Mahalaleel
*1423	2750	Death of Jared.
*1557	2616	Birth of Japheth.
*1559	2614	Birth of Shem.
*1652	2521	Death of Lamech.
1657	2516	Death of Methuselah.

### **Beginning of the Flood**

A.M. B.C.

1658	8515	End of the Flood.
*1659	2514	Birth of Arphaxad.
*1694	2479	Birth of Salah.
*1724	2449	Birth of Iber.
*1758	2415	Birth of Peleg.
*1788	2385	Birth of Reu.
*1820	2353	Birth of Serug.
*1850	2323	Birth of Nahor.
* 879	2294	Birth of Terah.
*1949	2224	Birth of Haran.
*1997	2176	Death of Peleg.
*1998	2175	Death of Nahor.
*2007	2166	Death of Noah.
*2009	2164	Birth of Abram.
*2019	2154	Birth of Sarah.
*2027	2146	Death of Reu.
*2050	2123	Death of Serug.
*2084	2089	Death of Terah.
2085	2088	Abram's Departure from Haran.
*2095	2078	Birth of Ishmael.
*2097	2076	Death of Arphaxad.
*2109	2064	Circumcision instituted.

**Promise of Isaac.**

2110	2063	Birth of Isaac.
*2127	2046	Death of Salah.
*2146	2027	Death of Sarah.
*2149	2024	Marriage of Isaac.
*2159	2014	Death of Shem.
*2169	2004	Birth of Jacob and Esau.
*2184	1989	Death of Abraham.
*2183	1985	Death of Eber.
*2009	1964	First Marriage of Esau.
*2332	1941	Death of Ishmael.
2246	1927	Flight of Jacob from Home.
2253	1920	Marriage of Jacob to Leah and Rachel.
2254	1919	Birth of Reuben by Leah.
2255	1918	Birth of Simeon by Leah.
2256	1917	Birth of Levi by Leah.

**Marriage of Jacob with Bilhah.**

2257	1916	Birth of Judah by Leah.
------	------	-------------------------

**Birth of Dan by Bilhah.****Marriage of Jacob with Zilpah.**

2258	1915	Birth of Naphtali by Bilhah.
------	------	------------------------------

**Birth of Gad by Zilpah.**

2259	1914	Birth of Issachar by Leah.
------	------	----------------------------

**Birth of Asher by Zilpah.****Birth of Zebulon by Leah.**

2260	1913	Birth of Dinah by Leah.
------	------	-------------------------

**Birth of Joseph by Rachel.**

2266	1907	Departure of Jacob from Laban.
2278	1895	Sale of Joseph by his Brethren.
2288	1885	Dreams of the Baker and Butler.
*2289	1884	Death of Isaac.

2290	1883	Promotion of Joseph.
2298	1875	First Journey of the Patriarchs into Egypt.
2209	1874	Migration of Jacob's Family to Egypt.
*2316	1857	Death of Jacob.
*2370	1803	Death of Joseph.
2435	1733	Birth of Moses.
2475	1698	Flight of Moses into Midian.
2515	1658	Exodus of the Israelites.
2516	1657	Setting up of the Tabernacle.
2554	1619	Return of the Israelites to Kadesh.

### **Death of Aaron.**

2555	1618	Death of Moses.
------	------	-----------------

### **Entrance of the Israelites into Canaan.**

2561	1612	Conquest of Canaan completed.
*2580	1593	Death of Joshua.
*2598	1575	Subjugation by Chushan-Rishathaim.
*2606	1567	Deliverance by Othniel.
*2646	1527	Subjugation by Eglon.
*2664	1509	Deliverance by Ehud.
*2474	1429	Judgeship of Shangar.

### **Subjugation by Jabin.**

*2764	1409	Deliverance by Barak.
*2804	1369	Subjugation by the Midianites.
*2811	1362	Deliverance by Gideon.
*2811	1322	Usurpation by Abimelech.
*2854	1319	Appointment of Tola as Judge.
*2877	1286	Appointment of Jair as Judge.
*2899	1274	Subjugation by the Ammonites.
*2917	1256	Deliverance by Jephthah.
*2923	1250	Appointment of Ibzan as Judge.
*2930	1243	Appointment of Elon as Judge.

*2940	1233	Appointment of Abdon as Judge.
*2948	1225	Subjugation by the Philistines.
*2988	1185	Deliverance by Samson.
*3008	1165	Appointment of Eli as Judge.
3018	1125	Capture of the Ark by the Philistines.
3049	1124	Restoration of the Ark by the Philistines.
3068	1105	Deliverance by Samuel.
*3080	1093	Accession of Saul.
3083	1084	Defeat of the Ammonites by Saul.
*3090	1083	Birth of David.
3100	1073	War of Saul with the Philistines.
3103	1070	Capture of Agag by Saul.
*3105	1068	Secret Anointing of David by Samuel.
3110	1063	Combat of David with Goliath.
3111	1062	Flight of David from Saul's Court.
31:2	1061	Refuge of David at Gath, etc.
3113	1060	Death of Samuel.
3118	1055	Second Sparing of Saul by David.
3119	1054	Residence of David at Zikiag.
3120	1053	Accession of David at Saul's Death.
312T	1046	Coronation of David over all the Tribes.
3128	1045	Defeat of the Philistines by David.
3129	1044	Expulsion of the Jebusites by David.
3130	1043	Removal of the Ark to Jerusalem.
*3136	1037	Kindness of David to Saul's Family.
3138	1035	Adultery of David with Bathsheba.
3139	1034	Birth of Solomon.
*3140	1033	Incest of Amnon with Tamar.
3130	1023	Rebellion of Absalom.
3158	1015	Usurpation of Adonijah.
3159	1014	Birth of Rehoboam.

### **Appointment of Solomon as Viceroy.**

3160	1013	Accession of Solomon at David's Death,
3163	1010	Founding of Solomon's Temple.

3170	1003	Dedication of Solomon's Temple.
3200	973	Accession of Rehoboam.

### **Secession under Jeroboam I.**

3203	970	Apostasy of Rehoboam.
3204	960	Invasion of Judah by Shishak.
*3217	956	Accession of Abijah over Judah.
3220	953	Accession of Asa over Judah.
3221	951	Accession of Nadab over Israel.
3223	950	Accession of Baasha over Israel.
*3226	947	Birth of Jehoshaphat.
3284	939	Invasion of Judah by Terah.
3245	928	International War.
3246	927	Accession of Elah over Israel.

### **Accession of Zimri over Israel.**

### **Secession under Omri of Israel.**

### **Accession of Tibni over Israel**

*3250	923	Birth of Jehoram II.
-------	-----	----------------------

### **Death of Tibni.**

*3256	917	Appointment of Ahab as Viceroy.
3258	915	Accession of Ahab over Israel.

### **Gout of Asa.**

3261	912	Accession of Jehoshaphat over Judah.
*3267	906	Birth of Ahaziah II.
3277	896	Appointment of Jehoram II. as Viceroy.
3278	895	Accession of Ahaziah I. over Israel.
3279	894	Accession of Jehoram I. over Israel.
3283	890	Second Appointment of Jehoram II. as Viceroy.
*3286	887	Accession of Jehoram II. over Judah.
3289	884	Birth of Jehoash I.

### **Accession of Ahaziah II. over Judah.**

*3290	883	Accession of Jehu over Israel.
-------	-----	--------------------------------

**Usurpation of Athaliah over Judah.**

*3296	877	Accession of Jehoash I. over Judah.
*3311	862	Birth of Amaziah.
*3318	855	Accession of Jelloalaz I. over Israel.
3335	838	Accession of Jehoash II. over Israel
3336	837	Accession of Amaziah over Judah.
*3338	835	Appointment of Jeroboam II. as Viceroy.
*3349	824	Birth of Uzziah.
*3350	823	Accession of Jeroboam II. over Israel.
3365	808	Accession of Uzziah over Judah.
*3367	806	Birth of Jotham.
*3331	782	Death of Jeroboam II., followed by an Interregnum in Israel.

**Earthquake and Leprosy of Uzziah.****Appointment of Jotham as Viceroy.**

*3397	776	Birth of Ahaz.
3403	770	Accession of Zechariah over Israel

**Accession of Shallum over Israel.**

3404	769	Accession of Menahem over Israel.
*3414	759	Accession of Pekahiah over Israel
*3416	757	Accession of Pekah over Israel.
*3417	756	Accession of Jotham over Judah.

**Appointment of Ahaz as Viceroy.**

*3422	751	Birth of Hezekiah.
3431	742	Subjugation of the Ammonites by Jotham.
3433	740	Accession of Ahaz over Judah.
3436	737	Death of Pekah, followed by an Interregnum in Israel.
*3444	729	Accession of Hoshea over Israel.
3445	728	Subjection of Hoshea by Shalmaneser.
3447	726	Accession of Hezekiah over Judah.

**First Revolt of Hoshea from Assyria.**

3448	725	Imprisonment of Hoshea by the Assyrians.
3449	724	Second Revolt of Hoshea from Assyria.
3450	723	Siege of Samaria by Shalmaneser.
3453	720	Assyrian Captivity.
3459	715	Capture of Ashdod by Sargon.
3160	713	Invasion of Judah by Sennacherib.

**Diversion of the Assyrians by Tirhakah.**

3161	712	Discomfiture of Sennacherib.
------	-----	------------------------------

**Sickness of Hezekiah.**

3463	711	Ambassadors of Merodach-Baladan to Hezekiah.
*3464	709	Birth of Manasseh.
3476	637	Accession of Manasseh over Judah.
*3509	664	Birth of Amon.
*3525	643	Birth of Josiah.
*3531	642	Accession of Amon over Judah.
*3533	640	Accession of Josiah over Judah.
*3539	634	Birth of Jehoiakim.
*3540	633	Conversion of Josiah.
*3541	632	Birth of Jehothaz II.
3545	628	Reformation by Josiah.
3550	623	Repairs of the Temple by Josiah.
*3514	619	Birth of Zedekiah.
*3557	616	Birth of Jehoiachiin.
3564	609	Slaughter of Josiah by Pharaoh-Necho.

**Accession of Jehoahaz II. over Judah.****Accession of Jehoiakim over Judah.**

3567	606	Invasion of Judah by Nebuchadnezzar as Viceroy.
------	-----	---

**Deportation of Daniel.**

3570	603	Dream of Nebuchadnezzar interpreted by Daniel.
3575	538	Accession of Jehoiachin over Judah.



**First general Deportation by the Babylonians.****Accession of Zedekiah over Juliah.**

3584	589	Seige of Jerusalem by the Babylonians.
3585	588	Destruction of Jerusalem by the Babylonians.

**Second general Deportation by the Babylonians.**

3591	582	Third general Deportation by the Babylonians.
3612	561	Release of Jehoiachin by Evil-Merodach.
3635	538	Capture of Babylon by "Darius the Mede."
3637	536	Decree of Cyrus for the Return of the Jews.

**Return under Zerubbabel.**

8633	535	Foundation of the Second Temple.
3653	520	Renewal of Building the Second Temple.
3656	517	Completion of the Second Temple.
3690	483	Divorce of Vashti.
3394	479	Marriage of Esther.
3699	474	Plots of Ilaman against the Jews.
3700	473	Deliverance by Esther.
3714	459	Second Decree for the Jews' Return.

**Beginning of Daniel's 70 Weeks.****Arrival of Ezra at Jerusalem.**

3715	458	Divorce by the Jews of their Gentile Wives.
3726	447	Information to Nehemiah of Jerusalem's State.
3727	440	Visit of Nehemiah to Jerusalem.
*3738	435	Return of Nehemiah to Persia.
3763	410	Reformation at Jerusalem resumed by Nehemiah.
3767	406	Close of the O. T. Canon.

**B.C**

332	Samaritan Temple built on Matthew Gerizim.
320	Ptolemy I. (Lagi) conquers Palestine.
319	Onias I. Jewish High-priest.
314	Antigonus seizes upon Palestine.

- 302 Simon (the Just) Jewish High-priest.
- 301 Ptolemy (Lagi) again reduces Palestine.
- 273 Eleazar Jewish High-priest.
- 264 Palestine the Scene of War between Egypt and Syria.
- 260 Manasses Jewish High-priest.
- 234 Onias III. Jewish High-priest.
- 219 Simon II. Jewish High-priest.
- 218 Antiochus the Great seizes the most of Palestine.
- 217 Palestine again reverts to Egypt.
- 202 Antiochus retakes Palestine.
- 199 The Egyptians once more occupy Palestine.

### **Onias III. Jewish High-priest.**

- 198 Antiochus again seizes Palestine.
- 193 Palestine finally ceded to Egypt.
- 176 Palestine once more a Syrian Province.

### **Hieliodorus attempts to plunder the Jewish Temple.**

- 175 Jason purchases the Jewish High-priesthood.
- 173 Jewish High-priesthood conferred on Menelaus (Onias).
- 170 Antiochus Epiphanes plunders the Jewish Temple.
- 167 The Syrian General Apollonius besieges Jerusalem and supplants the Worship of Jehovah, but is at length resisted by Mattathias.
- 166 Judas Maccalaeus routs the Syrians.
- 164 Jewish Temple Services renewed, 25th Kisleu.
- 163 Antiochus acknowledges the Jews' Independence.
- 161 Alcimus reinstated as Jewish High-priest.

### **Judas Maccabaeus succeeded by Jonathan.**

- 152 Jonathan nominated as Jewish High-priest.
- 147 Jonathan takes the Field against Demetrius.
- 145 Jonathan goes over to Demetrius.
- 144 Jonathan declares for Antiochus.
- 143 Jonathan succeeded by Simon Maccabaeus.
- 142 The Jews freed from Foreign Tribute.
- 141 Simon gets Possession of the Citadel of Jerusalem.
- 140 Simon becomes Hereditary Prince of the Jews.
- 138 War between Simon and Antiochus Sidetes.
- 135 Simon succeeded by John Hyrcanus as Jewish Prince and High-

priest.

- 63 Jerusalem taken by Pompey.
- 40 Herod (the Great) appointed King by the Romans.
- 37 Herod takes Jerusalem by Storm.

**Ananel (a Babylonian) Jewish High-priest.**

- 33 Jesus and Simon successively Jewish High-priests.
- 21 Herod begins the Reconstruction of the Temple.
- 6 Births of John (the Baptist) and of CHRIST.
- 5 Matthias Jewish High-priest.
- 4 Death of Herod the Great.

**Joazar, Eleazar, and Joshua successively Jewish High priests.**

**A.D.**

- 1 Beginning of the Vulgar Christian Era.
- 6 Archelaus banished to Gaul.

**Coponinu Procurator of Judmaa.**

- 7 Joazar (son of Boethus) Jewish. High-priest.

**Christ's Visit with his Parents to Jerusalem.**

- 9 Ambiviu. Procurator of Judaea.
- 11 Tiberius made Associate Emperor.
- 12 Annius Rufus Procurator of Judaea.

**Ananus Jewish High-priest.**

- 14 Tiberius succeeds Augustmus as sole Emperor.
- 15 Valerius Gratus Procurator of Judaea.
- 21 Ishmael (son of Phabi) Jewish High-priest.
- 22 Eleazar (son of Ananus) Jewish High-priest.
- 23 Simon (son of Camithus), and next (Joseph) Caiaphas Jewish High-priests.
- 25 Christ baptized by John.
- 26 Pontius Pilate Procurator of Juamea.
- 28 John the Baptist beheaded.
- 29 (Crucifixion of Christ. Martyrdom of Stephen.
- 30 Conversion of Paul.
- 32 Conversion of Cornelius.

- 36 Pilate succeeded by Marcellus as Procurator. Jonathan (son of Ananus) Jewish High-priest.
- 37 Caligula Roman Emperor. Theophilus (brother of Jonathan) Jewish High-priest.
- 39 Herod Antipas banished to Gaul.
- 40 Claudius Roman Emperor.
- 41 Herod Agrippa Ruler of Palestine.
- 42 Simon Cantheras Jewish High-priest.
- 43 Matthias (son of Ananus) Jewish High-priest.
- 44 Elionaeas (son of Cantheras) Jewish High-priest.

### **Martyrdom of James.**

#### **Death of Herod Agrippa I.**

- 45 Cuspius Fadus Procurator of Judaea.
- 47 Tiberius Alexander Procurator of Judaea.
- 48 Joseph (son of Kami) succeeded in the Jewish High priesthood by Ananias (son of Nebedaeus).
- 49 Ventidius Cumanus Procurator of Judaea.
- 53 Felix Procurator of Judaea. Herod Agrippa II. "King" of Trachonitis, etc.
- 54 Nero Roman Emperor.
- 55 Poreius Festus Procurator of Judaea.

#### **Ishmael (son of Fabi) Jewish High-priest.**

- 56 Paul's First Arrival in Rome.
- 62 Martyrdom of James (the Less).

#### **Albinus Procurator of Judaea.**

#### **Joseph Kabi Jewish High-priest.**

- 64 Martyrdom of Paul.
- 65 Gessius Florus Procurator of Judaea.
- 66 Breaking-out of the final Jewish War.

#### **Cestius Gallus besieges Jerusalem.**

- 67 Vespasian General of the Roman Forces in Judaea.

#### **Theophilus succeeded by Phannius as Jewish High priest.**

- 68 Galba Roman Emperor.

#### **Simon (son of Giorias) ravages Judaea.**

63 Otho, Vitellius, and Vespasian successively Roman emperors.

### **Three Jewish Parties in Jerusalem.**

- 70 Titus destroys Jerusalem.  
 71 Bassus sent to take charge of Judaea.  
 72 Fulvius Sylva sent as Roman General into Judaba.  
 79 Titus Roman Emperor.  
 81 Domitian Roman Emperor.  
 96 Banishment of the Apostle John to Patmos.

### **Nerva Roman Emperor.**

98 Trajan Roman Emperor.

### **Close of the N.-T. Canon.**

**VI.** *Controversies and Literature.* — The distance of the Creation from the Christian sera, which has been stated with about 140 variations, is given in the Indian Chronology, as computed by Gentil, at 6174 years; in the Babylonian, by Bailly, at 6158; in the Chinese, by Bailly, at 6157; in the Septuagint, by Abulfaragius, at 5508; while Jewish writers bring it down below the computation of Capellus, namely, 4000, and one, Rabbi Lipman, to so contracted a sum as 3616.

**1.** The chronology of the English Bible was regulated by the views of Usher (*Annales Vet. et Nov. Test.* first ed. fol. Lond. 1650, 1654), who followed, in general, the authority of the Hebrew text. Other chronologers have put themselves under the guidance of the Septuagint and Josephus, maintaining that the modern Hebrew text has been greatly vitiated in the whole department of chronology, and more especially in the genealogical tables which respect the antediluvian patriarchs, as well as the ten generations immediately after the Flood. The examination above does not sustain this conclusion. Yet the shortened scheme, adopted by Usher from the Masorite Jews, is recent in its prevalence among Christians when compared with the more comprehensive chronology of the Septuagint. This last was used before the advent of our Lord, and, being followed by the Greek fathers of the Church, was generally current, till, in the eighth century, a disposition to exchange it for the Rabbinical method of reckoning was first manifested by the venerable Bede. Roman Catholic authors, however, have usually adopted the latter, from the influence of the

Latin Vulgate, which strictly follows the Hebrew numbers. Isaac Vossius, in his treatise *'De Vera AEtate Mundi* (Haggai 1659, 4to), was the first of any note who forsook the Hebrew dates. Pezron, in his work *L'Antiquit' des Tems retablie et defendue contre les Juifs et les nouveaux Chronologistes* (Amist. 1687, 12mo), produced a great impression in favor of the lengthened period advocated by Vossius. It was not, however, till the middle of the last century that Jackson produced his great work, the *Chronological Antiquities* (Lond. 1752, 3 vols. 4to). He advocated the longer chronology of the Septuagint. In the beginning of the present century Dr. Hales published the first volume of a laborious work entitled *A New Analysis of Chronology*, an undertaking which ultimately extended to four volumes, chiefly in confirmation and illustration of the conclusions of Jackson. Mr. Faber, in his work on pagan idolatry, offers some judicious observations on the chronology of ancient history, treading generally in the footsteps of Hales. The *Origines* of Sir William Drummond proceeds also on the ground supplied by the Septuagint chronology. A detailed statement of grounds for admitting the authority of the Septuagint in preference to that of the original Hebrew may be found in a preliminary dissertation prefixed to the first volume of Dr. Michael Russell's *Connection of Sacred and Profane History, from the Death of Joshua to the Decline of the Kingdoms of Israel and Judah* (Lond. 1827, 3 vols. 8vo).

**2.** Upon the data we have considered above, three principal systems of Biblical Chronology have been founded, which may be termed the Long System, the Short, and the Rabbinical. All, or almost all, have erred on the side of claiming for their results a greater accuracy than the nature of the evidence upon which they rested rendered possible. Another failing of these chronologers is a tendency to accept, through a kind of false analogy, long or short numbers and computations for intervals, rather according as they have adopted the long or the short reckoning of the patriarchal genealogies than on a consideration of special evidence. It is as though they were resolved to make the sum as great or as small as possible. The Rabblins have in their chronology afforded the strongest example of this error, having so shortened the intervals as even egregiously to throw out the dates of the time of the Persian rule. The German school is here an exception, for it has generally fallen into an opposite extreme, and required a far greater time than any derivable from the Biblical numbers for the earlier ages, while taking the Rabbinical date of the Exodus, and so has put two portions of its chronology in violent contrast. We do not lay much

stress upon the opinions of the early Christian writers, or even Josephus: their method was uncritical, and they accepted the numbers best known to them without any feeling of doubt.

The chief advocates of the Long Chronology are Jackson, Hales, and Des Vignoles. They take the Sept. for the patriarchal generations, and adopt the long interval from the Exodus to the Foundation of Solomon's Temple. The Short Chronology has had a multitude of illustrious supporters, owing to its having been from Jerome's time the recognized system of the West. Usher may be considered as its most able advocate. He follows the Hebrew in the patriarchal generations, and takes the 480 years from the Exodus to the Foundation of Solomon's Temple. The Rabbinical Chronology has lately come into much notice from its partial reception, chiefly by the German school. It accepts the Biblical numbers, but makes the most arbitrary corrections. For the date of the Exodus it has virtually been accepted by Bunsen, Lepsius, and Lord A. Hervey. The system of Bunsen we may regard as constituting a fourth class of itself, based upon theories not only independent of, but repugnant to the Bible. For the time before the Exodus he discards all Biblical chronological data, and reasons altogether, as it appears to us, on philological considerations.

In the post-diluvian period Hales rejects the Second Cainan, and reckons Terah's age at Abram's birth 130 instead of 70 years; Jackson accepts the Second Cainan, and does not make any change in the second case; Usher and Petavius follow the Heb., but the former alters the generation of Terah, while the latter does not. Bunsen requires "for the Noachian period about ten millenia before our sera, and for the beginning of our race another ten thousand years, or very little more" (*Outlines*, 2:12). These conclusions necessitate the abandonment of all belief in the historical character of the Biblical account of the times before Abraham. The writer does indeed speak of "facts and traditions;" his facts, however, as far as we can perceive, are the results of a theory of language, and tradition is, from its nature, no guide in chronology. It is, however, certain that no Shemitic scholar has accepted Bunsen's theory. For the time from the Exodus to the Foundation of Solomon's Temple, Usher alone takes the 480 years; the rest adopt longer periods, according to their explanations of the other numbers of this interval; but Bunsen calculates by generations. The period of the kings, from the foundation of Solomon's Temple, is very nearly the same in the computations of Jackson, Usher, and Petavius: Hales lengthens it by supposing an interregnum of 11 years after the death of Amaziah;

Bunsen shortens it by reducing the reign of Manasseh from 55 to 45 years. The former theory is improbable and uncritical; the latter is merely the result of a supposed necessity.

**3.** The best authorities on chronology in general are Ideler's thorough *Handbuch d. math. u. technisch. Chronologie* (Berl. 1825, 2 vols.) and *Handbuch d. Chronol.* (Berl. 1831). The methods and results of these works most pertinent to Biblical chronology are also pursued in the first part of Browne's excellent *Ordo Sceclorum* (Lond. 1844). Comp. Matzka, *Chronol. in all. s. Epochen* (Wien, 1844). Jarvis's *Introd. to the History of the Church* (N. Y. and Lond. 1845) is a fundamental investigation of ancient aeras with reference to the Christian, and is remarkable for the evidence there given of an error in the Roman annals between B.C. 45 and A.D. 160, in consequence of which the author carries every event between these points one year farther back. A synopsis of the argument is given in Strong's *Harm. and Expos. of the Gospels* (N. Y. 1852), Append. I.

One of the earliest Christian systematic chronologies is the *Pentabiblion* of Julius Africanus (in the 3d cent.), of which only a few fragments remain. Another is the *Chronicon* of Eusebius (4th cent.), of the Latin translation of which by Jerome an edition with notes was published by Scaliger in 1658; and the Armenian version has since been discovered and published, with a Latin translation, at Venice, 1818. There is also a famous Spanish commentary upon this chronicle by Alfonso Fostato (Salamanca, 1506, 5 vols. fol.). The *Chronicon Paschale* (ed. Dufresne, Par. 1689, fol., and by Dindorf, Bonn., 1832) is a Byzantine work arranged upon the basis of the Easter festival. There is also the Jewish *Chronicon mundi majus et minus*, or *Seder Olam* (מל / [ rdsein Hebrew, Amsterd. 1711, 4to; in Latin, with a commentary, by J. Meyer, Amsterd. 1649, 4to), the former part of which is reputed to have been composed about A.D. 130, while the latter is of more recent date.

The foundation of the modern science of chronology may be said to have been laid by J. Scaliger in his work *De Emendatione Temporum* (Par. 1583, fol.; enlarged, Leyd. 1598; also Geneva, 1629). Another important work of that age is that of D. Petavius (or Petau), *De Doctrina Temporum* (Par. 1627, 2 vols. fol.), with its continuation, *Uranologion* (Par. 1630, fol.), and the abridgment, *Rationarium Temporum* (Par. 1630, 8vo, and since). Other important treatises bearing more or less directly on Biblical



chronology, besides those mentioned above, are: Calvisii *Opus' Chronologicum* (Lips. 1605, and since); Riccioli, *Chronologia Reformata* (Bon. 1669); Florentini, *De anno primitivo* (Aug. Vind. 1621); Labbii et Briettii *Chronologia historica* (Par. 1670); Des Vignoles, *Chronologie de l'Histoire Sainte* (Berl. 1738, 2 vols. 4to), Marsham, *Canon Chronicus* (Lond. 1672.; Lpz. 1676; Frcft. 1696); Newton, *Chronology* (Lond. 1728); Blair, *Chronolgy and History* (London, 1754, 1768); Kennedy, *Astronom. Chronology* (London, 1672); Playfair, *System of Chronol.* (Edinb. 1784); Clinton, *Fasti Hellenici* (Oxf. 1824-30); Clemencet, *L'Art de verifier les dates* (Par. 1818). More specific are: Vitringa, *Hypotyposis hist. et chronologie* (Havn. 1774); Bengel, *Ordo-temporum* (2d ed. Stuttg. 1770); Bennigsen, *Biblische Chronologie* (Lpz. 1784); Frank, *Nov. syst. chronologice* (Gott. 1788; abridgm. Dess. 1783); Tiele, *Chronol. d. alt. Test.* (Brem. 1839); Archinard, *Chronol. sacree* (Par. 1841); Seyffarth, *Chronol. sacra* (Lpz. 1846); Akers, *Biblical Chronology* (Cincin. 1855); Anon. *Palmoni* (Lond. 1851); also Capellus, *ChronologiSacra* (Par. 1655); Allen, *Chain of Script. Chronol.* (Lond. 1659); Bedford, *Script. Chronology* (Lond. 1730); Cunninghame, *Chronology, etc.* (Lond. 1834 sq.); Bosanquet, *Chronology of Daniel* (Lond. 1848); also *Assyr. and Heb. Chronology compared* (in the *Jour. Royal As. Soc.*, Lond. 1864, p. 148 sq.); Fausset, *Sacred Chronology* (Oxf. 1855); with many others of less extent. Compare also Prideaux, *Old and New Testament Connected*; Shuckford, *Sacred and Profane History of the World Connected*; 'Memoires de l'Academie des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres'; Michaelis, *Zeitrechnung von der Sindfluth bis Salomo* (in the *Gotting. Mag. der Wissensch.* I Jahrg.); Gesenius, *De Pentateuchi Samarit. Origin'* (Hal. 1815); Hegewisch, *Einl. in die hist. Chron.* (Alt. 1811); Beer's *Abhandlungen zur Erldut. d. alten Zeitrechn.* (Leipz. 1752); Silberschlag, *Chronologie der Welt* (Berl. 1783); Parker, *Chronology* (Lond. 1859); Rockerath, *Biblische Chronologie* (Minst. 1865); Lewin, *Fasti Sacri* (Lond. 1865); Shimeall, *Bible Chronology* (N.Y. 1860); Von Gumpach, *A ltjid. Kalendar(Briiss. 1848)*, and *Zeitrechn. d. Bab. u. Assyr.* (Heidelb. 1852). **SEE VULGAR ERA.**

### Chronology, Christian.

The first Christians, in their civil relations, used the civil chronology of the countries they lived in. The ecclesiastical chronology of the early Church was limited to the use of the Jewish week, which began with a work-day and closed with the Sabbath, and in which the several days were not

named, but counted. Gradually the day of rest was changed from the last day of the week to the first, and the other days of the week came to have a special ecclesiastical name. Both these changes proceeded from the commemoration of the day of the suffering and the resurrection of Jesus Christ—Sunday being the day of the resurrection, Friday the day of the crucifixion, and Wednesday the day of the trial. The two latter, as days of mourning and fasting, are mentioned by Tertullian (*de jejun.* c. 2) and by Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* 7:12, § 75); but they are probably of an earlier origin, for the name *static* (στάσις), by which they were generally designated at the time of Tertullian, occurs in the *Pastor Hermae* (lib. 3, simil. 5). Sunday, as a day of rejoicing, is first mentioned in the Epistle of Barnabas (chap. 15), and its celebration seems to reach back to the apostolic age. These three prominent days were called in the Latin Church, *feria quarta*, *feria sexta* or *parasceve*, and *dies dominicus* or *dominica*, and by the Greeks τετράς, παρασκευή, ἡμέρα κυριακή (also abbreviated κυριακή or κυριά), or ἀναστάσεως ἡμέρα. The oldest witnesses for the names of the station-days are again Tertullian and Clement. The former is also the first to mention the name of *dominica*, while κυριακή is first found in the epistles of Ignatius (*ad Magnes.*). The other week-days were designated by the Latins with the same name as the station-days (*feria*), and counted from *feria secunda* to *feria sexta* or *parasceve*, while the Greeks counted from ἡμέρα δευτέρα το ἕκτη or παρασκευή. The last day retained its Jewish name *sabbatum*, and σάββατον or σάββατα. The planetary appellation of days which emanated from the pagan astronomers in Alexandria (see Ideler, *Handbuch der mathem. und techn. Chronologie*, Berlin, 1825) is first mentioned by Tertullian, who mentions the *dies solis* (Sunday) and *dies Saturni* (Saturday); by Justin Martyr, who mentions τοῦ ἡλίου ἡμέρα (Sunday) and κρονική (Saturday); and by Clement of Alexandria, who mentions Ἐρμοῦ (Wednesday), and Ἀφροδίτης (Friday) ἡμέρα. Still another way of designating the week-days is found in the Easter Canon of Hippolytus, which marks the days of the week (beginning with Sunday) by the first letters of the alphabet, A to G.

Among the weeks of the year, the one including the anniversaries of the death and the resurrection of Christ came early to be celebrated with special solemnity. The time on which the former of these anniversaries should be commemorated even became the occasion of one of the greatest ecclesiastical controversies of the ancient Church, one party, which claimed

to follow the example of the apostles John, Philip, and Paul, insisting that it should be celebrated on the anniversary day of the month (the full moon's day of the Jewish month of Nisan), and the other party, which appealed to the other apostles as their authorities, urging the celebration on the anniversary day of the week (Friday). The Church of Rome followed the latter, and the churches of Asia Minor the former practice. Both customs required either a compliance with the Jewish Calendar or a special calculation of the Christian Easter. Of the latter class, the most ancient known to us is one found on the marble statue of Hippolytus, and computed to the first year I of the emperor Alexander Severus (A.D. 222). It fixes the 18th of March as the time of the equinox, is arranged according to the sixteen years' cycle, and determines the Easter Sundays according to the Latin rule, that, whenever the Easter Sundays fall upon Saturdays, Easter is to be celebrated, not upon the next, but upon the second next Sunday. In the Eastern churches special calculations were made by Dionysius of Alexandria, Anatolius of Laodicea, and others. Gradually the Alexandrine Easter Canon, the authorship of which is ascribed by Jerome and Bede to Eusebius, dislodged all others, and obtained general usage in the Church. It appointed for the celebration of Easter the Sunday following the day of the full moon which falls on or comes next after the equinox. The bishops, by paschal letters, informed the churches of the proper time of Easter in every year. A third, which is mentioned by Tertullian, tried to fix the 14th day of the month of Nisan, in the death-year of Christ (the 25th of March), as the immovable anniversary of the death, and the 16th day of Nisan as the anniversary of the resurrection of Christ. *SEE EASTER.*

Constantine the Great, in 321, ordered a civil observance of Sunday by prohibiting all secular business, and transferred the pagan *Nundinae* of the old Romans to Sunday. A Roman Calendar, compiled in the middle of the fourth century, divides the whole year, from the 1st of January, according to *Nundinae* and weeks, by placing in parallel columns the eight Nundinal letters A-H, and the seven week letters A-G. The entire suppression of the *Nundinae* is thought to have been effected by the Sunday laws of Theodosius the Great.

But while the week supplanted the *Nundinae*, the Christian appellation of the week-days gave way gradually, at least in the Western countries, to the pagan planetary names. The change was, however, not effected without considerable resistance. Philastrius (about 387) counts the use of the planetary names for week-days among the heresies. Ambrose and Gregory

of Tours (died 594) censure the use of the name Sunday (*dies solis*). A bishop of Iceland, in 1107, suppressed the planetary names and substituted for them numbers. The Spaniard Campanella made an attempt to introduce, in the place of pagan names of the week-days, the names of the seven sacraments, and in place of the usual names of months those of the twelve apostles. In the Eastern churches the planetary names never came into general use. The Slavi, Lithuanians, and Finns count the days of the week, calling Monday the first day (after the Sabbath).

The months of the Christians (except among the Copts and Abyssinians, who still use the old Alexandrine months) are still those of the Julian Calendar. The names of the Roman months have also in most Christian countries come into general use. In the Byzantine empire, the Syro-Macedonian names of the months maintained themselves by the side of the Roman until late in the Middle Ages, and among the Germanic and Slavic nations efforts were made to introduce native names, but the Roman names always prevailed. The Armenian, Syrian, Coptic, and Abyssinian Christians still use the national names of months exclusively. The "Society of Friends" (Quakers) reject both the planetary names of days and the Roman names of months, and simply count both (as "first day," instead of Sunday, and "first month," instead of January).

With the names of the Roman months also the Roman way of dating was extensively used. In the Latin Church it remained in use until the establishment of the modern languages (in Germany until the 14th century). Isolated instances of the present way of counting the days are found in a fragment of a Gothic Calendar in the 4th century; in an AngloSaxon Calendar of the 10th century; in the works of Pope Gregory the Great (594-604), and elsewhere. The designation of the days of the months by the names of saints came into use early in the Middle Ages. In the Byzantine Church the Roman way of dating seems to have been supplanted in the 7th century by the present way of counting the days. In Asia, the Roman way of dating was used only by way of comparison with the national method.

The beginning of the year in the Christian countries has remained, as it was fixed in the Julian Calendar, on the 1st of January. Dionysius Exiguus, in order to give the beginning of the year a Christian character, called it the "day of circumcision" (*dies circumcissionis*). Several attempts were made to substitute for the 1st of January another beginning of the year, relating to

some prominent event in the history of Christianity. Thus several popes began to use for that purpose the first day of March, probably on the ground that March was the usual month of the Passover, and Venice used in its public documents this day until the downfall of the republic. Another Roman new-year's day was the 25th of March (the festival of the Annunciation), and this was used in Pisa and Florence until 1749. But the most common was Christmas (a *Nativitate Domini*), which was even called *mos*, or *stilus curies Romance*. It was not until Pope Innocent XII (1691) that this habit was altogether abandoned. In Germany, the calendarium of Charlemagne has the 1st of January; the 25th of March was in frequent use until the 11th century, when it gave way to Christmas, which maintained itself until the peace of Westphalia. France, under the Merovingians, used the 1st of March; under the Carolingians, Christmas; under the Capetings, until the 16th century, Easter; the latter was also for a long time in use in Holland and in Cologne. Spain and Portugal long used the 25th of March, and from the 14th to the 16th century, Christmas. The Anglo-Saxons, according to Bede, began the year on Christmas; but gradually three different years were distinguished — the historical, legal or civil, and ecclesiastical. The beginning of the first has long been on the 1st of January; that of the second was the 25th of December until the 13th century, after that the 25th of March until 1752, when it was fixed at the 1st of January. In the Byzantine empire the 1st of January was in the 5th century supplanted by the 1st of September (the epoch of the Indictions), which the Russians abandoned for the 1st of January in 1700, and the kingdom of Greece in 1821. The Chaldaeans have adopted the 1st of September, while the Nestorians and Jacobites stick to the 1st of Tishri. The Copts and Abyssinians still adhere to the 1st of Thoth.

Of a special church year there are no traces until the time of Constantine the Great. Its beginning seems at first to have been made with the sun-month corresponding to the Jewish Nisan. Thus the Apostolic Constitutions designate December as the ninth, January as the tenth, and "Xanthicus" (which is usually identified with Nisan) as the first month. Epiphanius follows the same calculation; and Victorius, Dionysius, and Beda speak of the Easter month as the first. The epoch of the first Sunday of Advent originated with the Nestorians, and is first found in the *Responsoriale* of Gregory the Great, but seems to have been general in the Latin churches as early as the 7th century. The Greek Church has retained the 1st of September as the beginning of the church year. See Herzog,

*Real-Encyclopadie s.v. Zeitrechnung* (which we have chiefly followed in the above article). *SEE AERA; SEE CHURCH-YEAR; SEE CYCLE.*

## Chrysargyrum

(*χρυσάργυρον*), a tax on trade and commerce under the later Roman emperors, so called because paid in gold and silver; and also *tributum lustrale*, because paid once in every five years (*lustrum*). Even the poorest tradesmen were not exempt from it; and it was called an intolerable tax (*φόρος ἀφόρητος*, Libanius, *Orat.* 14, cont. Florent.). Yet Constantius freed the lower clergy, who gained their bread by trade or labor, from this tax; and later emperors confirmed the exemption. — Bingham, *Orig. Eccles.* bk. 5, ch. 3, § 6.

## Chrys'olite

(*χρυσόλιθος*, *golden stone*), the precious stone which garnished the seventh foundation of the New Jerusalem in John's vision (<sup>(~~621~~)</sup>Revelation 21:20); according to Schleusner, a gem of golden hue, or, rather, of yellow streaked with green and white (see Pliny 37:9, 42; Isidor. *Orig.* 16:14). It was called by some *chrysophyllum* (*χρυσόφυλλον*, Epiphanius, *De geminis*, 10). It was a name applied by the ancients to all gems of a golden or yellow color, but it probably designated particularly the *topaz* of the moderns (see, however, Bellermann, *Urim et Thummim*, p. 62). In the Sept. the word is employed for *vyvæī*, *tarshish*, the "beryl" of our version (<sup>(~~628~~)</sup>Exodus 28:20; <sup>(~~610~~)</sup>Ezekiel 10:9). *SEE BERYL; SEE TOPAZ.*

What is usually termed chrysolite is a crystalline precious stone of the quartz kind, of a glossy fracture. In chemical composition it is a ferriferous *silicate of magnesia*. The prevailing color is yellowish-green, and pistachio-green of every variety and degree of shade, but always with a yellow and gold luster. There are two particular species of chrysolite: one, called the Oriental chrysolite, of a pistachio-green, transparent, and, when held up to the light in certain positions, often with a cherry-red shade; the other is the granulous chrysolite, of different shades of yellowish-green color, half transparent and nearly pellucid (see the *Penny Cyclopedia*, s.v.). *SEE GEM.*

## Chrysologus, Petrus

archbishop of Ravenna, was born at Imola about 400, and was consecrated archbishop about 433. He was noted for strictness of discipline, and especially for eloquence, from which his surname was derived. Eutyches sought to gain the eloquence and reputation of Chrysologus for his party, but the latter not only repelled him, but strenuously opposed his doctrine. He died at Imola, according to one account, Dec. 2, 450; according to another, in 458. A number of *Sermons* (176) are preserved, of which the first edition, by Vincentius, appeared in 1534; another at Venice, 1750, fol. One of the best editions is *Sermones, editio omnium certe castigatissima* (Aug. Vind. 1758, fol.). These and the few letters of his that remain are collected in a complete edition in Migne's *Patrologia* (1846, imp. 8vo). — Migne, *Dect. de Biographie*, 3. 425.

## Chrysoprasus

(**χρυσόπρασος**, mentioned in <sup><621></sup>Revelation 21:20, as the tenth row of stones in the foundation of the heavenly Jerusalem), a precious stone of greenish-golden color, or apple-green, passing into a grass-green (Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* 27:20, 21); an Indian translucent gem, so called as resembling in color the juice of the leek (**πράσον**), with golden spots (**χρυσός**) — a species of beryl, supposed to be possessed of healing power in diseases of the eyes. Its spotted character may be inferred from the name given to it by Pliny (*Hist. Nat.* 37, c. 8), *pardalios*, or, rather, *pantherion*, from its resembling the leopard-skin (see Braun. *de Vest. Sac. Heb.* 2, c. 9, p. 509). The chrysoprase of the ancients is by some supposed to be identical with the stone now so called, viz. the apple or leek-green variety of agate, or uncrystallized quartz (*London Encyclopaedia*, s.v.), which owes its color to oxide of nickel; this stone at present is found only in Silesia; but Mr. King (*Antique Gems*, p. 59. note) says that the true chrysoprase is sometimes found in antique Egyptian jewelry set alternately with bits of lapis-lazuli. **SEE GEM.**

In <sup><0022></sup>Genesis 2:12, the Sept. renders the word **μῆνιρσο'ham**, by chrysoprase (**λίθος ὁ πράσινος**), but they were probably different gems. **SEE BERYL.**

## Chrysostom ST.,

born 347 at Antioch, died in exile 407. His proper name was JOHN, but since the seventh century he is better known as CHRYSOSTOM (*Χρυσόστομος*), the golden-mouthed pulpit orator of the Greek Church. Like Gregory of Nazianzen, and Augustine, he had a most excellent Christian mother Anthusa, who, by her exemplary virtue and piety, commanded even the admiration of the heathen. It was with reference to her that Libanius, the most distinguished rhetorician and literary representative of heathenism at the close of the fourth century, felt constrained to exclaim, "Ah, gods of Greece what wonderful women there are among the Christians!" Anthusa was married to a prominent military officer at Antioch, but became a widow in her twentieth year, and continued in that state, devoting herself exclusively to religion and the education of her children. She planted the seeds of early piety in the soul of Chrysostom, although, like Gregory Nazianzen, Augustine, and other sons of Christian mothers, he was not baptized till mature age. She gave him, at the same time, the benefit of the best intellectual culture of the age in the school of Libanius, who esteemed him his best scholar, and desired him to become his successor as professor of rhetoric or forensic eloquence. Chrysostom entered the career of a rhetorician, but shortly after he broke with the world, and resolved to devote himself exclusively to religion. After the usual course of catechetical instruction, he was baptized by bishop Meletius, of Antioch. His first impulse after his conversion was to embrace the monastic life, which, since St. Anthony of Egypt, the patriarch of monks, had set the example, and such men as Athanasius, Basil the Great, the two Gregories, Ambrose, Jerome, and Augustine had given it the sanction of their great authority, carried away many of the noblest and most earnest youths of the Church, as a mode of life best adapted to secure personal holiness and salvation, and to benefit the world by presenting to it, in bold contrast to its perishing vanities, the beauty and power of heroic self-denial and true happiness in the unbroken communion with God. Anthusa, however, defeated his design for a season. She took him by the hand, led him to her room, and by the bed where she had given him birth, she remonstrated with him in tears and tender entreaties not to forsake her. Like an obedient son, he yielded to her wishes; and although he, after her death, spent some time in monastic retreat, and retained ascetic habits even on the patriarchal throne, yet the greater part of his life was devoted to the active service of the Church in some of her most



influential positions. He commenced the clerical career as reader in the church of Antioch under Meletius, and would soon have been promoted to a bishopric, but he evaded the election by a sort of pious ruse, and thrust it upon his friend Basilius (not of Caesarea, but of Raphanea, in Syria), whom he considered worthier, but who bitterly complained of the deception. Chrysostom defended his conduct, and justified the theory of accommodation, or economy (*οἰκονομία*), as he called it, wherever it may be practiced from pure motives, and as a means to a good end; unwarrantably appealing to Paul, who became a Jew to the Jews, and a Gentile to the Gentiles. Other fathers (e.g. Jerome) had the same lax views on the duty of veracity, which find no support in the Bible, but were universally entertained among the heathen philosophers, especially the Greek sophists. Even Plato vindicates falsehood, and expressly recommends it to physicians as a help to the healing of the sick, and to rulers for the good of the people (*De Republ.* 3. p. 266). No wonder that even to this day strict veracity is so rare in the Oriental churches. This occurrence was the occasion of Chrysostom's famous treatise on the priesthood (*Περὶ ἱερωσύνης*, *De Sacerdotio*, *libri* 6), which, notwithstanding the serious defect alluded to, is one of the most useful works on the duties and responsibilities of the holy ministry, and has been often separately edited (by Erasmus, Cave, Bengel, etc.) and translated into modern languages (into English by Hollier, 1740; Bunce, 1759; Mason, 1826 (Phila. 12mo); Marsh, 1844, and B. Harris Cowper, 1866).

After the death of his mother Chrysostom fled from the seductions and tumults of city life to the monastic solitude of the mountains near Antioch, and there spent six happy years in the study of the Bible, in sacred meditation and prayer, under the guidance of the learned abbot Diodorus (afterwards bishop of Tarsus, † 394), and in communion with suchlike-minded young men as Theodore of Mopsuestia, the celebrated father of Antiochian (Nestorian) theology († 429). Monasticism was to him a profitable school of experience and self-government; because he embraced this mode of life from the purest motives, and brought into it intellect and cultivation enough to make the seclusion available for moral and spiritual growth. He thus describes the life of his brethren on the mountain solitude near Antioch: Before the rising of the sun they rise, hale and sober, sing as with one mouth hymns to the praise of God, then bow the knee in prayer under the direction of the abbot, read the Holy Scriptures, and go to their labors; pray again at nine, twelve, and three o'clock; after a good day's

work, enjoy a simple meal of bread and salt, perhaps with oil, and sometimes with pulse; sing a thanksgiving hymn, and lay themselves on their pallets of straw without care, grief, or murmur. When one dies they say, 'He is perfected;' and they all pray God for a like end, that they also may come to the eternal Sabbath-rest and to the vision of Christ."

In this period he composed his earliest writings in praise of monasticism and celibacy, and his two long letters to the fallen Theodore (subsequently bishop of Mopsuestia), who had regretted his monastic vow and resolved to marry. Chrysostom regarded this small affair, from the ascetic standpoint of his age, as almost equal to an apostasy from Christianity, and plied all his oratorical arts of sad sympathy, tender entreaty, bitter reproach, and terrible warning to reclaim his friend to what he thought the surest and safest way to heaven.

By excessive self-mortification Chrysostom undermined his health, and returned about 380 to Antioch. There he was ordained deacon by Meletius (who died in 381), and presbyter by Flavian in 386. By his eloquence and his pure and earnest character he soon acquired great reputation and the love of the whole church. During the sixteen or seventeen years of his labors in Antioch he wrote the greater part of his Homilies and Commentaries, his work on the Priesthood, a consolatory epistle to the despondent Stagirus, and an admonition to a young widow on the glory of widowhood and the duty of continuing in it. He disapproved second marriage, not as sinful or illegal, but as inconsistent with an ideal conception of marriage and a high order of piety.

Chrysostom was chosen, without his own agency, patriarch of Constantinople. At this post he labored several years with happy effect. By talent and culture he was peculiarly fitted to labor in a great metropolis. . He happily avoided the temptation of hierarchical pride and worldly conformity. In the midst of the splendors of New Rome he continued his ascetic habits, and applied all his income to the sick and the poor. He preached an earnest, practical Christianity, insisted on church discipline, and boldly attacked the vices of his age, and the hollow, worldly, and hypocritical religion of the imperial court.

But his unsparing sermons aroused the anger of the empress Eudoxia, a young and beautiful woman, who despised her husband and indulged her passions. His rising fame, moreover, excited the envy of the ambitious patriarch, Theophilus of Alexandria, who could not tolerate a successful

rival in Constantinople. An act of Christian love toward the persecuted Origenistic monks of Egypt involved him in the Origenistic controversy, which raged at that time with great violence in Egypt and Syria, and at last the united influence of Theophilus and Eudoxia overthrew him. Persecution and suffering were to test his character and to throw around his memory the halo of martyrdom for the cause of purity and charity. Theophilus first sent the aged Epiphanius, so well known for his orthodox zeal and his hatred of the arch-heretic Origen, to Constantinople, as a tool of his hierarchical plans, in the hope that he would destroy the thousand-headed hydra of heresy, and ruin Chrysostom for his apparent connection with it. Chrysostom, as a pupil of the Antiochian school of theology and as a practical divine, had no sympathy with the philosophical speculations and allegorical fancies of Origen, but he knew how to appreciate the merits of this great man, and was prompted by a sense of justice and Christian love to intercede in behalf of the Origenistic monks, whom Theophilus had unmercifully expelled from Egypt, and he showed them kindness when they arrived at Constantinople, although he did not admit them to the holy communion till their innocence should be publicly established. Epiphanius himself found that injustice had been done to those monks, and left Constantinople with the words, "I leave to you the city, the palace, and hypocrisy." He died on board the ship on his return to Cyprus (403). Theophilus now proceeded to Constantinople in person, and at once appeared as accuser and judge of Chrysostom. He well knew how to use the dissatisfaction of the clergy, of the empress Eudoxia, and of the court, with Chrysostom, on account of his moral severity and his bold denunciations. In Chrysostom's own diocese, on an estate, "at the oak" (synodus ad quercum), in Chalcedon, he held a secret council of thirty-six bishops against Chrysostom, and there procured, upon false charges of immorality, unchurchly conduct, and high treason. his deposition and banishment in 403. Among the twenty-nine charges were these: that Chrysostom called the saint Epiphanius a fool and demon; that he wrote a book full of abuse of the clergy; that he received visits from females without witnesses; that he bathed alone and ate alone.

Chrysostom was recalled, indeed, in three days, in consequence of an earthquake and the dissatisfaction of the people, but was again condemned by a council in 404, and banished from the court, because, incensed by the erection of a silver statue of Eudoxia close to the church of St. Sophia, and by the theatrical performances connected with it, he had, with unwise and

unjust exaggeration, opened a sermon, on ~~Mark~~ Mark 6:17 sq., in commemoration of John the Baptist, with the personal allusion, “Again Herodias rages, again she raves, again she dances, and again she demands the head of John [Chrysostom’s own name] upon a charger” (Socrates, *Hist. Eccl.* 6, c. 18). From his exile in Cucusus and Arabissus he corresponded with all parts of the Christian world, took lively interest in the missions in Persia and Scythia, and appealed to a general council. But even the powerful intercession of pope Innocent I and the sympathy of the people at Constantinople were of no avail against the wrath of the court and the envy of a rival patriarch. The enemies of Chrysostom procured from Arcadius an order for his transportation to the remote desert of Pityms. On the way thither he died at Comana in Pontus, Sept. 14, 407, in the sixtieth year of his age, praising God for everything, even for his unmerited persecutions. His last words were: Δόξα τῷ θεῷ πάντων ἔνεκεν. They express the motto of his life and work.

Chrysostom was venerated by the people as a saint; and thirty years after his death, by order of Theodosius II (438), his bones were brought back in triumph to Constantinople, and deposited in the imperial tomb in the Church of the Apostles. The emperor himself met the remains at Chalcedon, fell down before the coffin, and in the name of his guilty parents, Arcadius and Eudoxia, implored the forgiveness of the holy man. The age could not, indeed, understand and appreciate the bold spirit of Origen, but was still accessible to the narrow piety of Epiphanius and the noble virtues of Chrysostom.

John Chrysostom is the greatest commentator and preacher of the Greek Church, which reveres him above all fathers. He left a spotless name behind him. As a divine, he was eminently sound, moderate, and practical; less profound and original than Athanasius or Augustine, but superior to both as an exegete and sermonizer. He is the best representative of the Antiochian school as distinct from that of Alexandria. He avoided the errors into which his friend Theodore of Mopsuestia, and his successor, the unhappy Nestorius, of the same school, fell soon afterwards. Neander compares him to Spener, the practical reformer of the Lutheran Church in the 17th century. Villemain claims for him “the union of all the oratorical attributes, the natural, the pathetic, and the grand, which have made St. John Chrysostom the greatest orator of the primitive Church, and the most distinguished interpreter of that remarkable epoch.” Carl Hase says of him that “he complemented the sober clearness of the Antiochian exegesis and

the rhetorical arts of Libanius with the depth of his warm Christian heart, and that he carried out in his own life, as far as mortal man can do it, the ideal of the priesthood which, in youthful enthusiasm, he once described" (*Church History*, § 104). Niedner characterizes him thus: "In him we find a most complete mutual interpenetration of theoretical and practical theology, as well as of the dogmatical and ethical elements, exhibited mainly in the fusion of the exegetical and homiletical. Hence his exegesis was guarded against barren philology and dogma, and his pulpit discourse was free from doctrinal abstraction and empty rhetoric. The introduction of the knowledge of Christianity from the sources into the practical life of the people left him little time for the development of special dogmas" (*Geschichte d. chr. Kirche*, 1846, p. 323).

We have from Chrysostom over six hundred homilies, delivered at Antioch and Constantinople, by far the most valuable of his writings. They are consecutive expository sermons on Genesis, the Psalms, and most of the books of the New Testament. They contain his exegesis, and hence are so often quoted by modern commentators, especially the homilies on the Epistles of Paul. Besides them he wrote discourses on special occasions, among which the twenty-one homilies on the Statutes, occasioned by a rebellion at Antioch in 387, are the most celebrated. The other works of Chrysostom are his youthful treatise on the priesthood already alluded to; a number of doctrinal and moral essays in defense of the Christian faith, and in commendation of celibacy and the nobler forms of monastic life; and two hundred and forty-two letters, nearly all written during his exile between 403 and 407. The most important of the letters are two addressed to the Roman bishop Innocent I, with his reply, and seventeen long letters to his friend Olympias, a pious widow and deaconess. They all breathe a noble Christian spirit, not desiring to be recalled from exile, convinced that there is but one misfortune — departure from the path of piety and virtue, and filled with cordial friendship, faithful care for all the interests of the Church, and a calm and cheerful looking forward to the glories of heaven. The so-called *Liturgy* of Chrysostom, which is still in regular use in the Greek and Russian churches, bears the unmistakable marks of a later age.

*Literature.* — The best edition of the works of Chrysostom in the original Greek, with a Latin translation, is the Benedictine, prepared by Bernard de Montfaucon, first published in Paris 1718-1738, in 13 fol. vols.; reprinted in Venice 1734-'41; in Paris (Gaume), 1834-'39; and in Migne's *Patrologia*, 1859-'60. The Homilies have been often translated into

French, German, English, and other languages (English translation in the Oxford library of the Fathers, 1842-'53); so also his youthful work on the Priesthood (see above). On the life and character of Chrysostom see especially the *Vita* in vol. 13 of the *Opera*, p. 91-178; Tillemont, *Memoires*, vol. 11, p. 1-405; Stilting, *Acta Sanctorum* for Sept. 14; Neander, *Der heil. Chrysostomus* (Berlin, 1821, 3d ed. 1848, in 2 vols. (the first volume translated by Stapleton, Lond. 1838); Villemain, *Tableau de l'eloquence chretienne au IV<sup>e</sup> siecle* (Par. 1849, p. 154-217); Perthes, *Life of Chrysostom* (Boston, 1854, 12mo); Abbe Rochet, *Histoire de St. Jean Chrysostome* (Par. 1866). Comp. also Schaff's *Church History*, 1866, vol. 3, p. 702 sq. and 933 sq. (from which a part of the above sketch has been taken).

## Chub

[pron. *Cub*] (bWk, Heb. *Kub*, deriv. uncertain; Sept. apparently **Λίβυες**, but transposes; Vulg. *Chub*), a word occurring only once as the name of a people in alliance with Egypt in the time of Nebuchadnezzar (<sup>2315</sup>Ezekiel 30:5): "Cush, and Phut, and Lud, and all the mingled people (br<sup>l</sup>), and Chub (Sept. **Πέρσαι καὶ Κρήτες καὶ Λυδαὶ καὶ Λίβυες καὶ πάντες οὐ ἐπίμικτοι ἐπ' αὐτῶν ᾧ. ρ. Λίβυες καὶ Αἰθίοπες καὶ Λυδοὶ καὶ πᾶσα ἡ Ἀραβία**), and the children of the land of the covenant shall fall by the sword with them" (i.e. no doubt the Egyptians; see ver. 4). The first three of these names or designations are of African peoples, unless (but this is improbable) the Shemite Lud be intended by the third (see, however, 27:10; 38:5; <sup>2769</sup>Isaiah 66:19; <sup>2469</sup>Jeremiah 46:9); the fourth is of a people on the Egyptian frontier; and the sixth probably applies to the remnant of the Jews who had fled into Egypt (comp. <sup>2713</sup>Daniel 11:28, 30, 32, especially the last, where the covenant is not qualified as "holy"), which was prophesied to perish for the most part by the sword and otherwise in that country (<sup>2426</sup>Jeremiah 42:16, 17, 22; 44:12, 13, 14, 27, 28). This fifth name is therefore that of a country or people in alliance with Egypt, and probably of Northern Africa, or of the lands near Egypt to the south. Some have proposed to recognize *Chub* in the names of various African places — *Cobe* (**Κοβή**), a port on the Indian Ocean (Ptol. 4:7, §10); *Chobat* (**Χωβάτ** or **Χωβάθ**), in Mauritania (4. 2, § 9); and *Cobion* (**Κώβιον** or **Κωβίον**), in the Mareotic nome in Egypt (4. 5) — conjectures which are of no value except as showing the existence of similar names where we might expect this to have had its place. Bochart strangely regards it as the

city *Paliurus*, in Marmarica (Strabo, 17:838); while Havernick seeks it in the people called *Kufa* on the Egyptian monuments (Wilkinson, 1:379 sq.). Others, however, think the present Hebrews text corrupt in this word. It has been therefore proposed to read *Nub* (bWn) for *Nubia*, as the Arab. vers. has “the people the *Noobeh*,” whence it might be supposed that at least one copy of the Sept. had derived the first letter (v for the usual X); one Hebrews MS. indeed reads thus (bwnk, Cod. 409, ap. de Rossi). The Arab. vers. is, however, of very slight weight, and we have no authority of this kind for applying the word *Nub* (or *Kenub*, its Egyptian pronunciation; see Bunsen, *Egypt. Stell.* 2, 6) to *Nubia*, or rather the *Nubae* (Νοῦβαί, Strabo, 17:786, 819; 4:7, 30; Pliny 6:35; Steph. Byz. p. 596), the countries held by whom from Strabo’s time to our own are by the Egyptian inscriptions included in Keesh or Kesh, that is, Cush; the *Nubae*, however, may not in the prophet’s days have been settled in any part of the territory which has taken from them its name. Another conjecture (regarded as quite equal in probability by Gesenius, *Thes. Heb.* p. 664) is the emendation which Hitzig proposes (*Begriff der Kritik*, p. 129), namely, *Lub* (bWl). The *Lubim*, doubtless the Mizraite *Lehabim* of <sup>Q1113</sup>Genesis 10:13; 1 Chronicles 1, 11, are mentioned as serving with Cushim in the army of Shishak (<sup>14112</sup>2 Chronicles 12:2, 3), and in that of Zerah (16:8; comp. 14:9), who was most probably also a king of Egypt, and certainly the leader of an Egyptian army. **SEE CUSH; SEE ZERAH.** Nahum speaks of them as helpers of Thebes, together with Put (Phut), while Cush and Egypt were her strength (3:8, 9); and Daniel mentions the *Lubim* and Cushim as submitting to or courting a conqueror of Egypt (11:43). The *Lubim* might therefore well occur among the nations suffering in the fall of Egypt. There is, however, this objection, that we have no instance of the supposed form *Lub* in the sing., the noun being always given in the plural — LUBIM **SEE LUBIM** (q.v.); hence Hitzig has himself since rejected this view (*Kurzgef. exeget. Hdb. in Ezechiel*, in loc.). The suggestion of Havernick, that the name Chub is to be connected with *Kufa*, which occurs on the Egyptian monuments as that of a people conquered by the Egyptians (Wilkinson, *Anc. Egypt.* 1:367, 371), would be deserving of notice were it not that it involves the somewhat violent proposition that a people, of whom we only know that they were the allies of the Egyptians, should be identified with a people of whom we only know that they were the conquered enemies of the Egyptians; though it is certainly possible that they who were at an early period foes, may at a later period have become allies. Worthy of notice also

is the suggestion of Furst, who says, "It is possible that it is to be connected with *Coba*, the existing name of an Ethiopian port, and which, perhaps, was formerly the name of a district" (*Hebrew Handbook* s.v.).

### Chubb, Thomas

an English Deist, was born at East Harnham, a village near Salisbury, in 1679. His father dying, left his family poor, and Chubb was apprenticed to a glover in 1694. At this trade, and that of tallow-chandler, he supported himself, and at the same time cultivated his uncommon natural ability by diligent study. He died at Salisbury, Feb. 3, 1746. His first work, which appeared in 1715, was entitled *The Supremacy of the Father asserted* (8vo), and denied the divinity of Christ. It was followed by a series of publications, in which his skepticism was more and more fully developed. Among them are *Inquiries concerning Liberty of Conscience and Sin* (Lond. 1717, 8vo); and a great number of tracts on authority, human nature, miracles, etc. He was largely involved in controversy with Warburton, Stebbing, Fleming, and others. His posthumous tracts were published in 2 vols. 8vo, 1748; and were answered by Fleming, in *True Deism the Basis of Christianity; or, Observation on Chubb's posthumous Works*; and by Leland (*View of Deistical Writers*, vol. 1). "Chubb was a working man, endowed with strong native sense, who manifested the same inclination to meddle with the deep subject of religion which afterwards marked the character of Thomas Paine and others, who influenced the lower orders later in the century. In his general view of religion, Chubb denied all particular providence, and, by necessary consequence, the utility of prayer, save for its subjective value as having a reflex benefit on the human heart. He was undecided as to the fact of the existence of a revelation, but seemed to allow its possibility. He examined the three great forms of religion which professed to depend upon a positive revelation, Judaism, Mohammedanism, and Christianity. The claims of the first he wholly rejected, on grounds similar to those explained by Morgan, as incompatible with the moral character of God. In reference to the second he anticipated the modern opinions on Mohammedanism by asserting that its victory was impossible if it had not contained truth which the human spirit needed, In examining the third he attacked, like Morgan, the evidence of miracles and prophecy, and asserted the necessity of moral right and wrong as the ground of the interpretation of Scripture" (Farrar, *Critical History of Free Thought*, p. 142). There is a full account of Chubb, with



the opinions of various writers concerning him, in the *Biographia Britannica*, 3. 521-532.

## Chun

[pron. *Cun*] (Heb. *Kun*, ןכּ, deriv. uncertain; Sept. ἐκλεκτός, Vulg. *Chun*), a Syrian city mentioned in connection with Tibhath, as one of the “cities of Hadarezer,” from which David procured brass for building the Temple (<sup><BIB></sup>1 Chronicles 18:8). In the parallel passage (<sup><BIB></sup>2 Samuel 8:8) these two cities are called respectively Bethah and BERTHAI. It is perhaps the same with the *Conna* mentioned in the *Itin. Antonizi* as situated between Laodicea and Baalbek. The rendering of the Sept. seems to imply that instead of “from Chun” (ןכּמַי had read *Berod* (d/rB] q. d. rWbB; i.e. rWj B; choice); but Josephus supports the present Heb. text (Μάχωνι, *Ant.* 7, 5, 3). *SEE BERTHAI*.

## Church

**I.** *The word Church.* —

**1.** The origin of the word is uncertain. In the Germanic and Slavonic languages it is found as follows: Anglo-Saxon, *cyrica*, *circ*, *cyric*; English, *church*; Scottish, *kirk*; German, *kirche*; Low-German, *karke*; Frisian, *tzierke* or *tziurke*; Danish, *kyrke*; Swedish, *kyrka*; Bohemian, *cyrkew*; Polish, *cerkiew*; Russian, *zerkow*. The following derivations have been assigned to the word: (1) Heb. *hryqan* and *arg*; (2) Teutonic, *koren*, *karen*; (3) Celtic, *cyrch* or *cylch*, *cyrchu* or *cylchu*; (4) Latin, *curia*; Greek, *κυριακόν* (*the Lord's house*, from *κύριος*, *Lord*). The preponderance of opinion is in favor of the last derivation (Gieseler, *Eccl. Hist.* § 1; Hooker, *Eccl. Pol.* v. 13; Pearson, *On the Creed*, Oxf. 1820, 1:504; and, the principal authority, Jacobson, *Kirchenrechtliche Versuche*, Königsb. 1833, 8vo). On the other hand, Meyrick, in *Smith's Dictionary of the Bible* (in, Appendix, p. ci), argues at length against this derivation chiefly on the ground (1) that the Greek missionaries, who are supposed to have carried the Word among the Northern tribes, used *ἐκκλησία*, not *κυριακόν*; and that Ulphilas uses *aikklesjo* (<sup><BIB></sup>Romans 16:23 et al.); (2) that the Roman Church (and the Romanic languages after it) adopted the Greek word *ἐκκλησία*, not *κυριακόν*, from its Greek teachers. His conclusion, after dropping the first derivation, is that “it is difficult to say what is to be substituted. There was probably some word which, in the

language from which the Teutonic and Slavonic are descended, designated the old heathen places of religious assembly, and this word, having taken different forms in different dialects, was adopted by the Christian missionaries. It was probably connected with the Latin *circus*, *circulus*, and with the Greek κύκλος, possibly also with the Welsh *cylch*, *cyl*, *cynchle*, or *caer*. Lipsius, who was the first to reject the received tradition, was probably right in his suggestion, ‘Credo et a circo Kirck nostrum esse, quia veterum templa instar Circi rotunda’ (*Epist. ad Belgas*, Cent. 3. Ep. 44).”

**2. N.T. uses of the word Church.** — The Greek word ἐκκλησία in the New Testament (<sup><41618></sup>Matthew 16:18; 18:17; <sup><41012></sup>1 Corinthians 10:32; <sup><40022></sup>Ephesians 1:22), corresponding to the Hebrew **l hq; hd[earq]hais** from **καλεῖν**, to call (**κληῖσις**, a calling; **κλητοί**, called), and is rendered by our word church. The meaning of the word would thus seem to be, in the N.T., the whole company of God’s elect, those whom he has called to be his people under the new dispensation, as he did the Israelites under the old. Such is the signification in one of the two instances in which Christ uses the word in the Gospels: “Upon this rock I will build my *church*” (<sup><41618></sup>Matthew 16:18). The other (<sup><40117></sup>Matthew 18:17) refers to the single congregation. Instead of ἐκκλησία, Christ generally used the terms “kingdom of God,” “kingdom of heaven,” or simply “kingdom,” or thy kingdom, or the Son of Man’s kingdom (<sup><40113></sup>John 3:3; <sup><41012></sup>Matthew 6:32; *ib.* 4:23, etc.; *ib.* 20:21; *ib.* 13:41; 16:28). The word “church” is first applied by St. Luke to the company of original disciples at Jerusalem on the day of Pentecost (<sup><41217></sup>Acts 2:47), and is afterwards applied (in the Acts, Epistles, and Apocalypse) to, 1. The whole Christian body or society, as the sanctified of God (<sup><41617></sup>Ephesians 5:27); 2. The whole number of those who profess the Christian religion under pastors, etc. (<sup><41218></sup>1 Corinthians 12:18); 3. Particular societies of Christians in particular cities or provinces, e.g. the church in Jerusalem (<sup><41011></sup>Acts 8:1); 4. Religious assemblies of these societies and the places in which they met, e.g. (<sup><41015></sup>Romans 16:5), “Greet the church that is in their house;” etc. (<sup><41118></sup>1 Corinthians 11:18; 14:19, 28).

**3. Common uses of the word Church.** — The most common sense in which the word church is used is to denote the body of the acknowledged followers of Christ, or his visible body.

**2.** It is also used to denote the community of true believers, whether known to be such or not.

3. It is used as “church militant” and “church triumphant” to distinguish between believers yet on earth, and still contending with opposition, and believers already glorified in heaven.
4. It is used to designate the house of Christian worship.
5. Any particular denomination of Christian people, as the Lutheran, or the Protestant Episcopal, or Methodist Episcopal Church.
6. A particular congregation of any one denomination of Christians.
7. The religious establishment of any particular nation or government, as the Church of England.
8. The sum of the various Christian denominations in a country, as the Church in America.

These are the ordinary uses of the word, and it is important, in order to a right understanding of its force in any case, to know in which of these senses it is employed. Much confusion might be avoided if disputants would always clearly state in, which of all these equally admissible senses they use the word.

**II.** *Idea of the Church.* — The Christian religion (subjectively considered) is a divine life wrought in the soul of the believer in Jesus by the Holy Ghost, whereby the man is united through Christ unto God, walks before him in holiness, and finally dies in his favor, and is received into his eternal glory. The personal relation lies wholly between the individual and God. But the instinct of this new life is to propagate itself by diffusion, and for this diffusion it must have organization. This organization is found in the Church, whose function it is to make universal the religion of the individual. Moreover, the individual believer, for the nourishment of his own spiritual life, seeks communion with other believers; and this communion is furnished by the Church. “The Christian Church is a religious-moral society, connected together by a common faith in Christ, and which seeks to represent in its united life the kingdom of God announced by Christ” (Gieseler, *Eccl. Hist.* vol. 1, § 1). Christianity contains, on the one hand, a divine philosophy, which we may call its religion, and a divine polity, which is its Church” (Arnold, *Miscell. Works*, N. Y. p. 11). The Church is the particular form or expression of the kingdom of God, the institution through whose agency this spiritual and eternal kingdom is to be made effective among men.

But, although there are elements of truth in the statements already made, it is further true that. the Church, under the dispensation of the Spirit, is the necessary form or body of Christianity in the world. Not that the Church *is* Christianity, any more than the body of man is his life. The object of Christianity is the redemption of mankind; and the Church is the divinely constituted means of the ordinary application of redemption to individuals of mankind. It is therefore something altogether more and higher than a mere form of society, or an organization springing, like any merely human society, from the common wants and sympathies of those who unite to form it. It is “the kingdom and the royal dwelling-place of Christ” upon the earth (Neander). It has, therefore, a life of its own, of which Christ is the source, independent of the ordinary life of the order of nature. Christ, indeed, is the central source of life for both kingdoms (the kingdom of nature, and the kingdom of grace), but the mode of his vivifying operation is very different in the one from what it is in the other. But the Romanist view (and so the Greek and High Anglican) assumes that the Church is a form of organic life imposed upon the Christian society in a sort of outward way. The Protestant doctrine, on the other hand, is, that the Church is the divinely inspired organic growth of the Christian life; not, therefore, a merely human society, but the society of the faithful, constituted by the Divine Spirit. The Romanist view makes the outward form of the Church essential, and regards the internal nature as derivative; the Protestant view regards the internal life as the essence, and the outward and visible form as derivative, but both as divinely inspired and constituted (<sup><4106></sup>John 10:16; <sup><4108></sup>Matthew 16:18; 18:15-18).

**1. *The Scripture Idea.*** — In the N.T. the Church denotes “that one mystical body of which Christ is the sole head, and in the unity of which all saints, whether in heaven, or on earth, or elsewhere, are necessarily included as constituent parts.” For this Church Christ gave himself (<sup><4103></sup>Ephesians 5:23). This Church, chosen in him before the foundation of the world (<sup><4104></sup>Ephesians 1:4; <sup><4102></sup>1 Peter 1:2), he nourisheth and cherisheth as his own flesh (<sup><4105></sup>Ephesians 5:29, 30). The Church is called the House, the City, the Temple of God. To whom coming ye are built up a spiritual house, a holy temple (<sup><4104></sup>1 Peter 2:4,5). This spiritual temple is composed of all God’s people, and is his dwelling-place (<sup><4107></sup>1 Corinthians 3:17; <sup><4106></sup>2 Corinthians 6:16; <sup><4203></sup>Revelation 21:3; 22:14, 15). The Church is uniformly represented in the N.T. as the company of the *saved*; and they are spoken of as the body of Christ (<sup><4127></sup>1 Corinthians 12:27), as one body

(<sup><4016></sup>Ephesians 3:6; 4:4; <sup><4123></sup>1 Corinthians 12:13, 20). Of this body Christ is the Savior (<sup><4023></sup>Ephesians 5:23). They are also his bride (<sup><4051></sup>Ephesians 5:31, 32; <sup><4209></sup>Revelation 21:9, 10), and his fullness (<sup><4023></sup>Ephesians 1:23). They are termed also the light of the world (<sup><4054></sup>Matthew 5:14), and the salt of the earth (<sup><4053></sup>Matthew 5:13), as indicating the Church to be the true source of spiritual illumination and the instrument of salvation to the world. For the work which the Church is to accomplish for Christ by teaching, disciplining, comforting, etc., it must necessarily be visible, though all its members may not always be known.

**2. The Creeds and Dogmatic Definitions.** — The Apostles' Creed says, I believe "in the Holy Catholic Church, the communion of saints," to which the Nicene Creed adds apostolicity. The Catechism in use in the Greek Church gives the following definition: "The Church is a divinely-instituted community of men, united by the orthodox faith, the law of God, the hierarchy, and the sacraments" (*Full Catechism of the Orthodox, Catholic, Eastern Church*, Moscow, 1839). In speaking of the unity of the Church, Platon says: "From this unity of the Church all those have separated who either do not receive the divine word at all, or mix with it their own absurd opinions" (see *Bibliotheca Sacra*, 21:827). The Roman Catholic Church (*Catechism of Trent*) says, "The Church is one, because, as the apostle says, there is one faith, one Lord, one baptism;" but more especially because it has one invisible Ruler, Christ, and one visible, viz., the occupant for the time being of the chair of St. Peter at Rome"... "The Church is holy, first, because it is dedicated to God; secondly, because the Church, consisting of good and evil mixed together, is united to Christ, the source of all holiness; thirdly, because to the Church alone has been committed the administration of the sacraments, through which, as efficient instruments of divine grace, God makes us holy; so that whoever is truly sanctified must be found within the pale of the Church. The Church is catholic or universal because it is diffused throughout the world, embracing within its pale men of all nations and conditions, and also because it comprehends all who have believed from the beginning, and all who shall believe henceforward to the end of time. The Church is termed apostolic, both because it derives its doctrines from the apostles, whereby it is enabled to convict heretics of error, and because it is governed by an apostolic ministry, which is the organ of the Spirit of God" (*Catechism, Conc. Trid.* c. 10, § 1). Bellarmine defines the Church thus: "It is a society of men united by a profession of the same Christian faith, and a

participation of the same sacraments, under the government of lawful pastors, and especially of the one vicar of Christ upon earth, the Roman pontiff." The Lutheran Church defines the Church to be "a congregation of saints, in which the Gospel is purely preached and the sacraments are rightly administered" (*Confession of Augsburg*, sec. 7). "The sum of what we here profess to believe is therefore this: I believe that there is upon earth a certain community of saints, composed solely of holy persons, under one Head, collected together by the Spirit; of one faith and one mind, endowed with manifold gifts, but united in love, and without sects or divisions" (Luther's *Larger Catechism*). The Reformed Confessions. — The Church of England: "A congregation of faithful men, in which the pure word of God is preached, and the sacraments be duly administered according to Christ's ordinance in all those things that are of necessity requisite to the same" (art. 19). — The same definition is given by the Methodist Episcopal Church. — "The Church is a community of believers or saints, gathered out of the world; whose distinction it is to know and to worship, through the Word and by the Spirit, the true God in Christ our Savior, and by faith to participate in all the blessings freely given to us through Christ. Those are all citizens of one polity, subjects of the same Lord under the same laws, and recipients of the same spiritual blessings" (*Helvetic Confession*, 1566). — "The Catholic Church is the community of all true believers, viz., those who hope in Christ alone for salvation, and are sanctified by his Spirit. It is not attached to any one place or limited to particular persons, the members of it being dispersed throughout the world" (*Belg. Confession*, sec. 27, 29). — The Scotch Confession (*Conf. Scot.* art. 16) defines the Church "to be a society of the elect of all ages and countries, both Jews and Gentiles; this is the catholic or universal Church. Those who are members of it worship God in Christ, and enjoy fellowship with him through the Spirit. *This Church is invisible, known only to God, who alone knows who are his*, and comprehends both the departed in the Lord and the elect upon earth." — The Confession of Polish churches: "There are particular churches and the Church universal. The true universal Church is the community of all believers dispersed throughout the world, who are and who remain one catholic Church so long as they are united by subjection to one Head, Christ, by the indwelling of one spirit and the profession of the same faith; and this though they be not associated in one common external polity, but, as regards external fellowship and ecclesiastical regimen, be not in communion with each other." — "A true particular Church is distinguished from a false one by the profession of the

true faith, the unmutated administrations of the sacraments, and the exercise of discipline” (*Declaratio Thoruniensis*); — Dr. Gerhart, speaking for the German Reformed Church of America in its later form of thought, under the influence of the so-called Mercersburg theology, says: “The Christian Church is a divine-human constitution in time and space: divine as to its ultimate ground and interior life, and human as to its form; brought into existence by the miraculous working of the Holy Ghost on the day of Pentecost, who is sent by Christ as the bearer of his incarnate life and salvation, in order to continue and develop this life and salvation, according to the law of the Spirit, in its membership down to the end of time uninterruptedly. As such, it is not a collection of units, but an objective organism that has a principle, a unity, a law, organs, and resources of power and grace, which are in it and its own absolutely” (*Bibliotheca Sacra*, 1863, p. 53, 54. See also Dr. Nevin, in *Mercersburg Review*, vol. 9 [articles on “Hedge on Ephesians”]; vol. 10 [“Thoughts on the Church,” two articles]).

Such is the notion of the Church as presented in the great leading symbols of the principal churches and by their representative men. The subject is one beset with difficulties, because of the failure always to discriminate between the visible and invisible Church, and because every denomination, in order to render itself powerful and practical, must assume the form of a Church, and is consequently driven to define the Church to suit its own position and history. The distinction between the visible and invisible Church was recognized by Augustine; in his controversy with the Donatists, who held that to predicate catholicity of the Church it was necessary it should have subjective purity in its members, and that, so soon as it allowed corrupt and unworthy members, it ceases to be catholic, he maintained, “Many, by partaking of the sacrament, are *with* the Church, and yet are not in the Church.” Further: “Those who appear to be the Church, and to contradict Christ, therefore do not be long to that Church which is called the body of Christ” (see Neander, *Christian Dogmas*, 2, 395). That there is one visible Church all these Confessions concede; but whether or not there be a visible Church on earth entitled to be called the true Church, and the only true Church, is the question at issue between Romanists and Protestants. Certainly, “if we judge of the various churches into which Christendom is divided by their conforming in all respects by the principles and requirements of the Gospels, we cannot allow that any one of them is the perfect representation of that ideal state at which they all

aim; nor, on the other hand, can we entirely deny the name of a Christian Church to any one which professes to be built on the Gospel of Christ. They have all so much in common in this religious faith and life, and so much which distinguishes them from all other religious societies, as to justify us in considering them as one whole, and calling them, in a wide sense, The Christian Church? (Gieseler, *Church History*, vol. 1, § 1).

### 3. Notes, Faith, and Attributes of the Church. —

**(1.)** The *notes* of the Church are the signs by which the visible Church is distinguished, and differ according to the views which are held in the definition of the Church.

**(a)** The Roman Catechism states them to be unity, sanctity, catholicity, and apostolicity (*Cat. Cone. Trid.* p. 80, 81). Bellarmine assigns, in addition to these, antiquity, uninterrupted duration, amplitude, agreement in doctrine with the primitive Church, sanctity of doctrine, efficacy of the doctrine, the glory of miracles, the light of prophecy, the confession of adversaries, the unhappy end of the Church's enemies, and temporal felicity (*Bellarmino's Notes of the Church examined and refuted by eminent English Divines*, Lond. 1840). The "unhappy end of the Church's enemies" and "temporal prosperity" are rejected by Tournely, Bailly, and generally by modern Romish theologians (see Palmer, *On the Church*, 1:27).

**(b)** The Church of England has no authoritative declaration beyond its sixth article – the preaching of the pure word of God and the due administration of the sacraments, etc.; but the proper administration of the sacraments by ministers regularly authorized has led to a difference of opinion in determining these notes, which has become a wide divergency, the one side adhering to a free interpretation, in common with all Protestants, and the other approaching to the stricter Roman Catholic view. The strict, so-called, churchly interpretation begins with the inclusion of apostolicity (Palmer), and extends to truth of doctrine, use of means (as well as sacraments) instituted by Christ, antiquity without change of doctrine, lawful succession without change of doctrine, and universality in the *successive* sense, i.e. the prevalence of the Church successively in all nations (Dr. Field). This tendency towards Romanizing views has culminated in what is, for convenience, termed the High-Church, or Sacramentarian party, some of whom openly advocate a union of the Church of England with the Church of Rome and the Greek Church, in order to realize their note of the visible unity of the Church. "It is worthy



of remark,” says Litton, “that every theory of the Church, whether it profess to be Romanist or not, which teaches that the true being thereof lies in its visible characteristic, adopts instinctively the Romish notes, and rejects the Protestant.”

(c) The distinctively ‘Protestant notes’ — the preaching of the pure word of God and the right administration of the sacraments — are applicable not to the mystical body of Christ, but to the visible Church, or, rather, to churches or congregations of believers. “The Protestant says, in general, the church (or a part of it) is there where the Word and the sacraments are; and the society in which the one is preached and the other administered is a legitimate part of the visible Catholic Church” (Litton, *On the Church*, Phila. p. 254). “Some formularies, e.g. the Scotch Conf. (art. 18) add the exercise of discipline” (ibid.); and this it does very properly, for if purity of doctrine and life is to be maintained, it must always be a mark of a true Church that there be discipline. But inasmuch as it is impossible to discern always who are inwardly pure, and also perfectly to enforce discipline, the visible Church will always be liable to the intrusion of the wicked, and hence cannot claim to be identical with the mystical body of Christ in any one place, but may claim to be a part of it, so far as in its doctrine and life it conforms to the requirements of the Gospel. “As notes” (the sacraments and the ministry of the Word), “therefore, serve to assure us of the existence of that mystical body which in itself is an object not of sense, but of faith; by which the charge brought of old against Protestant doctrine — that its invisible Church is a fiction of the imagination — is abundantly refuted” (Litton, p. 257).

(2.) *Faith*. — The faith of the Church is given, in authoritative, though not in dogmatical form, in the Word of God. “The Church, as the body of believers in Christ, existed before the New Testament was written. It was to the Church that the Word was addressed. It is by the Church that the authenticity of the Word has been witnessed from the beginning. But the Word was given to the Church as its test and standard of faith. The ‘faith’ was in the Church before the Word was written; but the Word was given to be the norm of faith, by which the Church might and should, in all ages, test the faith, or any proposed modifications or developments of the faith.”

The Church’s faith, as drawn from, and resting on, the Word of God, is expressed in her creeds or confessions. At successive periods, as the exigencies of the times have required, or have seemed to require, its

leading minds have convened, sometimes by civil, sometimes by ecclesiastical authority, at other times by both, in general councils, when, by consent, the doctrines of the Church have been thrown into the form of confessions or symbols. In these symbols, the floating, undefined, but current beliefs of the general Church have crystallized, and thus have been transmitted to us. The first is the Apostles' Creed. This is universally accepted in the Church, and is of highest authority. Though the most ancient of all the formularies of belief, there is no evidence that the apostles composed it as it now reads; the best explanation is that it grew into shape from the common and general confession of faith in the primitive Church until it very early assumed the form it now has. It is the germ of all subsequent creed development. The next is the Nicaeno-Constantinopolitan symbol, commonly called the Nicene Creed, which was the work of two oecumenical councils in 325 and 381. This has always been of great weight, as chiefly settling the doctrine of the Trinity, and expresses the general view of the Church to this day. The Chalcedon symbol followed in 451; and then the Athanasian Creed, called after Athanasius, though it is doubtful if he was the author. There were no other confessions until the Reformation, since which we have the Lutheran symbols (7); the Reformed (18); the papal (Canones et Decreta Concilii Tridentini. 1545; *Professio fidei Tridentina* of Pope Pius IV, etc.); confessions of the Greek Church; Arminian and Socinian confessions; but none of these are of universal authority, as are the original four of the early Church.

**(3.)** The *attributes* of the Church are unity, holiness, catholicity, and apostolicity. These also are explained differently, according to the theory of the Church maintained. Protestants generally find these attributes only in the invisible Church. There is evidently a unity of faith (<sup><4043></sup>Ephesians 4:13), a unity of love (<sup><4133></sup>1 Corinthians 13:13), one spirit (<sup><4004></sup>Ephesians 4:4), one hope (*ibid.* 12), one body (<sup><4515></sup>Romans 12:5), one head (<sup><4045></sup>Ephesians 4:15), and one object of worship (<sup><4046></sup>Ephesians 4:6). That this unity is under one common earthly head is held by Roman Catholics, but denied by Protestants. By these a spiritual unity is affirmed to exist, even where there is not uniformity of Church polity, nor entire agreement of doctrine, nor, indeed, any internal bond save that of the "communion of saints." Holiness is ascribed to the Church as expressing the moral purity of its members; they are addressed in the N.T. as "saints," sanctified," by reason of their union with Christ as their living head, and the possession of the Holy Ghost, the Sanctifier (<sup><4002></sup>1 Corinthians 1:2; 6:19). Because this

holiness is a personal work in the hearts of believers *as such*, it can be predicated strictly only of the invisible Church, but it ought to be manifested in the individual and corporate life of the Church, in order that she may fulfill its original constitution. Catholicity: was first applied to the Christian Church to designate not only its universality as embracing all true believers, but also the oneness of those believers as excluding all heretics. In modern times it is used to mean the universally diffused nature of the Church by its presence, without respect to local or national boundaries. The Romanist claims that all, and those only, who are united to the pontiff at Rome belong to the Catholic Church; while Protestants admit it to be the whole body of Christians, in whatever visible communion they may be: hence composed of all the churches of all nations (~~<415>~~Mark 15:15; ~~<408>~~Acts 10:34, 35), the same in all time (~~<430>~~Matthew 28:20), and possessed, by reason of the presence of its great head, of the means of saving grace (*ibid.*; ~~<402>~~Ephesians 1:22). Apostolicity is not insisted upon by Protestants; when used, however, by them, it means the possession by the Church of true apostolic doctrine, spirit, and life; while by Roman Catholics it means having a ministry regularly and *visibly* succeeding to the apostles.

The attributes (unity, holiness, catholicity, perpetuity) are unquestionably essential to the true Church, and are ascribed to her in the New Testament. But neither the N.T. nor the Apostles' Creed define the Church as a visible organization, but as the "communion of saints." This Church has always existed; but no visible corporation or society on earth has ever been endowed with the attributes above named. See this argument well stated in the *Princeton Review* (Oct. 1853); compare Barrow, *Sermon on the Unity of the Church*, 3. 311 (N.Y. 1845).

**III.** *History of the Doctrine of the Church.* — The apostles and their immediate successors were too much engrossed with the work of spreading the Gospel to pause to prescribe the nature of an institution which was sure to grow into shape as the necessities of the case required. The apostles themselves were too earnestly employed in fulfilling the command of Christ to disciple all nations, and those directly following them partook too largely of their spirit, and understood too fully their mind, to be turned aside by the necessity of explaining what they knew to be a fact. Hence "no exact definitions of the Church are found previous to the time of Cyprian" (Hagenbach, *History of Doctrines*, 1:193). The definitions of the latter (Cyprian) make an epoch in the history of this doctrine. The first difficulty arose as to the unity of the Church, in confounding the inward

with the outward. “Irenaeus shows the first germs of this perversion; it was matured by Cyprian” (Neander, *Christian Dogmas*, vol. 1, p. 220). “Thus the Jewish stand-point (a theocracy), which at first had been overcome, made its way into the Church in another form” (*ibid.*). Irenaeus says the Church alone contains all the riches of truth; Clement describes the Church as a mother, both as a mother and virgin, as the body of the Lord; Origen, though usually mild towards heretics, knows of no salvation out of the Church; Tertullian claimed that whoever separated from the connection with the outward communion, which was of apostolic origin, and had at its head the *sedes apostolicae*, in so doing renounced Christ, though after joining the Montanists he essentially changed his opinion. It is of no avail, says Cyprian, what a man teaches; it is enough that he teaches out of the Church; where the bishop is, there is the church, etc. The roots of the extreme church doctrine are to be traced thus early. A reaction, however, soon took place, growing out of a more scientific discernment of the spiritual idea of the Church. Clement calls the Church a community of men led by the divine *Logos*, an invincible city upon earth, which no force can subdue, where the will of God is done as it is in heaven. Others combated the outward unity of the Church as unscriptural. Montanism insisted that the unity is inward; it regarded the internal fact of possessing the Spirit as the fundamental thing — not the ordinary influence of the spirit in sanctification, but his extraordinary power in giving new revelations, which were the sources of authority and unity in the Church. A farther reaction of separatism against the Catholic idea took place in Novatian and his followers. They insisted that the Catholic Church is essentially holy in all its members, and hence must exclude from its communion all unworthy members, and never readmit them, otherwise it would lose its catholicity. They consequently withdrew, and claimed to be the Catholic Church. “The false idealism of the Gnostics, and the subjective, heretical, and schismatical tendencies of separate sects, especially of the Montanists and the followers of Novatian (the primitive Puritans), form a striking contrast with this false external unity of the Catholic Church”, *SEE HAGENBACH AND NEANDER*. “Two causes contributed (in the second period of the Church history) to determine about the Church: 1. The external triumph of the Church itself in its victory over Paganism, and its rising power under the protection of the state. 2. The victory of Augustinism over the doctrines of the Pelagians, Manichaeans, and Donatists, which in different ways threatened to destroy ecclesiastical unity. In opposition to the Donatists, Augustine asserted that the Church consists of the sum total of

all who are baptized, and that the (ideal) sanctity of the Church is not impaired by the impure elements externally connected with it. The bishops of Rome impressed upon this catholicism the stamp of the papal hierarchy by claiming for themselves the primacy of Peter. But, whatever variant opinions were held respecting the seat and nature of the true Church, the proposition that *there is no salvation out of the Church* was firmly adhered to, and carried out in all its consequences” (Hagenbach, vol. 1, p. 352). It is worthy of note that at this period Jovinian taught that the Church is founded on Faith, Hope, and Love. In this Church there is nothing impure; every one is naught of God.; no one can break into it by violence or steal into it by artifice.” “As Jovinian taught the Pauline doctrine of faith, so he did the Pauline idea of the invisible Church, while Augustine obstructed his similar fundamental idea by a mixture of the Catholic idea of the Church.” “Here again we have a sign of the Protestant element in Augustine” (his comment on the “Thou art Peter”), “that all religious consciousness is immediately to be traced up to Christ, and that with him the community originates which is called the Church” (Neander, *Christian Dogmas*, vol. 2, p. 397, 398).

Until the 14th century the Roman hierarchy had comparatively no opposition in carrying out supremacy in the West to its fullest extent; at this time a freer spirit began to show itself. Even on the Catholic standpoint a difference was stirred respecting the relation of the changeable and unchangeable in the development of the Church; on the position of the papacy in respect of the Church; whether the pope was to be regarded as its representative or sovereign head; whether the general councils or the pope stood highest. The University of Paris, with chancellor Gerson at its head, led on this controversy. *SEE GERSON*. “The mystical idea of the Church and the notion of a universal priesthood, which was intimately connected with it, was propounded, with more or less accuracy of definition, by Hugo of St. Victor, as well as by the forerunners of the Reformation, Wycliffe, Matthias of Janow, Huss, John of Wesel, Wessel, and Savonarola” (Hagenbach). These tendencies were fully developed in the Reformation and in its results. The Western religious world became divided in the statement of the Church dogma, as it looked at the question of salvation. The Protestant, regarding the doctrine of justification by faith as fundamental, said the Church is approached through it; the Romanist, still adhering to the Church as the fountain of spiritual life, affirmed that justification is obtained through the Church. Protestants assert that the

Church consists in the invisible fellowship of all those who are united by the bonds of true faith, which ideal union is but imperfectly represented by the visible Church, in which the true Gospel is taught and the sacraments are rightly administered; the Roman Catholics, that the Church is a visible society of all baptized persons who adopt a certain external creed, have the same sacraments, and acknowledge the pope as their common head.

The recent controversies concerning the idea and nature of the Church all revolve about the one point, viz., whether the Church of which Christ is the "Head" is, or is not, a visible corporation here on earth, entitled to the promises, privileges, and authority which the Scriptures assign to the spiritual Church. Protestants generally deny; the Romanists, the HighAnglicans, and a few writers in other branches of the Protestant Church, affirm. The so-called New-Lutheran divines of Germany have developed a theory of the Church in which the Protestant idea gives way to the hierarchical; in which the sacraments are not merely notes of the true Church, but the real guards of its continued life. The profound and mysterious synthesis of the divine and human is found in faith, according to the old Protestant system; according to the new, it is found in the sacraments (compare Schwartz, *Zur Geschichte d. neuesten Theologie*, bk. 3. ch. 3). Rothe has developed, with his usual vigor, a theory of the Church akin to that of Arnold, viz., that the Church is indispensable to the moral education of humanity; but that, as humanity improves, the necessity for the Church diminishes; and, finally, the state will become religious (a real theocracy), and the Church will become absorbed in the state.

**IV.** *Constitution of the Church.* — Christ did not so much create a Church during his sojourn on earth as implant principles which would be subsequently developed into a Church. Whilst he was yet with his disciples, they needed no other bond to hold them together than his person. The founder of the new manifestation of the kingdom of God seemed not to design to collect about him numerous adherents, but to implant deeply into the minds of a few the higher animating spirit of this kingdom, which through their lives should work out into a complete and effective organization. He found those whom he called for this work Jews; he associated with and instructed them after the customs of Judaism. He distinctly told them, however, that they, in their persons, faith, life, and teaching, were to constitute the beginning and the agency of a new order of things. They were commanded to go forth after his death and disciple all nations, and to baptize them in the name of the Father, the Son, and the

Holy Ghost, and thus bring all people into the kingdom of God. It is thus clear that the religion of Christ was designed by him to supersede all others, not only by its spirit and essence, but also in the particular method or form of its manifestation. He made provision for this result by constituting apostles, who should authoritatively command and teach, should open and shut the kingdom of heaven, bind and loose on earth, and so render visible and powerful his Word among men. Before entering upon their mission, they were to tarry in Jerusalem until endued with power from on high (Luke), which power they were assured would come not many days after the ascension of their Lord. That they already recognized themselves as chosen for a high especial work is evident by their filling up the vacancy in their number caused by the apostasy and death of Judas Iscariot with the selection of another, Matthias, to fill his place (~~Acts~~ Acts 1:15, 26). Thus complete, they continued to wait and pray for the space of seven days. When the day of Pentecost had fully come, “while the apostles and disciples, a hundred and twenty in number, were assembled in or near the Temple for the morning devotions of the festal day, and were waiting in prayer for the fulfillment of the promise, the exalted Savior poured down from his heavenly throne the fullness of the Holy Ghost upon them, and founded his Church upon earth” (Schaff, *Church History*, vol. 1, p. 59). The day of Pentecost may be regarded as the birthday of the Christian Church. Then it was formed; thence its gradual development proceeded. There is a diversity of opinion as to the internal polity it assumed, as might be expected; but it must be conceded by all that the apostles would have “sufficient guidance” as to the manner in which it was to be organized. This guidance does not imply that its *particular form* must have been given to them by Christ, but only such direction as would lead them to pursue the wisest methods. Consequently they began by preaching; and, as converts were made, by baptizing them, and then taking them into a closer fellowship for the celebration of the Lord’s Supper, spiritual instruction, and worship (~~Acts~~ Acts 3:42, etc.). As they were Jews, it was likely they would adopt the methods of worship, government, etc., to which they were accustomed. Archbishop Whately says (*Kingdom of Christ delineated*, p. 88): “It appears highly probable, I might say morally certain, that the synagogue was brought — the whole or chief part of it — to embrace the Gospel. The apostles did not, then, so much form a Christian Church (or congregation, *ecclesia*) as make an existing congregation Christian by introducing the Christian sacraments and worship, and establishing whatever regulations were necessary for the newly-adopted faith, leaving



the machinery (if I may so speak) of government unchanged; the rulers of synagogues, elders, and other officers, whether spiritual or ecclesiastical, or both, being already provided in the existing institutions.” Vitranga (see his *De Synagoga Vetere*), Neander, Litton, and many others, agree in this opinion, that the synagogues were the pattern which the apostles proposed to themselves, though it is by no means certain that they adopted any model.

**1.** All that can be done in the determination of the polity of the *apostolic Church* is to trace the practice of the apostles as recorded in their acts and writings. This polity is not presented as legislative enactments, but simply as facts, showing how the apostles acted in given cases. In the first account we find the Church composed of the apostles and other disciples, and then of the apostles and “the multitude of them that believed.” Hence it appears that the Church was at first composed entirely of members standing on an equality with one another, and that the apostles alone held a higher rank, and exercised a directing influence over the whole, which arose from the original position in which Christ had placed them in relation to other believers (Neander, *Planting and Training*, p. 32). The apostles, as necessity required, created other offices, the first of which we have mention is that of *deacon* (διακονία) (<sup><400></sup>Acts 6:1), followed soon after by that of *elder* (πρεσβύτερος) (<sup><410></sup>Acts 11:30). The time of the creation of the office of elder or presbyter is not given, from which it is not clear whether it arose before or after the diaconate. The first reference to elders assumes their existence. The office of elder and that of bishop are generally conceded to be identical. The apostles, deacons, and elders, with the whole body of believers in every place, constituted the membership and government of the Church. *SEE BISHOP*. The deacons were overseers of the poor, and probably conducted religious worship and administered the sacraments (<sup><408></sup>Acts 8:38). The clerical function of the deacon is disputed (see *American Presb. and Theol. Review*, vol. 5, p. 134). The elders were appointed not only to teach and administer the sacraments, but also to govern the Church or churches in the absence of the apostles (<sup><405></sup>Acts 20:28, etc.). The ministry, however, was not confined to these orders; it was rather a gift which any one possessing could exercise under due regulations. By reference to <sup><404></sup>1 Corinthians 12:4-12, also 28, it will be seen that “apostles,” “prophets,” “helps,” and “governments,” all pertain to the ministry; also in the corresponding passage, <sup><401></sup>Ephesians 4:11, 12, the ministerial office is ascribed to the direct agency of the Holy Ghost: “He



gave some, apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers; for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ.” “These passages establish nothing respecting the ministerial *offices* of the apostolic age; what they do teach us is that the spiritual endowments necessary for the office of an apostle, a pastor, a teacher, or a governor of the Church, whether these functions were united in the same person or not, flow directly from Christ, and are a part of the standing spiritual constitution of the Church” (Litton, p. 374). The manifold gifts of the Spirit were termed generically *charismata* (χαρίσματα), and were either a natural endowment, sanctified and applied under the influence of the Holy Spirit to the edifying of the Church, or a supernatural gift of a miraculous character, in the exercise of which the divine agent was more conspicuous than the human. Another division is into those which displayed themselves in *word*, and those which had a more particular reference to action (Litton; Neander, *Planting and Training*; Olshausen, Hooker, etc.). These gifts, it appears, were not confined to any particular class, but were bestowed as the Spirit saw fit to distribute them. **SEE GIFTS, SPIRITUAL.** The *priestly* function pertained to the ministerial office only in the sense that all believers were priests, to offer up spiritual sacrifices to God by Christ (1 Peter 2:4, 5, etc.); and in no sense was there a sanctity attaching to the minister which did not attach to the ordinary believer, except, perhaps, to the apostles, whose office was not to be permanent in the Church. No human mediation is represented in the New Test. as necessary to the soul seeking the forgiveness of sins and the fruits of the Spirit except such as may *assist* knowledge and faith, but never as *indispensable*. Christ and his salvation are equally accessible to minister and people, and on the same terms.

The *discipline* of the apostolic Church comprehended four particulars in its exercise:

1. Nothing scandalous or offensive unto any, especially unto the Church of God, could be allowed (1 Corinthians 10:32);
2. All things were to be done with seemliness and in order (1 Corinthians 14:40);
3. All unto edification (1 Corinthians 14:26);
4. All unto the glory of God (1 Corinthians 10:31).

The *sphere* of its government was strictly spiritual. The apostles honored the civil authority as a divine institution, and enjoined obedience in the days of Claudius and Nero, as did our Savior in all temporal matters render obedience to Herod, and command that “the things which belong to Caesar should be rendered to Caesar.” But in the spiritual calling the rule was “to obey God rather than man,” and for this principle they were ready to die.

Since the apostolic times the Constitution of the Christian Church has undergone various modifications. The first of these changes is the distinction between *bishop* and *elder*. It is maintained by extreme advocates of Episcopacy that St. Paul, in empowering Timothy at Corinth, and Titus in Crete, in the capacity of presbyters, to ordain elders in every city, and to exercise jurisdiction over officers of that class, as well as those who held the office of deacon, appointed them thus to be permanent, and so created the office known in after times as the local bishop. The moderate Episcopalians and the Presbyterians hold that the mission of Titus and Timothy was peculiar, contemplating a special work, and that the mission ceased with its accomplishment. On the whole, on this case, as well as on that of St. James at Jerusalem, and the angels of the apocalyptic churches, Litton says, “Respecting the origin of the episcopal order, Scripture leaves us very much in the dark. No order of ministers other than these three — apostles, presbyters, and deacons are mentioned in the New Testament as forming part of the then existing polity of the Church; for every attempt to establish a distinction between the presbyter and the bishop of Scripture will prove fruitless, so abundant is the evidence which proves they were but different appellations of one and the same office (p. 412).” As to the rise of episcopacy, it is said “to these successors of the apostolic delegates” (such as Timothy) “came to be appropriated the title of bishop, which was originally applied to presbyters. At the commencement of the second century and thenceforward, bishops, presbyters, and deacons are the officers of the Church wherever the Church existed. Ignatius’s epistles (in their unadulterated form), and the other records which are preserved to us, are on this point decisive... . They (the bishops) retained in their own hands authority over presbyters and the functions of ordination, but with respect to each other they were equals” (Smith’s *Dict. of Bible*, art. CHURCH). Dr. Hitchcock (*Am. Presbyt. and Theol. Rev.* vol. 5, no. 17) affirms, “Thus throughout do we find in Clement the original New Testament polity (identity of presbyters and bishops) as yet unchanged” (p. 137). “In short, the Ignatian Episcopacy,

instead of having the appearance of a settled polity, handed down from the apostles, has the appearance of being a new and growing institution, unlike what went before, as well as what was coming after it” (*ibid.* p. 146). “The wavering terminology of Irenaeus is indicative not of apostolic tradition, but of later genesis and growth, and that growth not yet completed” (*ibid.* 147). “No hesitation in Tertullian in accepting the Episcopal regimen. Evidently this had become the settled polity. The maturity of the system is indicated by entire steadiness in the use of terms” (*ibid.* 148). “In Cyprian of Carthage, between 248-258, we find the system fully matured. Now these are tokens of growth, and are inconsistent with the idea of apostolic tradition” (*ibid.* 153). There is but little doubt the bishops at first succeeded to office by seniority, and afterwards, as the difficulties of the office increased, A.D. 200, they became elective (Hilary). As the Church multiplied and expanded, the older churches and the most numerous became relatively more important and influential, and their bishops more powerful; hence we find the episcopacy undergoing marked changes: 1. The bishoprics at Jerusalem, Rome, Antioch, Alexandria, Ephesus, and Corinth are termed by pre-eminence *sedes apostolicae*, without, however, the concession of superior authority; 2. Consequent upon provincial synods the metropolitan dignity arose; also, 3. The patriarchal; and 4, finally, the papacy. Cyprian allowed that “precedency should be given to Peter, that the Church of Christ may be shown to be one.” “The same propension to monarchical unity, which created out of the episcopate a center, first for each congregation, then for each diocese, pressed on towards a visible center for the whole Church. Primacy and episcopacy grew together” (Schaff, *History of the Christian Church*, vol. 1, p. 427). The high antiquity of the Roman Church; the missionary labors at Rome of Peter and Paul, the two leading apostles; the political pre-eminence of the metropolis of the world; the executive wisdom and orthodox instinct of the Roman Church, and other secondary causes, favored the ascendancy of the Roman see (*ibid.*). The early fathers, as Ignatius, Irenaeus, Tertullian, Hippolytus, Cyprian, etc., concede precedence to the Church at Rome, but only in honor, not in jurisdiction. After the conversion of Constantine, and the removal of the Roman capital to Byzantium (afterwards called Constantinople), the see of the new capital boldly disputed the supremacy with the see of Rome, from which time, as new agitations arose in the Church, and the empire gradually fell to decay, the two great divisions into the Eastern or Greek, and Western or Roman Catholic took place, and became the settled forms and sources of ecclesiastical dominion.

Additional and inferior orders of the ministry rapidly multiplied in the Church. These were, archdeacons, deaconesses, subdeacons, acolytes, exorcists, lectors or readers, ostiarii or door-keepers, psalmists or singers, copiatæ or fossarii, catechists, defensores or syndics; oekonomi or stewards, besides others (Bingham's *Antiquities of Christ. Ch.* vol. 1, p. 126). There were four several ways of designating persons to the ministry in the apostolic and primitive Church: 1. By casting lot; 2. By choice of the first-fruits of the Gentiles; 3. By particular direction of the Holy Ghost; 4. By common suffrage and election. Ordination was first by the laying on of the hands of the apostles or elders, and afterwards of a bishop or bishops (see *ibid.*).

As to the powers of the clergy in the government of the Church, two principal, distinct, and opposite theories obtain. The Roman Catholic is, that "the government of the Church is a hierarchy, or the relation of the clerical body. to the Christian people is that of a secular magistracy to its subjects, and Christian ministers are mediators between God and man—that is, are priests in the proper sense of the word" (Litton. p. 395). "The hierarchism of Rome is the natural and inevitable consequence of the doctrine that the clergy are *κατ' ἐξουσίαν*, the Church" (*ibid.* 397). Bellarmine sums up the Romish doctrine thus: "It has always been believed in the Catholic Church that the bishops in their diocese, and the Roman pontiff in the whole Church, are real ecclesiastical princes; competent by their own authority, and without the consent of the people or the advice of presbyters, to enact laws binding upon the conscience, to judge in causes ecclesiastical like other judges, and, if need be, to inflict punishment" (Bellarm. *De Romans Pont.* b. 4, c. 15). The Protestant theory is that all believers are a spiritual priesthood, and, as such, constitute the Church, and that the *whole* Church, thus composed of believers differing in gifts according to the operation of the Spirit, is the fountain of authority in the administration of government. "In short, no principle of ecclesiastical polity is more clearly deducible from Scripture than that the sovereignty of a church resides not in the people apart from their pastors. This, however, being admitted, the converse also remains true, that the sovereignty of a church is not in the pastors exclusively of the people" (Litton, p. 399). Dr. Schaff says, in reference to the first council of Jerusalem, "though not a binding precedent, (it) is a significant example, giving the apostolic sanction to the synodical form of church government, in which all classes of the Christian community are represented in the management of public

affairs and in settling controversies respecting faith and practice” (*Ch. Hist.* vol. 1, p. 136). By many Protestants this view of the council is questioned, and the right of laymen to an equal participation in church government, from this and other apostolic examples, denied; so that, to this day, the relative powers of ministry and laity, in the administration of ecclesiastical government, remain undefined among some of the great Protestant churches.

*Membership of the Church.* — “Church members are those who compose or belong to the visible church. As to the real church, the true members of it are such as come out from the world, <sup><4067></sup>2 Corinthians 6:17; who are born again, <sup><4012></sup>1 Peter 1:23; or made new creatures, <sup><4067></sup>2 Corinthians 5:17; whose faith works by love to God and all mankind, <sup><4016></sup>Galatians 5:6; <sup><4014></sup>James 2:14, 26; who walk in all the ordinances of the Lord blameless. None but such are members of the true church; nor should any be admitted into any particular church without evidence of their earnestly seeking this state of salvation.

*Fellowship.* — “Church fellowship is the communion that the members enjoy one with another. The ends of church fellowship are, the maintenance and exhibition of a system of sound doctrine; the support of the ordinances of evangelical worship in their purity and simplicity; the impartial exercise of church government and discipline; the promotion of holiness in all manner of conversation. The more particular duties are, earnest study to keep peace and unity; bearing of one another’s burdens, <sup><4016></sup>Galatians 6:1, 2; earnest endeavors to prevent each other’s stumbling, <sup><4012></sup>1 Corinthians 10:23-33; <sup><4014></sup>Hebrews 10:24-27; <sup><4013></sup>Romans 14:13; steadfast continuance in the faith and worship of the Gospel, <sup><4022></sup>Acts 2:42; praying for and sympathizing with each other, <sup><4023></sup>1 Samuel 12:23; <sup><4018></sup>Ephesians 6:18. The advantages are, peculiar incitement to holiness; the right to some promises applicable to none but those who attend the ordinances of God, and hold communion with the saints, <sup><4023></sup>Psalm 92:13; 132:13, 16; 36:8; <sup><4012></sup>Jeremiah 31:12; the being placed under the watchful eye of pastors, <sup><4017></sup>Hebrews 13:7; that they may restore each other if they fall, <sup><4016></sup>Galatians 6:1; and the more effectually promote the cause of true religion” (Watson, s.v.).

*Literature.* — Besides the works already cited, see Hooker, *Eccles. Polity*, 1:346; 2:226, 345; 3:442 (Oxford, 1793, 3 vols. 8vo); Calvin, *Institutes*, bk. 4, ch. 1; Pearson, *Exposition of the Creed*, art. 9; Cranmer, *Works*;

Burnet, *On the 39 Articles*, art. 19; Browne, *On the 39 Articles*, art. 19; Palmer, *Treatise of the Church* (Anglican: N. Y. 1851, 2 vols. 8vo); Litton, *The Church of Christ* (Protestant view: London, 1851, 8vo; Philadelphia, revised ed. 1863, 8vo); Stone, *The Church Universal* (Protestant: N. Y. 1846; new ed. 1867); Watson, *Theological Institutes*, pt. 4, ch. 1; Schaff, *Apostolical Church*, ch. 2; Rothe, *Die Anfänge d. christlichen Kirche* (vol. 1:1837). In the Romanist view, Perrone, *Prælectiones Theologicae*, 1:181 sq.; Mohler, *Symbolism*, p. 330 (N. Y. 1844, 8vo). Against the Romanist view, Cramp, *Text-book of Popery*, p. 42; Elliott, *Delineations of Romanism*, bk. 3. ch. 1; Jackson and Sanderson, *On the Church*, edited by Goode (Philadelphia, 1844, 18mo); Whately, *Kingdom of Christ* (N. Y. 1843, 12mo). On the doctrine of the Church in the creeds of the churches, Guericke, *Allgemeine christliche Symbolik* (3d ed. Lpzg. 1861, § 71; partly translated from 1st ed. in *evangelical Review*, 1853, art. 2); Ebrard, *Christliche Dogmatik*, 2, § 459-490; Winer, *Commpar. Darstellung*, 19. See also Coleman, *Ancient Christianity*, ch. 6; *N. Brit. Review*, Feb. 1853, art. 5; *Lond. Quart. Rev.* (Methodist), June, 1854; April, 1855; Cunningham, *Historical Theology*, vol. 1, ch. 1. For the Congregational view, Ripley, *Church Polity* (Boston, 1867, 18mo); B. Cooper, *Free Church of Ancient Christendom* (Lond. n. d., 18mo); Dexter, *On Congregationalism*, ch. 2 (Boston, 1865, 8vo).

## Church, Abyssinian

SEE *ABYSSINIAN*.

## Church And State.

**1. Pagan Nations.** — In the Pagan states the religious life has been, on the whole, part of the political, and religion an affair of the state. In general, the priestly dignity was vested in the chief of the state government. In Athens and other Greek republics the popular assemblies had the final decision on religious affairs. In Rome the priestly dignity was originally united with the person of the kings; after the establishment of the republic, the Senate had supreme control of religious affairs; on the establishment of the empire, the emperor became *Pontifex Maximus*.

**2. Among the Jews.** — Among the Jews, the whole government of the state was based upon the idea that Jehovah was the ruler of the people. All the national institutions were destined to promote the worship of the King of Israel, and to make the people obedient to his precepts as they were laid

down in the Old Testament. God, the king of Israel, ruled the people through the organs which he appointed — through Moses, Aaron and his descendants, Joshua and the judges, and the prophets. The demand of the Jews for a king was therefore censured by Samuel as a weakening of the perfect theocracy; but even the king always remained in the Jewish law the earthly representative of Jehovah, and he had no right to give new laws, but simply to execute and enforce the laws given directly by Jehovah. *SEE THEOCRACY.*

**3. Teaching of Christ and the Apostles.** — The teaching of Christ on the relation of the Church founded by him to the state was very plain. He distinctly recognized the absolute law-giving power of the state governments in all secular affairs, and enjoined upon his followers to obey the state laws in everything that was not opposed to the precepts of their religion. His reply to the Pharisees, “Render unto Caesar the things which are Caesar’s, and unto God the things that are God’s” (<sup><4021></sup>Matthew 22:21), distinctly pronounces the separation between the Church and the State. He declares the powers of the civil rulers to be of divine authority by saying to Pilate, “Thou couldest have no power at all against me except it were given thee from above.” The apostles enjoin upon Christians obedience to the existing state governments: thus Paul, in the Epistle to the Romans (<sup><510></sup>Romans 13:1, 2), “Let every soul be subject to the higher powers. For there is no power but of God; the powers that be are ordained of God. Whosoever, therefore, resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God; and they that resist shall receive unto themselves damnation.” Similar precepts are given in <sup><510></sup>1 Timothy 2:1, 2; 2 <sup><510></sup>Titus 3:1; <sup><4023></sup>1 Peter 2:13. Only in case of demands directly contrary to the Christian religion, obedience was to be refused. Thus Peter and the other apostles, when commanded not to teach in the name of Jesus, answered, “We ought to obey God rather than men” (<sup><4159></sup>Acts 5:29).

**4. Christianity in the Time of Constantine.** — In compliance with these teachings of Christ and the apostles, the first Christians conformed themselves to all secular laws; and only when things were demanded of them contrary to Christian law, such as the open renunciation of their faith, they refused obedience, but submitted to the penalties imposed upon them. The persecutions which the Christians had to suffer during the first three centuries arose not from any active opposition on their part to the Roman laws, but chiefly from the application of the ancient laws, which forbade any Roman citizen to worship divinities not recognized by the state, and

any conquered nation to propagate its religion in other parts of the empire. Hence the more the outward distinction of the Christians from the Jews became apparent, the more they exposed themselves to the application of the Roman law. Most of the persecutions were, however, of short duration, and some of the emperors even showed themselves favorable to the Christians. As civil and military offices frequently brought the occupants into situations in which they had to pay some homage, direct or indirect, to the pagan state religion, the Christians naturally regarded it as dangerous to perform the duties of such offices. The fact, however, that Christian senators and Christian soldiers are mentioned in the early history of the Church, shows that the holding of such offices was, in itself, not deemed incompatible with the religious duties of a Christian.

**5. From Constantine to Charlemagne.** — A new era in the history of the relation between Church and State begins with the reign of Constantine the Great. In the years 312 and 313 full freedom was guaranteed to the Christian Church throughout the empire. Soon imperial edicts granted many privileges to the clergy. They received the same immunities which were possessed by the pagan priests, and soon were preferred to the latter; the particular churches obtained the right of receiving legacies; the bishops received some kind of independent jurisdiction. The emperor, in conferring these rights, acted from the old Roman standpoint of chief of the state in matters religious as well as secular. Thus the first exhibition of a Christian state churchism was a direct emanation from pagan views transferred to the Christian Church. The emperor retained the *insignia* and the name of *Pontifex Maximus*. Gratian was the first who laid aside the *insignia*, but the name was retained much longer. On the coins Constantine placed the cross, as a symbol of Christianity, by the side of the sun-god, as the representative of the old religion. The emperors thus from the start began to view themselves more as patrons than as members of the Christian Church, and the chiefs of the Church were, on the whole, well pleased with the privileges which were conferred upon them, and thought little of disputing the influence which the emperor gradually claimed to exercise upon Church affairs. In the East, this subjection of the ecclesiastical authorities to the state governments went much further than in the West, and has remained a characteristic of the Eastern churches up to the present day. The emperors convoked the synods, and claimed the right of sanctioning their resolutions. Even doctrinal formulas were sometimes drawn up by the emperors, and only promulgated by the bishops. The



banishment of bishops for not concurring in the resolutions passed by synods convoked by the emperors, and frequently acting under the direct influence of the emperors, began even during the reign of Constantine.

In the western countries of the empire, the prominent position which was early awarded the bishop of Rome, and subsequently the local separation from the seat of the empire, weakened the power of the emperor in Church affairs. Some of the most prominent bishops and priests (Anbrose, Jerome, etc.) repelled in energetic language the right claimed by the emperors to decide Church questions. Several of the Eastern emperors thought it, moreover, in their interest to gain the friendship of the Roman bishops by making to them large concessions, and thus encouraged the aspirations of the latter to a supreme power in the Church. The Roman bishop Gelasius, in 494, claimed a superiority of the ecclesiastical over the secular power, and a synod convoked by the Roman bishop Symmachus, in 502, condemned the encroachment of king Odoacer upon the rights of the Church. When the German tribes, and in particular the Franks, became Christians, their kings gave to the clergy great privileges, and a great influence upon the administration of national affairs, but in return claimed the supreme power in ecclesiastical as well as secular affairs. Meetings of the clergy could not take place without royal permission, and all their resolutions needed, before being promulgated, the sanction of the kings. Even the appointment of the bishops soon came to be regarded as a royal prerogative. Charlemagne, who was crowned by Pope Leo III as Roman emperor, conceived the bold idea of a universal Christian monarchy. In his opinion, it was the chief duty of the emperor to defend the Church of Christ everywhere against pagans and infidels, and to extend her territory. The Church, on the other hand, was to aid in the execution of this plan by spiritual means. The pope, in his eyes, was the first clergyman of the empire, whose election, as well as that of the bishops, had to be ratified by the emperor. He was anxiously intent upon avoiding all conflicts between Church and State, but reorganized the whole ecclesiastical constitution of the empire, and even issued decisions on doctrinal questions, as, for instance, the heresy of the Adoptianists.

**6. *From Charlemagne to the Reformation.*** — The weak successors of Charlemagne were not able to carry through the ideas of the great emperor; and the natural tendency of the Church, and in particular of the popes, to elevate their dignity at the expense of that of the emperors, met with but little resistance. The synods of this time generally propounded the

doctrine that the pope held the highest position in the government of the Christian Church, and the emperor the highest position in the secular government of the Christian world; but that the Church was more important than the state, and the dignity of the pope higher than that of the emperor. This doctrine was in particular propagated by the pseudo-Isidorian decretals, which about this time obtained a leading influence upon Church legislation. The independence of the imperial power found, however, some very energetic champions even among the bishops; as, for instance, Hincmar of Rheims († 881). During the ninth and tenth centuries the authority of the papal see greatly suffered from the immoral character of some of its occupants, and it was therefore easy for the great German emperors of this time to increase the imperial power at the expense of the papal. The emperors still deemed it their duty to execute the laws of the Church, and excommunication was frequently followed by the ban; but, at the same time, the emperors recovered their former influence upon the election of the popes. This lasted until the middle of the 11th century, when the papal see, under the influence of the monk Hildebrand, began to exhibit greater strength, and put forth more exorbitant claims than ever before. In 1059 Nicholas II annulled the direct power of the emperors in the election of popes, which was transferred to the College of Cardinals, while to the emperor only the confirmation of the pope elect was left. When Hildebrand himself, in 1073, under the name of Gregory VII, ascended the papal throne, he boldly and vigorously proclaimed a new theory of the relation between Church and State. He claimed for the Church alone a divine origin, ascribing to all secular institutions, and in particular to the state itself, a human origin. The Church, therefore, was to be the highest power in society, and the state, for its legal existence, required the sanction of the Church. In the Church he enforced the law of celibacy, in order to separate the clergy entirely from the laity, and the absolute subordination of priests to bishops, and of both to the pope, in order to concentrate all power in the hands of the latter, and to make him the real head of the universal Christian monarchy. Gregory and his successors had an unceasing conflict with the German emperors with regard to this theory, and in particular as to the appointment of bishops and other ecclesiastical dignitaries by the secular power. Many bishops and priests took sides with the emperors, who repeatedly caused the election of anti-popes. Nevertheless, the theory which maintained the superiority of the Church to the state continually gained ground. The views of Gregory VII were further developed by Alexander III and Innocent III. The latter maintained that the State and the

world had not the nature of a divine institute, but were the products of human power and will. The Church, which is of divine origin, is therefore higher than the state. The state, in itself, is only a body which is dead until a soul is infused into it. This soul is the Church. The state is like the moon, an opaque body, which needs to be illumined by the Church. Christ gave to Peter the government over all the world, and the pope is the legitimate successor of Peter. To him, therefore, belongs the final decision in all affairs, and in particular the decision as to who is to govern the states. All the decrees of secular rulers require the sanction of the popes. But neither Innocent nor any of the following popes succeeded in carrying out these theories fully in practice. The emperors and kings, aided in general by the laity and a large number of the clergy, opposed the papal claims, in spite of all the excommunications which were hurled against them. Even men like Bernard of Clairvaux expressed their dissent from these ultrapapal theories. The last pope who endeavored to enforce these claims was Boniface VIII, who, in his notorious bull, *Unam Sanctam*, maintained it to be necessary for salvation to believe that the Roman popes had power over everything on earth. Boniface had to pay for this extraordinary assumption of power with imprisonment and ill-treatment which caused his death. The transfer of the papal see to Avignon, and subsequently the Great Schism, were fatal blows to the practical execution of the mediaeval theory of Church and State, although the theory itself was never formally renounced, and the notorious bull, *Unam Sanctam*, of Boniface VIII, which, as far as France was concerned, had been revoked by one of the Avignon popes (Clement V), was formally restored by Leo X in 1516. But the popes had not sufficient power to prevent the emperors and kings from passing laws by which the rights of the state governments were enlarged, and many salutary reforms introduced into the churches.

**7. From the Reformation to the present Time.** — The great reformers of the 16th century — Luther, Calvin, Zwinglius, Melancthon, and others — were all agreed in condemning the confusion by the Church of Rome of spiritual and secular power. They all insisted on keeping the two powers apart, and especially in their earlier writings favored the self-government of the Church. But these views were not consistently carried through. As all the bishops opposed the reform of the Church, the princes and the municipal governments were invited by the reformers to see to the execution of the Church reform, and to the reconstruction of the Reformed churches. No provision being made for a common bond of union between

the Reformed churches in different countries, the power of the state government in each particular country over the Church grew almost without opposition. To this must be added that most of the reformers adhered to the idea of a Christian state whose authorities were invested with the right to punish those who denied the fundamental doctrines of Christianity. *SEE SERVETUS*. Thus State-Churchism was established in all the Lutheran and Reformed countries, and developed the more rapidly, as the churches had never so powerful a representative as the Church of Rome had had during the Middle Ages. The constant efforts of the Roman Catholic states to root out Protestantism by force naturally led to retaliatory measures on the part of Protestant princes, and thus the dangerous principle came gradually to be developed, *Cujus regio ejus religio* (the religion of a country must conform to that of the prince). The application of this principle led, on the one hand, to many and bloody wars, but, on the other, it induced the Roman Catholic princes to claim, like the Protestant princes, a greater influence over religious affairs than the popes had ever conceded during the Middle Ages. The success of the Reformation had shown the weakness of the popes, and their opposition to the radical changes in the relation of the Church of Rome to the states was more nominal than efficient. The last coronation of an emperor of the West by the pope was that of Charles V in 1530. The popes protested in 1648 against the peace of Westphalia, in 1701 against the creation of a kingdom of Prussia, and in 1815 against the treaty of Vienna, but all these and similar acts had no influence whatever.

The growth of rationalism and infidelity in the 17th and 18th centuries accustomed princes and statesmen to regard the churches as part of the state organism, and just as absolutely subject to the government of every territory as the civil administration. This is the aera of the territorial system, the period of the greatest debasement of the Christian churches. Nearly all the Church assemblies, viz. the convocations in England; the national synods and general assemblies of the Protestant churches in France, Germany, and other countries; the national, provincial, and diocesan synods of the Church of Rome, were forbidden, or fell into general disuse. In the Church of Rome, during this period, the claims of the pope were not only denied by the state governments, but strenuous efforts were made in France, Germany, Italy, and other countries to reduce the papal prerogatives in matters purely ecclesiastical, and to increase that of the

bishops and of the national churches. These efforts, however, were less successful than those of the state governments.

The French Revolution of 1789 shook the structure of society of Europe, political as well as ecclesiastical, to its very foundations. The principles of the Revolution did not prevail, but the governments of Europe saw the necessity of reconstructing the administration of the states. Several important changes date from the Congress of Vienna in 1815. The long alliances of Protestant and Roman Catholic governments in the war against France, and the territorial changes introduced by the Congress of Vienna, led to an interchange of toleration, as far as the Lutheran, Reformed, and Roman Catholic churches were concerned. Some states recognised all three as state churches, entitled to support by the state governments; and in most of the others there was at least a gradual approach to giving to the members of the three churches equality of political rights. The relation of the Roman Catholic Church, in both Roman Catholic and Protestant countries, to the pope was regulated by concordats and conventions, *SEE CONCORDATS*, which stipulated what rights the state governments should allow the pope to exercise upon the Church of a particular country, and what influence the state governments (even the Protestant) should have upon the election of bishops, the appointment of other ecclesiastical dignitaries, the direction of Roman Catholic schools, the management of Church property, and other denominational affairs. In the Protestant churches, a consciousness awoke of the unworthy servitude into which the Church had been forced in the 17th and 18th centuries, and the demand grew stronger and stronger for the restoration of at least a part of the self-government of the churches, by means of convocations, synods, assemblies, and councils. A new impulse was given to these demands by the revolutionary movements of the year 1848, and by the agitation for political reforms which has since been going on in nearly all the European states. The regular convocation of elective Church assemblies, and the transfer to them of a greater or lesser part of the government of the Church, has, since 1848, been the general tendency in all the Protestant churches of Europe. As regards the Church of Rome, public opinion more and more declared itself against the conclusion of concordats, and in favor of a regulation of the Roman Catholic affairs of every particular country by special laws, due regard being had to the recognition by the Roman Catholics of the pope as the head of the Church.

While the Lutheran and Reformed churches assumed almost from their very beginning the character of state churches, a number of minor sects sprang up in the 16th and the following centuries, which, meeting, on the hand of the state governments, with nothing but persecution, were led to demand from the state not only toleration for themselves, but freedom of religious belief in general. Especially was this the case in England, where the Nonconformists gained greater strength and influence than any dissenters on the Continent of Europe, and became true pioneers of the principle of a complete separation between Church and state. Persecution drove many of the dissenters to the New World, and here their principles found a genial soil. In some of the colonies Church and State were united, more or less closely, until after the Revolution. At the declaration of independence, the United States established the absolute separation of Church and State, and the legal equality of all forms of belief, as fundamental institutions. The United States have always remained true to this principle, and in the several states of the Union it is now practically carried out. The prosperous growth of the free American churches, and their influence upon society, has had great effect upon opinion in the Old World. The experience of America has largely added to the number of the friends of free churches in Europe. The number of dissenting churches which claim absolute independence of the state is everywhere on the increase, and with them sympathize a large political party of Radicals, who make entire separation between Church and State a part of their political platform: In 1848, the principle of separation of Church and State was formally acknowledged in the new constitutions of France, Austria, Prussia, and other states. This triumph of the American principle was of only short duration; but none of the European countries have since ceased to have a large political party which aims at conforming legislation on Church affairs to that of the United States, and at carrying through the principle of entire separation between Church and State. It is a very remarkable fact that even men like Dr. Pusey have of late shown themselves favorable to the separation of Church and State, in order to put an end to the servile condition of the Church. One of the most prominent Protestant statesmen and writers of France, Count de Gasparin, speaks on the subject as follows: "Let no one be surprised at the extreme importance I attach to the separation of Church and State. For two centuries past the Church and society have been at war. In abolishing the unjust and worn-out pretences of both Church and State, their separation would give both to the Church and to society the peace they require. It would seem

nowaday as though the citizen and the Christian were two different persons, having different rights and different duties. The Christian is taught to curse liberty as the poisonous fruit of philosophy and revolution; the citizen is taught to look upon the Church as the natural enemy of modern institutions. Thus arises a sullen enmity, a deep-rooted anxiousness in the minds of the people, and, so to speak, two nations within the same society. Yet nothing would be more erroneous than this distinction. Christianity is so far from being the enemy of free institutions, that these institutions have never existed but in Christian countries; the nations which obey the law of Brahma, of Buddha, and of Mohammed, know of no other form of government than despotism. Liberty is the fruit of the Gospel; it proceeds from the only religion which intrusts the individual with the care and the salvation of his own soul; materialism kills it, faith makes it live; and, in return, by an intimate and mysterious connection, despotism kills faith, liberty nourishes it. What is this opposition which divides the Church and society? Nothing but a misunderstanding, whose mist shall disappear before the sun of liberty. The ideal of the Christian is also the ideal of the citizen. The state would gain no less than the Church by their mutual independence. We never attempt with impunity to rule that which God has created to be free. For two centuries the state has dragged on the Church, or has been dragged by it; the result was mutual suffering and mutual servitude. Separation restores each to its proper place. The state has no longer but citizens to deal with; it has no longer to fear the murmurs of conscience, or those invisible enemies which sap and weaken its foundations. Free in its action, authority gains both in strength and in respect; the vestry-quarrels, which are the plague of all state religions, are at an end. Union made the Church the enemy of the state, separation makes them friends. Conscience revolts against the hand of the state, it loves a power which guarantees it freedom." *SEE TOLERATION.*

Among the Liberal party of the Roman Catholic countries of Europe the principle of a separation between Church and State has likewise found many advocates. Of the great statesmen of Europe in modern times, few have given so cordial an adhesion to the principle as count Cavour, who, during his whole political career, stood up for a free Church in a free state; and baron Ricasoli, whose famous letter to the Italian bishops, dated Nov. 26, 1866, is a complete commentary on the subject, and a document which, in the history of European State-Churchism, will remain of lasting importance. We give the following extract from it: "The decisions adopted

by the government arise from the desire that perfect liberty in the relations between Church and State should pass from the abstract religion of principle in which it had hitherto remained into the reality of fact. The government, therefore, desires that Italy may very soon enjoy the magnificent and imposing religious spectacle now afforded to the free citizens of the United States of America by the National Council of Baltimore, wherein religious doctrines are freely discussed, and whose decisions, approved by the pope, will be proclaimed and executed in every town and village without *exequatur* or *placet*. It is liberty which has produced this admirable spectacle; liberty, professed and respected by all, in principle and in fact, in its amplest application to civil, political, and social life. In the United States every citizen is free to follow the persuasion that he may think best, and to worship the Divinity in the form that may seem to him most appropriate. Side by side with the Catholic Church rises the Protestant temple, the Mussulman mosque, the Chinese pagoda. Side by side with the Romish clergy the Genevan consistory and the Methodist assembly exercise their office. This state of things generates neither confusion nor clashing. And why is this? Because no religion asks either special protection or privileges from the state. Each lives, develops, and is followed under the protection of the common law, and the law, equally respected by all, guarantees to all an equal liberty. The Italian government wishes to demonstrate as far as possible *that it has faith in liberty*, and is desirous of applying it to the greatest extent compatible with the interests of public order. It therefore calls upon the bishops to return to their sees whence they were removed by those very motives of public order. It makes no conditions save that one incumbent upon every citizen who desires to live peaceably — namely, that he should confine himself to his own duty and observe the laws, The state will insure that he be neither disturbed nor hindered; but let him not demand privileges if he wishes no bonds. The principle of every free state, that the law is equal for all, admits of no distinctions of any kind. The government would be glad to cast off all suspicion and abandon every precaution, and if it does not now wholly act up to this wish, it is because the principle of liberty which it has adopted and put into practice is not equally adopted and practiced by the clergy. Let your lordships remark the difference between the condition of the Church in America and the condition of the Church in Europe. In those virgin regions the Church is established amid a new society, but which *carried with it from the mother country all the elements of civil life*. Representing the purest and most sacred of the social elements, the



religious feeling which sanctions right, and sanctifies duty, and carries human aspirations far above all earthly things, the Church has here sought only the empire pleasing to God, the empire of souls. Companion of liberty, the Church has grown beneath its shelter, and has found all that sufficed for free development and the tranquil and fecund exercise of its ministry. It has never sought to deny to others the liberty which it enjoyed, nor to turn to its exclusive advantage the institutions which protected it. In Europe, on the other hand, the Church arose with the decadence of the great empire that had subjugated the earth. It was constituted amid the political and social cataclysms of the barbarous ages, and was compelled to form an organization strong enough to resist the shipwreck of all civilization amid the rising flood of brute force and violence. But while the world, emerging from the chaos of the Middle Ages, re-entered the path of progress marked out by God, the Church impressed upon all having any relation with it the immobility of the dogma intrusted to its guardianship. It viewed with suspicion the growth of intelligence and the multiplication of social forces, and declared itself the enemy of all liberty, denying the first and most incontestable of all, the liberty of conscience. Hence arose the conflict between the ecclesiastical and the civil power, since the former represented subjection and immobility, and the latter liberty and progress. The conflict, from peculiar circumstances, has greater proportions in Italy, because the Church, thinking that a kingdom was necessary to the independent exercise of its spiritual ministry, found that kingdom in Italy. The ecclesiastical power, from the same reason, is here in contradiction not only with the civil power, but national right. The bishops cannot be considered among us as simple pastors of souls, since they are at the same time the instruments and defenders of a power at variance with the national aspirations. The civil power is therefore constrained to impose those measures upon the bishops which are necessary to preserve its rights and those of the nation. How is it possible to terminate this deplorable and perilous conflict between the two powers-between Church and state? Let us 'render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and unto God the things that are God's,' and peace between Church and state will be troubled no more."

See Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* vol. 19 (Supplem.), s.v. *Staat und Kirche*; a complete history of the relation of the Christian Church to the state was begun by Riffel (Romans Cath.), but not completed (*Geschichtliche Darstellung der Verhältnisse zwischen Kirche und Staat*, vol. 1, Mainz,

1836, embracing the time from the foundation of Christianity to Justinian I); Vinet, *Essai sur la manifestation des convictions religieuses et sur la separation de l'eglise et de l'tat envisagee comme consequence necessaire et comme garantie du principe* (Paris; 1842; translated into English, Lond. 1843, 12mo); Laurent, *L'Eglise et l'E'tat*; Hundeshagen, *Ueber einige Hauptmomente in der geschichtlichen Entwicklung des Verhältnisses zwischen Staat und Kirche*, in Dove's *Zeitschrift für Kirchenrecht*, vol. 1 (Berlin, 1861); Roscovany (Romans Cath.), *Monumenta Cathovica pro independentia ecclesice ex potestate civili*, tom. 1 (Quinque Ecclesiis, 1847); Richter, *Geschichte der evangel. Kirchenvsrfassung in Deutschland* (Leipzig, 1851); the manuals of Church law (*Kirchenrecht*) by Richter, Walter, Philips, and others. Lord Montague pleads for the State Church in *The Four Experiments in Church and State* (London, 1863), maintaining that only four forms of Church and State are possible: 1. When the Church is identical with the state, i.e. when it is a national Church; 2. When the Church is under the state; 3. When the Church overrides the state; 4. When there is no Church at all. In the author's opinion, the national is the only normal form of Church and state. In each of the other forms the Church and state are depraved. See also Dupin, *Traite de la Puissance eccles. et temporelle* (Paris, 1707); Dupin's *Manuel du Droit Ecclesiastique* (Paris, 4th ed. 1845; claiming the rights of Roman Catholic state governments over the Church of Rome); Zachariee, *Einheit des Staats und der Kirche* (1797); De Maistre, *Du Pape* (the most celebrated defense of ultra-papal theories); Archbishop Wake, *The Authority of Princes*; Warburton, *Alliance of Church and State* (1736); Hobbes, *Leviathan* (1608); Gladstone, *State in Relation to Church* (2 vols. 4th ed. 1841); Pusay, *Royal Supremacy* (1847); Coleridge, *Constitution of Church and State* (1830); Chalmers, *National Churches* (1838); Vincent, *Protestantisme enz France*, p. 190; Brownson's *Review* (Romans Cath.), Oct. 1854; Dexter, *Congregationalism* (Bost. 1865), p. 209; D'Aubigne, *Essays* (N. Y. ed.), p. 239; Palmer, *On the Church*, 2, 291 sq.; *Church of England Quarterly*, Jan. 1855, art. vi; Schaff, *Church History*, 2, 90, 356; Calvin, *Institutes*, bk. 4, ch. 20; *English Review*, vol. 11 and foll. (many articles); *Catholic World*, April, 1867, art. 1; Wardlaw, *On Church Establishments* (London, 1839, 8vo); Noel, *On the Union of Church and State* (N. Y. 1849, 12mo); Cunningham, *Discussion of Church Principles* (Edinb. 1863, 8vo).

## Church, Armenian

*SEE ARMENIAN CHURCH.*

## Church, Associate

*SEE PRESBYTERIAN (ASSOCIATE) CHURCH.*

## Church, Baptist

*SEE BAPTISTS.*

## Church, Catholic Apostolic

*SEE CATHOLIC APOSTOLIC CHURCH.*

## Church, Congregational

*SEE CONGREGATIONALISTS.*

## Church Congress,

a name given to free gatherings of ministers and laymen of the Established Church of England, which since 1861 have annually been held for the purpose of discussing important religious and ecclesiastical questions. The first congress was convoked by a self-constituted committee, which invited men of all theological parties to be present. In order to maintain the neutral character of the Church Congress, no resolutions were to be passed. Although this original plan has been adhered to, the High-Church party has been in an unmistakable ascendancy at all the congresses, and the Low-Church party, on that account, in 1866, formed a design (not yet executed) of calling a separate Low-Church Congress. The congresses held from 1861 to 1866 were as follows: 1861, Canterbury; 1862, Oxford; 1863, Manchester; 1864, Bristol; 1865, Norwich; 1866, York. At each of these congresses the bishop of the diocese presided. The attendance in every case was large, and a number of bishops, and prominent clergymen and laymen, took part in the proceedings. A curious difficulty stood in the way of the congress of 1865, which deserves mention, as it shows the relation of the bishops of England to these meetings. When it was resolved by the congress of 1864 (at Bristol) to hold the next one at Norwich, it was understood that the sanction and co-operation of the bishop of that city had been obtained. But this proved to be a mistake; and when the bishop was applied to by the official residuum of the congress, he did not consider

the authority of the persons constituting it sufficient to entitle them to his consideration. The request from a public meeting, and a vote taken in the diocese of Norwich on the subject, was deemed no more sufficient. Only when the chapter of Norwich (including the honorary canons) had declared in favor of the congress, the bishop consented to preside. See Rivington's *Eccles. Year-book for 1865* (London, 1866. The "Yearbook" gives, at p. 135 to 172, a full account of the Congress of Norwich). The full proceedings of each meeting of the congress have been published in a special report.

## Church, Constitution Of

*SEE ECCLESIASTICAL POLITY.*

## Church, Cumberland Presbyterian

*SEE PRESBYTERIAN (CUMBERLAND) CHURCH.*

## Church Diet

(*Kirchentag*), a name given to free gatherings of clergymen and laymen of the German Protestant state churches, held since 1848 for the discussion of religious and ecclesiastical questions. The Church Diets were called into existence in consequence of the revolutionary movements of the year 1848, which appeared to tend to a separation between Church and State, and to endanger the influence of the evangelical Church upon society. Members of the Lutheran, the Reformed, and the United Evangelical churches took part, and the High Church "Confessionalists," under Stahl and Hengstenberg, worked hand in hand with the Evangelical party, under men like Nitzsch, Bethmani-Hollweg, and others, at the first annual meetings of the Diet of Wittenberg (1848 and 1849), Stuttgart (1850), Elberfeld (1851), Bremen (1852), Berlin (1853), Frankfurt (1854), Libeck (1856), Stuttgart (1857), Hamburg (1858). But in 1860 the former party did not appear, because the executive committee had refused to put the Dissenter and the Civil Marriage questions on the programme of the meeting.

Consequently, at the assembly of Barmen (1860), and the following ones at Brandenburg (1862) and Altenburg (1864), the Evangelical party (the "Consensus" party) was alone represented. Simultaneously with every meeting of the Church Diet has been held an assembly of the Congress for Home Missions. *SEE HOME MISSIONS.* The full proceedings of each meeting of the diet have been published in a special report. A briefer

account is given in the annual *Kirchliche Chronik* by Matthes. See also Dorner, *Reform d. evangel. Landeskirchen* (1848); *Entstehung und Gesch. des Kirchentages* (1853).

## Church Discipline

*SEE DISCIPLINE.*

## Church, Dutch Reformed

*SEE HOLLAND; SEE REFORMED PROTESTANT DUTCH CHURCH.*

## Church Edifices.

Under *Architecture* (q.v.) a brief history has been given of the development of ecclesiastical architecture. The present article will contain various particulars concerning the history of some of the most prominent churches, their names, form, site, position, the arrangement of the interior, the outer buildings connected with the Church service, etc.

**I.** *History of the Erection of Churches.* — Until the second century Christians were not permitted to erect churches, but were compelled to worship in private houses, in the open fields, or, to escape persecution, in the Catacombs (q.v.) and other concealed places. On the suspension of persecution, we find, from A.D. 202 and forwards, notices of Church edifices in Nicomedia, Edessa (Odessa), and other cities. Diocletian issued an edict (A.D. 305) ordering all Christian churches to be razed to the ground. Under Constantine these were rebuilt, and great numbers of new ones erected over the whole Roman empire. Chief among them were the magnificent basilicas, *SEE BASILICA*, of St. Peter, St. Paul, and Maria Maggiore in Rome. The form of the buildings and the contamination of idolatry prevented the general changing into Christian houses of worship of the old pagan temples, many of which were destroyed. Still some of them were thus converted, especially after the time of Theodosius I, and the materials of others were largely used. Justinian I (A.D. 565) rebuilt twenty-four churches in Constantinople alone, and many other churches, cloisters, resting-places for pilgrims, and other religious buildings, over the entire empire of the Orient, and especially in Palestine. The church of St. Sophia (q.v.) he rebuilt with great beauty and splendor. This served as a pattern for Church edifices through the whole Christian world. Such was the splendor of the new St. Sophia that Justinian exclaimed, *Νεκίκηκά σε,*

**Σολομών**, “I have surpassed thee, O Solomon!” The emperor appointed for the service of this church sixty presbyters, one hundred deacons, forty deaconesses, ninety sub-deacons, one hundred and ten readers, twenty-five singers, one hundred door-keepers, making five hundred and twenty-five of the clergy and attendants. From the death of Justinian (A.D. 575) to the eighth century but few Church buildings of great note were erected. During the reign of Charlemagne many churches were erected in North-western Europe. The belief that the world was to be destroyed in the year A.D. 1000 paralyzed all energy, and it was not till that year had passed that the great revival of all departments of human activity called forth the spirit of princes and cities, as well as of the clergy, to the erection of the many grand monuments of ecclesiastical architecture that adorn the history of the Middle Ages. This zeal in church-building became so modified into a spirit of pride, ambition, and corruption during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries as to become one of the chief causes that produced the Reformation. The system of selling indulgences to raise money for building churches, first introduced in the eleventh century, was carried to such excess in raising funds for rebuilding the gorgeous St. Peter’s (q.v.), that the reformers had in this a most powerful argument in their contest with the Romish Church. In Europe, the building, repairing, and maintaining of edifices for the national churches is provided for entirely, or at least to a great extent, from the general national taxes. Other churches build their edifices by voluntary contributions. This is universally the case in the United States of America.

In the remainder of this article we chiefly follow Bingham, *Orig. Ecclesiastes* bk. 8, ch. 1), making use of Farrar’s abridgment, with modifications and additions.

**II.** *The ancient Names of Churches.* — The word *dominicum*, or *domus Dei*, the Lord’s house, occurs in the 4th century. Cyprian uses it to denote the Lord’s day, and also the Lord’s Supper; yet it is used by Jerome for a building set apart for divine worship. It answers to the Greek **κυριακόν**. **SEE CHURCH.** *Domus Dei, domus ecclesiae, domus divina* — that is, “the Lord’s house,” “the house of the church,” “the house of God” — are expressions in frequent use from the third century. In Eusebius we have **οἶκος ἐκκλησίας**, *the house of the church*. *Domus divina*, the house of God, was a term employed to designate the palace of the Roman emperor; but the Christians transferred the appellation to their churches. Tertullian uses the name *domus columbce*, the house of the dove, or, as Mede

explains it, the house of the dove-like religion, or the house of the dove-like disciples of Christ. As the Temple of God at Jerusalem is frequently in Scripture styled the house of prayer, so Christian churches are called **προσευκτήρια**, or **οἴκοι εὐκτήριοι**, *oratories*, or *houses of prayer*. In later times these titles were appropriated to smaller or domestic chapels. Some early writers distinguish between **ἐκκλησιαστήριον** and **ἐκκλησία**, the former signifying the *building*, and the latter the *congregation*; but in the writings of Ignatius, Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, Cyprian, and others, the word **ἐκκλησία** usually means the *building*, and at length became the current expression. *Basilica* was originally applied to the imperial palace, or public halls, and was not used to designate places of worship until Christian emperors had appropriated, such buildings to the use of the Church. **SEE BASILICA**. **Ἀνάκτορον** is synonymous with *basilica*, and was occasionally applied to places of divine worship built by emperors. Churches were sometimes called *tituli* (**τίτλοι**), either from the inscription of dedication, or from the sign of the cross. The term **τρόπαια**, *tropcea*, occurs in Eusebius. The reason of this name is sought in the reported appearance of the cross to Constantine, and the *Labarum*, on which, according to Eusebius, was inscribed **τοῦ σταυροῦ τρόπαιον**. **Μαρτύριον**, or *memoria*, denoted a church dedicated to the memory of a martyr. If the person in memory of whom the church was built was a prophet or an apostle, then the church respectively took the name **ἄποστολείον** and **προφητεῖον**. In addition, we find at different times, and for various reasons, the following names given to Christian churches: **σκηνή**, *concilia, conciliabula, conventicula, cases*, **σύνοδοι**, **μοναστήριον**, **κοιμητήριον**, *corpus Christi*, **ναός**, **νῆσος**, and many others. The titles *fanum* and *delubrum* were at all times rejected as profane.

*Names of individual Churches.* — Individual churches were, soon after the time of Constantine(?), dedicated to certain saints, and called by the names of those saints. Some of the Protestant denominations name their church edifices after the apostles, but only for the purpose of distinction from each other. Puritans, and the churches influenced by them, name their churches by their ordinal numbers, as the first, second, etc., or by the street on which they are located. In the Methodist Church the names of the apostles are often used; and church edifices are sometimes named in honor of Wesley or some other distinguished leader in the Church.

## Picture for Church Edifices 1

**III. Forms of Churches.** — The earliest ground-forms were oblong. The basilicas (q.v.) were fashioned after the analogy of a ship, or perhaps, rather, after the oblong form had been settled upon by other influences — as of architectural convenience, etc. — that part of the church to receive believers was called the nave (*navis*, ship). This was afterward connected with allegorical or mystical meanings; e.g. to denote the dangers to which the Church was exposed, and the safety which it offered to its members. The boat of Peter and the ark of Noah were explained as emblematic of the Church in these two respects. On the other hand, the Byzantine churches, and many that were influenced by them, were *round*. During the *Lombard*, or *early Round-arch* period of architecture, the churches assumed the form of a cross. In the late Gothic they had the head of the cross bent, to represent the bowing of the head of the Savior when he died: thus at Rouen (St. Ouen). The transepts of the cross often did not extend beyond the walls, not appearing at all in the external architecture.

**IV. The Site** — This was generally chosen on the summit of a mountain or other elevated place, for two reasons, viz. security and retirement from the bustle of the world, and a notion that elevated places were specially holy. The Temple of Solomon had been built on a hill; and the Christians remembered the expression, “I will lift up mine eyes to the hills, from whence cometh my help.” At first, exposed situations were avoided; but when the impediment arising from persecution was removed, they were preferred. At other times they erected their churches over the graves of martyrs; and occasionally the cemeteries were used for devotional purposes. In the tenth and eleventh centuries there were many places of this kind called *κρυπταί*, *cryptoe*.

**V. Aspect.** — The earliest churches faced eastward; at a later period (4th or 5th century) this was reversed, and the sacramental table was placed at the east, so that, in facing it in their devotions, they were turned towards the east. The Jewish custom was to turn to the west in prayer. “As the Jews began their day with the *setting sun*, so the followers of Christ began theirs with the *rising sun*. The eye of the Christian turned with peculiar interest to the east, in remembrance of the Morning Star, the Savior, the Sun of Righteousness. This idea was mixed up with many religious observances. After baptism the newly-admitted members of the church were turned with their faces eastward; and the dead were usually buried in



the same position, under the conviction that Christ at His second coming should appear in the east.”

**VI. Internal Arrangement.** — No particular structure or arrangement of the interior prevailed during the first three centuries. From the fourth century we find uniformity prevailing in the *basilicas* both of the East and West. The body of the church was divided into three parts, corresponding with the threefold division of the Christians — into *clergy*, including the servants of the congregation; *faithful*, or *believers*; and *catechumens*. This arrangement was also in conformity with the division of the ancient Temple — into the holy of holies, the sanctuary, and the court. The three parts were:

1. The *bema*, or sanctuary, in which the clergy officiated.
2. The *naos*, or nave, appropriated to the faithful, the lay-members of the church.
3. The *narthex*, or ante-temple, the place of penitents and catechumens.

Sometimes four or five divisions are enumerated: this arises from subdividing the narthex into outer and inner, and also reckoning the *exedrae*, or outer buildings, a portion of the church.

**1. The Bema, or Sanctuary.** — The inner part of the church appropriated to the clergy: from **βαίνειν, φοιρ ἀναβαίνειν**, *to ascend*. This name was sometimes given to the raised platform which supported the throne or chair of the bishop and the seats of the presbyters, and sometimes to the whole of that part of the church in which the platform and the altar stood. It was also called **ἅγιον, ἁγίασμα, ἅγιον ἁγίων**, *the holy*, or *the holy of holies*; **ἱερατεῖον** and **πρεσβυτήριον**, *presbytery*, because it was the place in which the presbyters sat and discharged their duties; **θυσιαστήριον**, because the altar stood here; **ἄδυτον, ἄβατον**, or more commonly in the plural, **ἄδυτα, ἄβατα**, *places not to be entered or trodden*, because laymen and females were not allowed to enter. Because kings and emperors were privileged with a seat within this inclosure, it was called **ἀνάκτορον**, *royal palace*. The platform of this part of the church was an elliptical recess, with a corresponding arch overhead, and separated from the nave by a rail curiously wrought like net-work, called *cancelli*, chancel. Within were the bishop's throne, and subordinate seats right and left for the lower clergy. The bishop's throne was usually covered with a

veil, and for this reason was called *cathedra velata*. In the middle stood the altar, in such a position as to be easily encompassed on every side. On one side of it was a small table for receiving oblations; on the other a recess, called **σκευοφυλάκιον**, into which the vessels were conveyed after the sacrament.

**2. The Nave.** — This was the main body of the church, and called by different names, derived from the uses to which it was applied. It was called the oratory of the people, because they there met for religious worship, reading the Scriptures, prayer, and hearing the word. It was also called the place of assembly, and the quadrangle, from its quadrangular form, in contrast with the elliptical form of the chancel. In a central position stood the *ambo, suggestum lectorum*, or reader's desk, elevated on a platform above the level of the surrounding seats. This was sometimes called the pulpit, and the tribunal of the church, in distinction from the **βῆμα**, or tribunal of the choir. The choristers were provided with seats near this desk. The seats on either side, in front, were occupied by the faithful, or the communicants. The gospels and epistles were chanted from before the altar. The sermon was also delivered by the preacher standing on the platform of the sanctuary, or on the steps leading to it. But when large churches were erected, it became difficult for the preacher to make himself heard from this position. To remedy this inconvenience, a platform was erected for him in front of the *bema*, within the body of the nave. The rules of the primitive churches required the separation of the sexes, and this was generally observed. The men occupied the left of the altar, on the south side of the church, and the women the right, on the north. They were separated by a veil, or lattice. In the Eastern churches the women occupied a gallery, while the men sat below. The catechumens occupied a part near to the believers, arranged in their several classes; but they were required to withdraw at the summons of the deacons — *Ite, catechumeni!* In the rear of the catechumens sat the penitents, who had been allowed a place again within the church. The walls of the church were surrounded by antechambers and recesses for the accommodation of the assembly, for meditation, reading, and prayer. There were aisles surrounding the nave which separated it from the chambers. It was separated from the chancel by a partition or lattice-work, with a curtain, and the entrance to the choir was by folding-doors in this partition. These doors were provided with curtains, which, as well as the larger curtain, called **καταπέτασμα** and

καταπέτασμα μυστικόν, were drawn aside during the celebration of the Eucharist, and during the delivery of the sermon.

## Picture for Church Edifices 2

**3.** *The Narthex, or Ante-temple.* — This was the outer division within the walls. It was called **πρόναος**, *ante-temple*; **πρόπυλα**, *portico*; and **νάρθηξ**, *or ferula*. The latter name is supposed to have been given it in consequence of its oblong shape, resembling in this respect a *ferula*, or rod. It was an oblong section of the building, extending quite across the front of the church. It was entered by three doors leading from the outer porch. The great entrance was at the west, opposite to the altar; it was called (after the corresponding part of the temple) **ώραία ορ βασιλική**, *the beautiful or royalgate*. The *vestibule*, or **πρόναος**, in the stricter sense, was allotted to the catechumens and penitents. Heretics and unbelievers were also allowed a place here, though this was forbidden by some Eastern synods. The **πρόπυλα**, *or portico*, was chiefly used for the performance of funerals. But, in the larger churches, meetings on ecclesiastical affairs were held in it. The primitive Christians were accustomed to wash before entering a church, as a symbol of the purity becoming that holy place. In due time the vessel used for that purpose was introduced into the porch. The vessel was called **κρήνη, φιάλη, φρέαρ, κολυμβεῖον, λεοντάριον**, *cantharus*.

**VII.** *The outer Buildings, or Exedre.* — All the buildings attached to the church, such as courts, side-buildings, wings, and other erections and places in the area connected with it, were called *exedroe*. The enclosure around the church was known by the names **περίβολος, στοαί, περιστῶν, τετραστῶν, τετράστυλον**, *ambitus, peristylia*. The open space between the extreme circumference and the church is called by Eusebius **αἶθρον**, *impluvium*, but is no other than the Latin *atrium*, and is synonymous with the word *area*. In this space stood the energumens, and that class of penitents called **προσκλαίοντες**, *or flentes*. They were also called **χειμάζοντες**, *or χειμαζόμενοι*, from the circumstance of their standing in the open air, exposed to all the changes of the weather. The most important of the exedrae were the *baptisteries*. In these places the candidates were instructed and prepared for baptism, and there were separate apartments for men and women: here also councils and ecclesiastical meetings were held, and hence it may be inferred that they were of capacious dimensions. These baptisteries were not attached to all

churches, but were generally erected adjacent to cathedral churches, denominated, on this account, *baptismal* and *central* churches. There were also several other smaller buildings, such as the *diaconicum magnum*, in which the sacred utensils, and the ornaments and robes of the clergy, were kept. This was called **κειμηλιαρχεῖον, γαζοφυλάκιον, σκευοφυλάκιον**. Here the clergy were accustomed to retire for private exercises preparatory to the public services: hence it was called *secretum*, or *secretarium*. It was also a general audience-room, and denominated *salutarium, receptorium*. Many are of the opinion that the building was used as a *prison* for the confinement of delinquent clergymen. There was another class of buildings called *pastophoria*. This is a word borrowed from the Septuagint translation of <sup><3607></sup>Ezekiel 40:17, where it denotes the chambers in the outer courts of the Temple. Learned men are divided in opinion as to the uses of the *pastophoria*: some suppose them to have been watch-houses, others apartments for the accommodation of the clergy. Libraries were attached to many churches. In these collections were included not only the liturgical and other churchbooks, and the manuscript Eopies of the holy Scriptures, in the original languages and translations, but also homilies, *catecheses*, and other theological works. From the libraries of Jerusalem and Caesarea, both Eusebius and Jerome chiefly derived the materials for their writings. Schools were, in later times, established in connection with some churches. If no building was provided for the purpose, the catechumens, or younger clergy, were taught in the baptistry or vestry. Other buildings were **οἴκοι βασιλῆιοι**, *the habitations of the bishop and clergy*; **λουτρά**, *baths*; **ἀνακαμπτήρια**, *lodging-places*, supposed by some to have been a kind of inn, by others a common place of resort for rest or recreation.

*Doors.* — Churches were usually provided with three doors, in imitation of the Temple. The principal entrance was called **πύλη**, and **πύλη ώραία** or **βασιλική**. They were sometimes made of brass, and often richly ornamented. The date of the building or dedication of the church was usually inscribed on the door. Sometimes a motto was affixed, a doctrinal sentiment, a prayer, or doxology. Later, the doors were often of bronze, ornamented with Biblical scenes, etc. In the early Round-arch period (A.D. 700-1000) the columns beside the doors usually rested on the backs of crouching lions, griffins, or other real or imaginary animals, who symbolized a guardianship of the entrance to the church.

The doorway was often highly ornamented with clusters of beautifully-wrought columns, and with a correspondingly decorated arched way overhead. This arch later contained angels or saints sculptured in the stone.

*Pavements.* — From the fourth century downwards, great attention was paid to the pavement of the church. In large churches, the narthex had a pavement of plaster; the nave one of wood; and the sanctuary, or part immediately around the high altar, was adorned with a tessellated pavement of polished and parti-colored marble, constituting a rich mosaic work.

### Picture for Church Edifices 3

*Windows.* — The Christian churches from the first were well provided with windows. It is customary to refer the origin of glass to the third century; but this is incorrect. The Phoenicians, Egyptians, Greeks, and Romans used glass long before the Christian aera. *SEE GLASS.* In France, windows of both colored and cut glass were in use in the sixth century.

The following statement with regard to the mediaeval and more modern churches and cathedrals is taken from Chambers, *Encyclopaedia*, s.v.

“In the larger and more complete churches, the nave, and frequently also the choir, are divided longitudinally by two rows of pillars into three portions, the portion at each side being generally somewhat narrower and less lofty than that in the center. These side portions are called the aisles of the nave, or of the choir, as the case may be. In some churches the aisles are continued along the transepts, thus running round the whole church; in others there are double aisles to the nave, or to both nave and choir, or even to nave, choir, and transept. Behind, or to the east of the choir, is situated the ‘Chapel of the Virgin,’ with sometimes a number of altars; and it is not unusual for side chapels to be placed at different places along the aisles. These usually contain the tombs of the founder, and of other benefactors to, or dignitaries connected with, the church. The extent to which these adjuncts exist depends on the size and importance of the church, and they are scarcely ever alike in two churches, either in number, form, or position. Vestries for the use of the priests and choristers generally exist in connection with the choir. Along the sides of the choir are ranged richly-ornamented seats or stalls, usually of carved oak, surmounted with tracery, arches, and pinnacles; and among these seats, in the case of a bishop’s church, the highest and most conspicuous is the so-called *cathedra*, or seat for the bishop, from which the cathedral takes its

name. The larger English cathedral and abbey-churches have usually a chapter-house attached to them, which is of various forms, most commonly octagonal, and is often one of the richest and most beautiful portions of the whole edifice. On the Continent, chapter-houses are not so common, the chapter (q.v.) being usually held in the cathedral itself, or in one of the chapels attached to it. Cloisters (q. v) are also frequent, and not unusually the sides of those which are farthest removed from the church or chapter-house are enclosed by other buildings connected with the establishment, such as a library, and places of residence for some of the officials of the cathedral. It is here that, in Roman Catholic churches, the hall, dormitories, and kitchens for the monks are commonly placed. Beneath the church there is frequently a crypt (q.v.). In some cathedral churches, the crypt is in reality a second underground church of great size and beauty. The baptistery (q.v.) is another adjunct to the church, though frequently forming a building altogether detached. Most of the parts of the church which we have mentioned may be traced on the annexed ground-plan of Durham Cathedral, but it must not be supposed that their position is always that which is there represented. The position of the nave, choir, or chancel, aisles and transepts, are nearly invariable, but the other portions vary, and are scarcely alike in two churches." Modern Church edifices vary greatly in form, structure, and arrangements. See Bingham, *Orig. Eccles.* bk. 8; Coleman, *Christian Antiquities*, ch. 13; also Siegel, *Handbuch der christlich-kirchlichen Alterthumer*, 2:366, 427, and references there. On the adaptation of ancient art to modern Church architecture, and its dangers, see Close, *Church Architecture Scripturally considered* (Lond. 1844, 8vo); T. K. Arnold, *Remarks on Close's Church Architecture* (London, 1844); and a series of articles on Church architecture in the *Christian's Monthly Magazine* (Lond. 1844, 1845); Milman, *History of Latin Christianity*, vol. 8, ch. 8.

## Church, Evangelical

*SEE PRUSSIA.*

## Church Fathers

*SEE FATHERS.*

## Church, French Reformed

*SEE FRANCE, REFORMED CHURCH OF.*

Church, Gallican

*SEE GALLICAN CHURCH.*

Church, German Reformed

*SEE GERMAN REFORMED CHURCH.*

Church, Greek

*SEE GREEK CHURCH; SEE RUSSIA.*

Church History

*SEE ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY.*

Church, Lutheran

*SEE LUTHERAN CHURCH.*

Church, Methodist (Episcopal And Other).

*SEE METHODISTS.*

Church Missionary Society

*SEE MISSIONARY SOCIETIES.*

Church, Moravian

*SEE MORAVIANS.*

Church Music

*SEE MUSIC; SEE PSALMODY.*

Church, New Jerusalem

*SEE SWEDENBORGIANS; SEE NEW JERUSALEM.*

Church Of England

*SEE ENGLAND, CHURCH OF.*

## Church Of God,

a denomination of Baptists in the United States, organized in 1830 by John Winebrenner, formerly a minister of the German Reformed Church at Harrisburg, Pa.

**I. History.** — During the period of Winebrenner's pastorate, revivals of religion were frequent within the bounds of his charge, and extended from it gradually to other churches and congregations, although some ministers of the German Reformed Church opposed the movement. As, in the mean time, Mr. Winebrenner's sentiments in regard to theology and church government underwent a change, and other preachers were raised up from among the converts whose views agreed with his, a call was made in 1830 for a Convention to organize an association. Mr. Winebrenner was chosen moderator of the Convention, and it was resolved to form a separate denomination, under the name "*Church of God.*" — The Church took root chiefly in Pennsylvania and the Western States, having (in 1867) no eldership in the New England States and in New York, and but one eldership in the Southern Texas. The latter, at the beginning of the war, separated from the General Eldership because of the antislavery doctrines professed by it. At an annual meeting held in 1866, the Texas eldership expressed a desire to reunite with the General Eldership, but no definite resolutions were passed.

The eighth triennial General Eldership of the Church was held at Decatur, Illinois, on May 31, 1866, and the following days. The following Annual Elderships were represented: East Pennsylvania, West Pennsylvania, East Ohio, West Ohio, Indiana, Southern Indiana and Illinois, Iowa, German, Michigan. A. F. Shoemaker was elected speaker. Centralia College, in Kansas, was recognized as an institution of the Church, and it was resolved to establish another college in Ohio, West Pennsylvania, Indiana, or Illinois. The subscription list of the weekly denominational organ, the *Church Advocate*, was reported to be 2700, and resolutions were passed in favor of the establishment of a Sunday-school paper by the Board of Publication, and of a German paper by Rev. J. F. Weishampel. A series of resolutions was also adopted on the duty of loyalty, against slavery, and in favor of equal rights of all men, irrespective of color.

**II. Doctrines.** — (Gorrie, cited below.) The following is a full statement of the views of the denomination:



- 1.** She believes the Bible, or the canonical books of the Old and New Testament, to be the Word of God, a revelation from God to man, and the only authoritative rule of faith and practice.
- 2.** She believes in one Supreme God, consisting of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, and that these three are co-equal and co-eternal.
- 3.** She believes in the fall and depravity of man; that is to say, that man by nature is destitute of the favor and image of God.
- 4.** She believes in the redemption of man through the atonement, or vicarious sacrifice of Jesus Christ.
- 5.** She believes in the gifts and office-work of the Holy Spirit; that is, in the enlightening, regenerating, and sanctifying influence and power of the Spirit.
- 6.** She believes in the free moral agency of man; that he has moral ability, because commanded to repent and believe, In order to be saved; and that the doctrine of unconditional election and reprobation has no foundation in the oracles of God.
- 7.** She believes that man is justified by faith in Christ and not by the works of law, or by works of his own righteousness.
- 8.** She believes in the necessity of regeneration, or the new birth; or in the change of man's moral nature, after the image of God, by the influence and power of the word and Spirit of God, through faith in Christ Jesus.
- 9.** She believes in three positive ordinances of perpetual standing in the Church, viz. Baptism, Feet-washing, and the Lord's Supper.
- 10.** She believes two things essential to the validity of baptism, viz. faith and immersion — that faith should always precede immersion; and that where either is wanting there can be no scriptural baptism.
- 11.** She believes that the ordinance of feet-washing, that is, the literal washing of the saints' feet, according to the words and example of Christ, is obligatory upon all Christians, and ought to be observed by all the churches of God.
- 12.** She believes that the Lord's Supper should be often administered, and, to be consistent, to Christians only, in a sitting posture, and always in the evening.

- 13.** She believes in the institution of the Lord's day, or Christian Sabbath, as a day of rest and religious worship.
- 14.** She believes that the reading and preaching of God's word, the singing of psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, and the offering up of prayers, are ordained of God, and ought to be regularly and devoutly observed by all the people and churches of God.
- 15.** She believes in the propriety and utility of holding fast-days, experience meetings, anxious meetings, camp-meetings, and other special meetings of united and protracted efforts for the edification of the Church and the conversion of sinners.
- 16.** She believes that the Gospel ministry, Sabbath-schools, education, the religious press, the Bible, missionary, temperance, and all other benevolent causes, ought to be heartily supported.
- 17.** She believes that the Church ought to relieve and take care of her own poor saints, superannuated ministers, widows, and orphans.
- 18.** She believes that the manufacture, traffic, and use of ardent spirits as a beverage or common drink, is injurious and immoral, and ought to be abandoned.
- 19.** She believes the system or institution of involuntary slavery to be impolitic or unchristian.
- 20.** She believes that all civil wars are unholy and sinful, and in which the saints of the Most High ought never to participate.
- 21.** She believes that civil governments are ordained of God for the general good; that Christians ought to be subject to the same in all things, except what is manifestly unscriptural; and that appeals to the law, out of the Church, for justice and the adjustment of civil rights, are not inconsistent with the principles and duties of the Christian religion.
- 22.** She believes in the necessity of a virtuous and holy life, and that Christ will save those only who obey him.
- 23.** She believes in the visibility, unity, sanctity, universality, and perpetuity of the Church of God.
- 24.** She believes in the personal coming and reign of Jesus Christ.

**25.** She believes in the resurrection of the dead, “both of the just and the unjust;” that the resurrection of the just will precede the resurrection of the unjust.

**26.** She believes in the creation of new heavens and a new earth.

**27.** She believes in the immortality of the soul; in a universal and eternal judgment; and in future and everlasting rewards and punishments.

**III. Church Government.** — “In church government this body is independent and congregational; yet the members of all churches, when duly organized, are subject to the supervision of a Church Council, composed of the preachers in charge and the elders and deacons of each church, all of whom are elected by the members. In addition to the councils of each local church, they have a confederation of churches called an ‘Eldership,’ consisting of all the pastors within certain bounds, and an equal number of ruling elders as delegates. She has, in addition to her local churches or stations, larger fields of operation, called circuits. Hence her ministers are some of them stationed, and others travel on circuits, and others are missionaries at large.” The elderships meet annually. The General Eldership, which consists of delegates from Annual Elderships, is held every three years. The General Eldership owns and controls all the common property of the Church. No minister can be delegated to it who has not held a preacher’s appointment for five years previous (Gorrie, cited below).

**IV. Statistics.** — The Church has a domestic and foreign missionary society and a printing establishment, all which are under the control of the General Eldership. A weekly paper, the *Church Advocate* (in 1867, 32d volume), and a Sunday-school paper, called the *Gem* (established in 1867), are published at Lancaster, Pa. The denomination in 1889 had 11 elderships, about 475 churches, 450 ministers, and 29,683 members. See Gorrie, *Churches and Sects*; Winebrenner, *History of Religious Denominations*; *American Baptist Almanac*; *Annual American Cyclopaedia* for 1866, p. 112.

## Church Of Jesus Christ Of The Latter-Days Saints

*SEE MORMONS.*

## Church Of The Messiah,

a religious sect established in 1863, in Maine, by a person named Adams, who previously had been a Mormon elder. The founder of the sect claimed to have visions and special inspirations. Among the peculiar points of the new faith were, that its members are of the tribe of Ephraim, and that, "as the curse was now taken off from Palestine," the time had come for the lost ten tribes to return to the land of their fathers. They anticipated the re-establishment at Jerusalem of the throne of David in greater than Solomon's splendor. In expectation of the near advent of the Messiah, 156 members of the sect from the State of Maine went in 1866 to Palestine, and established a colony at Jaffa, the sea-port of Jerusalem, with one president (Adams) and two bishops as its leaders. Through the efforts of the American and English consuls in Jerusalem, they met with a kind reception on the part of the Turkish pacha and the people of Jaffa. Land had been secured for them before their arrival, through the American vice-consul at Jaffa. The colonists built quite a number of houses and a three-story hotel, having brought the lumber all the way from Maine. Complaints made by the colonists of the hardships they were forced to endure induced the government of the United States to send, at the beginning of 1867, an agent (the Rev. Dr. Bidwell, of New York) to Jaffa, in order to make a thorough examination into the affairs and prospects of the colony. In the course of the year 1867, a considerable number of the colonists became dissatisfied with their condition and the rule of president Adams, and returned home. The remainder have gradually dispersed.

## Church Of Rome

*SEE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH.*

## Church Of Scotland

*SEE SCOTLAND; SEE SCOTLAND, FREE CHURCH OF.*

## Church Polity

*SEE ECCLESIASTICAL POLITY.*

## Church, Presbyterian

*SEE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH.*

## Church, Protestant Episcopal

SEE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH.

## Church, Reformed

SEE REFORMED CHURCH.

## Church, Reformed Presbyterian

SEE PRESBYTERIAN (REFORMED) CHURCH.

## Church, States Of The

(*Patrimonium Petri*), the territory governed by the Pope as secular prince.

**I. History** — The Church of Rome, which became at an early date one of the chief Christian churches of the world, received in 321, by a special edict of the emperor Constantine, the right to accept legacies. The story, however, that Constantine presented bishop Sylvester and the Roman Church with the city of Rome and other territories is an invention, and the pretended document of donation is a late forgery, taken from the so-called *Constitutum Sylvestri*, which was compiled from the *Gesta beati Sylvestri* (see Minch [Romans Cath.], *Ueber die erdichtete Schenkung Constantin des Grossen*, Freiburg, 1824; Biener, *de donatione a Constantino M. imperatore in Sylvestrum pontificem collata*, in his work *de collectionibus canonum ecclesias Graecoe*, Berlin, 1827). Under the later emperors, a large amount of property of every description, including many landed estates in various parts of Italy and France, was presented to the Roman Church; and, moreover, the emperors conferred upon the bishops of Rome many lucrative privileges, as Gratian upon Damasus in 378, Valentinian upon Leo the Great in 445, etc. The ecclesiastical prerogatives which the popes claimed as heads of the Church, and which were gradually conceded by the emperors and acquiesced in by the bishops, greatly enlarged the secular power and wealth of the popes. Under Gregory I the landed property belonging to the Roman Church was very extensive, especially in Sicily and Gaul. But until the eighth century the Roman bishops held all this landed property subject to the sovereign authority of the emperors. The first independent possession of the popes was the town of Sutri, which Gregory II, in 728, obtained from the Longobardian king Luitprand, who had wrested it, with other territories, from the Byzantine emperors. The friendly relations between the Roman See and Luitprand ceased under

Gregory III (731741), and most of the papal territory was reoccupied by the Longobardians. The pope invoked the intercession of Charles Martel, in consequence of which Luitprand, in 742, restored to Pope Zachary not only the former property of the Roman bishops, but also the four Byzantine towns of Amelia, Orta, Bomarzo, and Bieda. The pope even succeeded in disposing the king amicably toward the exarch, in reward for which he received from the Byzantine emperor two villas. King Aistulph conceived the plan of conquering and annexing all Italy, and thus forced Pope Stephen II (752757) to invoke again the aid of the Franks. Pepin, who owed his crown partly to the influence of the pope, twice (754 and 755) undertook a campaign into Italy, declined the demand of the Byzantine emperor to restore to him his former Italian possessions, gave to the pope, in addition to his former possessions, the Exarchate and the Pentapolis (the five cities of Rimini, Pesaro, Fano, Sinigaglia, and Ancona), and assumed himself the title of patricius (patron) of Rome. The original document of donation is no longer extant. The Longobardian king Desiderius found means to put off the complete execution of the stipulations made by Pepin, and ultimately new hostilities broke out, which induced Adrian I to invoke the aid of Charlemagne, who in 744 put an end to the Longobardian kingdom, and enlarged the donations of his fathers. As the original deeds of these donations are lost, their extent can no longer be fixed with entire accuracy. The extant document in which Louis le Debonnaire sanctions the donations of Charlemagne is a forgery. In consequence of the coronation of Charlemagne as emperor by Leo III, in 800, the connection of the pope with the Eastern empire entirely ceased, and the papal documents were henceforth dated after the beginning of the reign of the new emperor. The king of the Franks, as Roman emperor, had thus become the real sovereign of Rome, who had to sanction the election of a pope. The temporal power of the popes rapidly increased under the weak Carolingians, after whose extinction (888) the imperial dignity was, until 923, conferred upon Italian grandees, and subsequently was for some time discontinued altogether. When Otto I, in 952, reassumed the dignity of Roman emperor, he at once confirmed the papal possessions (the original document is lost, but a copy somewhat modified in the eleventh century is extant). A document containing a donation from Otto III to Sylvester II is a forgery, and there are no other reasons for the existence of that pretended donation. In 1052 the Roman See obtained feudal right over Benevento. The countess Matilda of Tuscany promised to the pope to bequeath to him her extensive territory; but on her death the property became the subject of a violent and

protracted dispute, and the claims of the popes were not recognized until 1201, by Otto IV. In the agreement between Otto and the pope the following territory was designated as papal possessions: the country from the defiles of Ceperano (on the frontier of Naples), as far as the fort of Radicofano (on the Tuscan frontier), the exarchate of Ravenna, the Pentapolis (see above), the Marches, the duchy of Spoleto, the possessions of the countess Matilda, the county of Brittenorium, with other adjacent lands expressly mentioned in the documents of the emperors from the times of Louis (which latter clauses recognized the contents of a number of spurious documents). Otto IV also promised to *deo* fend the claims of the pope to the kingdom of Sicily. Thus the States of the Church were firmly established, and as, since 1059, the election of the pope had been independent of the emperor, the high political position of the popes in the Christian world was confirmed.

During the following centuries the popes were more intent upon preserving than upon enlarging their possessions. In 1273, Philip III presented to Gregory X the county of Venaissin, and in 1348 Clement VI purchased Avignon from Joanna, queen of Sicily and countess of Provence. During the residence of the popes at Avignon, and during the schism, the popes had to concede extensive privileges to various cities. Other parts were given as fiefs to Italian princes: thus, in 1443, Alphonso I of Naples was made papal vicar of Benevento and Terracina; but Nicholas V (1447-1455), Pius II (1458-1464), and Sixtus IV (1471-1484) reconsolidated the papal possessions. Julius II (1503-1512) reconquered from the Venetians all the places which had formerly belonged to the pope, and even added to his territory Parma, Piacenza, and Reggio, thus giving to the States of the Church the most extensive frontier they have ever had. Parma and Piacenza were soon lost again, but in their place Camerino and Nepi were obtained. Reggio had to be abandoned in 1523, and Modena in 1527; but, on the other hand, a number of republican communities were fully subjected, as Ancona in 1532, Perugia in 1540, and the feudal relations of others, as Ferrara (1598), Urbino (1636), and the duchy of Castro (the dispute concerning which lasted until 1735), were abolished. About fifty years later the States of the Church entered into a period of rapid decline. In 1783 the government of Naples declared the feudal relation in which that kingdom had stood to Rome as terminated. In 1792 Avignon and Venaissin were annexed to France, and in 1796 another considerable tract of territory was lost. At the peace of Tolentino, Feb. 19, 1797, Pius VI had to cede all the

papal possessions situate in France, and to agree that the districts of Ferrara, Bologna, and Romagna should be incorporated with the new Transpadan Republic. On the 15th of February the republic was proclaimed in the city of Rome, the papal government was declared abolished, and the pope himself was carried into captivity. The treaty of Vienna, in 1815, restored to the pope the Marches, with Camerino, the duchy of Benevento, with the principality of Ponte-Corvo, the legations of Ravenna, Bologna, and Ferrara; and gave to the emperor of Austria the right of garrisoning Ferrara and Comacchio. Nothing was said in the treaty of Vienna about the papal claims to Avignon and Venaissin, on which account the pope protested against the portion of the treaty relating to the States of the Church.

Certain acts of Leo XII (1824) created general indignation among the inhabitants of the papal territory. In February, 1831, an insurrection broke out in Bologna, which soon spread through the whole province, and from there through the larger portion of the States of the Church. A provisional government was established, and on the 26th of February an assembly of deputies declared the abolition of the temporal power of the popes. The intervention of Austria put, however, an end to the insurrection. The representatives of the great powers found the civil administration so unsatisfactory that they urgently recommended the introduction of reforms. As these were not granted, a new insurrection occurred, which caused another intervention of Austria, and the occupation of Bologna by Austrian troops. This was at once followed by an occupation of Ancona by France, which was unwilling to leave the pope under the sole patronage of Austria. Both occupations lasted until 1838. Gregory XVI (1831-1846) convoked an assembly of deputies, in order to learn the wishes of the people, but it led to no reforms of any account. The discontent of the people continued, and showed itself in repeated revolutionary outbreaks. Pius IX (elected June 16, 1846) began to introduce important changes into the public administration (*motu proprio* of 2d and 14th of October, 1847, fundamental statute of 14th of March, 1848, etc.), and thus gave an impulse to a political movement which he soon found himself unable to control. He had to grant, on the 14th of March, 1848, a constitutional form of government, which was soon followed by the appointment of a liberal ministry (Mamiani) and the convocation of a Constituent Assembly. An attempt to curb the liberal movement by the appointment of a conservative ministry (Count Rossi) failed, and the pope was compelled to consent to



the appointment of a democratic ministry. On the 25th of November the pope fled from Rome in disguise, and took up his residence at Gaeta, in the kingdom of Naples. In consequence of this movement a provisional government was established at Rome, which declared the temporal power abolished, and proclaimed the republic (February, 1849). This led to a new intervention of Austria (after the defeat of Sardinia) in the legations, and to the landing in the Papal States of a French army, under Oudinot, in April, 1849. The city of Rome surrendered on the 2d of July, the papal rule was restored, and all the reforms of the first years of the reign of Pius were abolished. The political and financial condition of the States of the Church after the restoration of the pope was most deplorable, and the people continued to be dissatisfied with the papal rule. When, in 1859, in consequence of their defeat at Magenta, the Austrians had to withdraw their troops from Central Italy, Bologna and the neighboring legations (the Romagna) at once shook off the papal rule, and, together with Parma and Modena, organized them, under the name of Emilia, into a provisional state under the dictatorship of Farini. After the treaty of Zurich (Nov. 10, 1859), Austria and France proposed the convocation of a congress for the regulation of the Italian affairs, but the pope refused to take part in it, as the great powers did not agree to guarantee to him the restoration of the Romagna. Victor Emmanuel consequently, by a decree of the 18th of March, 1860, after a popular vote had declared in favor of annexation, incorporated the Romagna with the kingdom of Italy. The papal government now tried to organize a powerful army, chiefly of foreign volunteers, under the French general Lamoriciere. When, after the conquest of Naples by Garibaldi, a part of the old Neapolitan army had been united with the papal troops, the Italian government demanded the discharge of the foreign volunteers as menacing the unity of Italy, and, when the papal government refused to comply with this request, the king marched troops into the papal territory, defeated the papal troops at Castelfidardo on the 18th of September, and captured the remainder at Ancona. Umbria and the Marches now declared at once in favor of annexation, and, a popular vote having been taken, were incorporated with Italy by decree of the 17th of December. As, after the fall of Gaeta, Rome became the refuge of the expelled king of Naples, and the center of all plots against Italian unity, the Italian Party of Action loudly demanded the conquest of Rome, and in March, 1861, even the Italian Parliament declared the city of Rome the natural and indispensable capital of the kingdom. Attempts made by the Italian prime minister Cavour to prevail

upon the pope to consent to a separation between his temporal and ecclesiastical power failed; and the same was the case with a proposition of Louis Napoleon to bring about a reconciliation between the Italian and the Roman governments on the basis of the existing extent of the papal territory. In 1862, Garibaldi made an attempt, at the head of an army of volunteers, to conquer Rome, and deliver Italy both from the rule of the pope and that of the French, but this movement was promptly suppressed by the Italian government. On the 15th of September, 1864, France concluded with the government of Italy a convention, by which France promised to withdraw its army of occupation from Rome within two years, while Italy, on the other hand, promised not to attack the papal territory, and even to protect it against any foreign attacks, to assume a proportional part of the papal debt, and not to oppose the organization of a papal army, provided the latter should not threaten the safety of Italy. In accordance with the provisions of this convention, the city of Rome and the papal territory were evacuated by the French troops in December, 1866. The pope has, up to this time, persistently declined all proposals to abandon his claims to the provinces which have been incorporated with the kingdom of Italy, and still more to renounce the temporal power altogether. *SEE TEMPORAL POWER.*

**II. Ecclesiastical Statistics.** — The Papal States had in 1853 an area of 17,494 square miles, and, according to the census, a population of 3,124,668 souls, among whom were 9237 Israelites and 263 Protestants, while the rest were Roman Catholics. They had nine archbishoprics, viz., Rome (whose metropolitane is the pope himself, represented through a cardinal vicar), Benevento, Fermo, Ferrara, Ravenna, Urbino, Bologna, Camerino, Spoleto—the last three without suffragans. The number of bishoprics was seventy-nine, of which, however, many had been permanently united, so that the actual number of bishops amounted only to fifty-eight. All the eight archbishoprics and most of the bishoprics lie in the provinces which in 1859 were annexed to Sardinia. The States of the Church, thus reduced, had in 1867 about 700,000 inhabitants. The city of Rome had, in 1866, 210,701 inhabitants, among whom were 4567 Israelites and 429 Protestants. Convents are very numerous. There were, in 1845, 1824 convents of monks and 612 of nuns. The secular clergy were estimated at 35,000, monks 10,000, nuns 8000. The former belong to 50, the latter to 21 different orders. The total number of clerical persons in the city of Rome was (in 1866) 7378. The superiors of most of the orders

reside in Rome. *SEE MONACHISM*. As the seat of the central government of the Roman Catholic Church, the States of the Church (more particularly Rome) have a number of ecclesiastical offices and boards, which are treated of in separate articles. *SEE POPE; SEE CARDINAL; SEE CONGREGATION; SEE CURIA ROMANA*. See Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 7, 676 sq.; Wetzler und Welte, *Kirchen-Lexikon*, 6:175; Sugenheim (Protest.), *Geschichte der Entstehung und Ausbildung des' Kirchenstaats* (Leipzig, 1854); Scharpff (Roman Catholic), *Entstehung des Kirchenstaats* (1854; transl. Baltimore, 1860); Dollinger (Romans Cath.), *The Church and Churches* (Munich, 1861; transl. 1863); Brockhaus, *Conversations-Lexikon*, 8 (11th edition, 1866), 823 sq. *SEE ITALY*.

### Church, United Presbyterian

*SEE PRESBYTERIAN (UNITED) CHURCH.*

### Church-Wardens,

officers in the Church of England, whose business is to look to the church, church-yard, and to observe the behavior of the parishioners; to levy a shilling forfeiture on all such as do not go to church on Sundays, and to keep persons orderly in church time, etc. By Canon 89, church-wardens or questmen in every parish are required to be chosen by the joint consent of the minister and the parishioners, if it may be; but if they cannot agree upon such a choice, then the minister shall choose one and the parishioners another, and without such a joint or several choice none shall take upon them to be church-wardens. But if the parish is entitled by custom to choose both church-wardens, then the parson is restrained of his right under this canon. The duties of English church-wardens are laid down in Prideaux, *Practical Guide to the Duties of Church-wardens* (10th ed. Lond. 1835, 12mo). In the Protestant Episcopal Church in America, their duties in general are to protect the church building, to see that worship is duly provided for and performed, and to represent the body of the parish when occasion may require. They are chosen, with the vestrymen, “annually in Easter-week, according to the canons of the various dioceses.” Their duties are enjoined by diocesan, not by general canons. — Hook, *Church Dictionary*, s.v.; Staunton, *Ecclesiastical Dictionary*, s.v.

## Church-Yard,

a piece of ground adjoining a church, set apart for the interment of the dead. During the first three centuries of our aera the Christians followed the law of pagan Rome, according to which every one could select his burying-place outside of the towns. The Christians generally preferred to be buried near the graves of the martyrs, and thus they early obtained common burying, or, as they called them, sleeping-places (*cameteria, dormitoria*), which were sometimes above the ground (area), and sometimes in subterranean caves. *SEE CATACOMBS*. When the persecution of Christianity ceased, and the relics of the martyrs were transferred to the churches within the towns, the places around the churches, or the vestibules of the churches, were commonly selected for burying the dead; for a burial in the church itself was strictly forbidden, and only granted as a special distinction to bishops, princes, and other persons of high ecclesiastical or political position. Thus gradually the churchyards became an established institution in connection with the church. In large cities every particular church had its church-yard, and not until the 14th century are the church-yards to be found without the town. Gradually it became general to close the church-yards in the towns, and to remove them out of the towns, until ultimately the governments of most of the states enforced this rule from sanitary reasons.

In the Church of Rome, church-yards are consecrated with great solemnity. If a church-yard which has been thus consecrated shall afterwards be polluted by any indecent action, or profaned by the burial of an infidel, a heretic, an excommunicated or unbaptized person, it must be *reconciled*; and the ceremony of the reconciliation is performed with the same solemnity as that of the consecration! (Buck). *SEE CONSECRATION*.

In the Protestant churches of Germany and other countries, church-yards were set apart by praying and reading of the Scriptures; in England and Sweden a formal consecration is still in use.

In England the church-yard is the freehold of the parson; but it is the common burial-place of the dead, and for that reason it is to be fenced at the- charge of the parishioners, unless there is a custom to the contrary, or for a particular person to do it, in respect of his lands adjoining to the church-yards; and that must be tried at common law (Hook). *SEE BURIAL; SEE CEMETERY*.

The control of the church-yards has given rise to many conflicts between Church and State. The Church of Rome forbids the burial of heretics, suicides, excommunicated persons, and unbaptized children upon the Roman Catholic cemetery; while the state governments, both Protestant and Roman Catholic, regarding the cemetery as public and not ecclesiastical property, have frequently endeavored to compel the burying of all dead without distinction in the same cemetery. In the United States the government does not meddle with the places and modes of burial, and religious bodies, as well as single congregations and individuals, can make any provisions they please for the burial of their dead. — Wetzler u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* 6:201; Herzog, *Real-Encyclop.* 7:706.

### Church-Year.

Neither the New Testament nor the Church literature of the first three centuries contain any intimation that the Christians of that time viewed the year from any other stand-point than that of subjects of the Roman emperor or other princes. *SEE CALENDAR; SEE CHRONOLOGY, CHRISTIAN.* The first impulse to the idea of a church year distinct from the civil year was given by the establishment of anniversaries of prominent events in the life of Christ. The most ancient of these anniversaries were those of his death and resurrection, *SEE EASTER*; gradually were added to them those of his birth, *SEE CHRISTMAS*, of the outpouring of the Holy Ghost, *SEE PENTECOST*, of the circumcision, *SEE EPIPHANY*, of the ascension, *SEE ASCENSION DAY*. Christmas, Easter, and Pentecost came each to be regarded as the center of a cycle, the three cycles together embracing a commemoration of every thing memorable in the life of the Redeemer. When the worship of the Virgin Mary and of the saints was developed in the Church of Rome, a number of festivals commemorating events in the life of the Virgin Mary, and the death-days of the apostles, martyrs, and saints, were added to the ecclesiastical calendar. This combination suggested to the writers of the Church the idea that the church-year is to celebrate, within the compass of a civil year, the commemoration of all the memorable events in the life of the Church, from the birth of, or, rather, the announcement of the birth of Christ to the death of the last saint. The habit of beginning this year with the first Sunday of Advent is first found among the Nestorians, and was only gradually adopted by the Church of Rome. There are, in all, four Sundays of Advent, intended to prepare the mind for the proper celebration of Christmas (25th of December). Christmas, like Epiphany, Easter, Ascension, and Pentecost,

were each followed by an “octave” (commemorative services referring to the great festival during eight days, the chief festival itself being counted in), the Sunday immediately following the festival being denominated the Sunday “within the octave.” The Sundays following the “Sunday within the octave of Epiphany” were called the “second, etc., Sunday after Epiphany,” until the Sunday Septuagesima began the Easter cycle. It was followed by the Sundays Sexagesima, Quinquagesima, four Sundays of Lent, Palm Sunday, and Easter Sunday; Sunday within the octave of Easter (“Low Sunday”), second, third, etc., Sundays after Easter, until the Sunday within the octave of Ascension forms the boundary-line between the Easter and the Pentecost cycles. Whitsunday (Pentecost) opens the Pentecost cycle; and the following Sundays are called the first (festival of the “most Holy Trinity”), second, etc., Sunday after Pentecost. They run on until the close of the church-year, when the recurrence of the first Sunday of Advent opens the new year. The last festival which Rome added to her church-year was that of *Corpus Christi* (q.v.), to be an annual celebration of the doctrine of transubstantiation. According to the importance attributed to the several festivals, the Church of Rome makes the distinction of “simple,” “semi-double,” and “double” festivals; the latter being again subdivided into “double second class” and “double first class” (the highest festivals). The Church books, as Missal and Breviary, have special services for each particular festival, and for each class of festivals. *SEE BREVIARY AND MISSAL*. Roman Catholic writers have often dwelt on a mysterious correspondence between the seasons of the church-year and those of the natural year (Christmas, the appearance of Christ in the lost world in winter, when nature appears to be dead; Easter, in spring, when nature seems to revive; Pentecost, in summer, when every thing is in highest bloom), entirely forgetting that this correspondence holds good only of the northern hemisphere. Other writers have more reasonably traced in this correspondence an influence of pagan festivals, in which this kind of correspondence can be traced to a very large extent, upon the doctrines and institutions of the Church of Rome; but although in some instances the influence is undeniable, it is difficult to say how far it extended. The chief features of the church-year were fully developed when the separation between the Latin and Greek churches took place, and there is, therefore, but little difference in the church-year of the two churches. The Greeks begin their year on the 1st of September, and have, of course, none of the saints of the Roman Church who either lived or were canonized after the

separation, while the Latins do not recognize the few saints which the Greek Church has added to the catalogue of the ancient saints.

Luther and the Lutheran Church retained, on the whole, the Roman Catholic idea of the church-year. They rejected the Corpus Christi festival and the days of the saints, but retained most of the festivals of Mary as being based upon events mentioned in the Bible, and the celebration of the days of the apostles and the angels. In the conflict between High-Church and Low-Church Lutherans in the 19th century, the former party strongly insisted upon retaining every thing to which Luther and the other fathers of the Lutheran Church had not objected, and some leading men of the school even showed a disposition to strain every thing in common between the early Lutheran and the Roman Catholic churches as far as their membership in the Lutheran Church would possibly admit. This tendency shows itself also with regard to Church festivals and the idea of a church-year. The Reformed churches desired to return to the form of divine worship as it existed in the primitive service, and therefore showed a tendency to reject the whole idea of a church-year. In Geneva, at the time of Calvin, only the Sunday was celebrated, and the same habit prevailed in most of the Reformed churches of Switzerland. In Germany the opposition of the Reformed to the church-year was not so thorough. In modern times the celebration of Good Friday has been introduced into most of the Reformed churches (in Geneva since 1820). In the Church of England, the High-Church party retained much more of the Latin church-year than was done by the Lutherans; and in modern times efforts have even been made to conform the Anglican church-year in almost every particular to that of the Church of Rome. The Dissenting churches of England and the Protestant churches of the United States have generally rejected the idea of a church-year, with its system of peculiar festivals. Easter and Good Friday, however, are celebrated by church services in many of the Dutch and German Reformed and Methodist churches, and some others; and in the German Reformed Church the idea of a church-year, as it was developed in the Latin Church of the Middle Ages, has found many defenders. See Herzog, *Real-Encyklopadie*, 7:643 sq.; Wetzler u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lexikon*, 6:161 sq. The most important Roman Catholic works on the church-year are Gretser, *De Festis Christianorum*; Benedict XIV, *De Festis*; Staudenmaier, *Geist des Christenthums*; Nickel, *Die hist. Zeiten*; Binterim, *Denkwürdigkeiten*. Protestant works: Strauss, *Das evangel.*

*Kirchenjahr* (Berlin, 1850); Bobertag, *Das evangel. Kirchenjahr* (Breslau, 1853).

### Church, John Hubbard D.D.,

a Congregational minister, was born at Rutland, Mass., March 17, 1772. He graduated at Harvard 1797, and was installed pastor in Pelham, N. H., Oct. 31, 1798. He died in June, 1840. Dr. Church was trustee of Dartmouth College, President of N. H. Bible Society, and filled several other honorable stations. He published a number of occasional sermons. — Sprague, *Annals*, 2:445.

### Church, Thomas D.D.,

a divine of the Church of England, was born 1707, and educated at Brazenose College, Oxford. In 1740 he was made vicar of Battersea, and afterwards prebend of St. Paul's. He died in 1756. Among his publications are, *Essay on the Demeniacs of N.T.* (Lond. 1737, 8vo); *Doctrine of the Church of England on Regeneration* (Lond. 1739, 8vo); *Vindication of the miraculous Powers of the Church in the first three Centuries* (answer to Middleton [Lond. 1750, 8vo]). He wrote also several tracts against Wesley and the Methodists, notices of which may be found in Wesley's *Journals* (*Works*, 5:265, 6:145).

### Churching Of Women

a form of *public thanksgiving* for women after *child-birth*, used in the Greek and Roman churches, in the Church of England, and in the Protestant Episcopal Church. "It is in all probability of Jewish origin, and derived from the rite of purification enjoined in the twelfth chapter of Leviticus. The rubric [of the English Church] commands that the office be used only in the church. Churching in private houses is inconsistent with the very name of the office, and with the devotions prescribed by the office." The Roman Catholic Church allows, in exceptional cases, churching in private houses, and the churching of mothers of illegitimate children. Eden, *Churchman's Dictionary*, s.v.; Procter *On Common Prayer*, p. 427; Brownell, *Comm. on Prayer-book*, p. 490; Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lexikon*, 1:552 (s.v. *Aussegnung*).



## Churl

(*yl jKī kilay'*, <sup><231B></sup>Isaiah 32:5; or *yl Kəkelay'*, ver. 7), a *deceiver* (as it should have been rendered); while CHURLISH is the proper rendering (of *hVq; kasheh'*, *rough*, as often elsewhere rendered) for a coarse, ill-natured fellow (<sup><027B></sup>1 Samuel 25:3; compare 2 Maccabees 14:20; Ecclesiasticus 18:18; 42:14), like Nabal (q.v.).

## Churning

(*/ymj mits, squeezing*) signifies the act of pressing (<sup><218B></sup>Proverbs 30:33), being the same word rendered “wringing” and “forcing” in the same verse, and agrees with the Eastern mode of making butter (see Thomson, *Land and Book*, 1:393). *SEE BUTTER*.

## Churton, Ralph

a minister of the Church of England, was born near Bickley, Cheshire, Dec. 8, 1754. He was educated at Malpas Grammar-school, and at Brazenose College, Oxford, where he was entered in 1772, and became fellow in 1778. In 1785 he delivered the Bampton lecture *On the Prophecies respecting the Destruction of Jerusalem* (Oxf. 1785, 8vo). In 1792 he became rector of Middleton Cheney; in 1805 he was made archdeacon of St. David's. For forty years he labored diligently and faithfully as a parish priest, and was engaged also in frequent and useful literary labors. He died March 23, 1831. Besides the Bampton lecture, he published *Memoirs of Archdeacon Townson* (1773, 1828, 1830); *Lives of Bishop Smith and Sir Richard Sutton* (1800, 8vo); *Life of Dean Nowell* (1809, 8vo); and numerous detached sermons and pamphlets. — *Annual Biography and Obituary* (Lond. 1832), 16:273.

## Chu'shan-Rishatha'im

(Heb. *Kushan' Rishaatha'yim*, *μϋj [V]i`VRK*, Sept. *Χουσανρεσαθαίμ*, Vulg. *Chusan-Rasathaim*), the king of Mesopotamia who oppressed Israel during eight years (B.C. 1575/1567) in the generation immediately following Joshua (<sup><008B></sup>Judges 3:8). The name, if Hebrew, would signify *Cush* (comp. CUSHAN, <sup><310B></sup>Habakkuk 3:7) of the *two wickednesses*; but First (*Heb. Handwörterb.* s.v.) compares the Arabic signification, *chief of two governments* (see Abulf. *Ann.* 2, p. 100), with reference to the two-fold form of Aram-Naharaim (q.v.). Josephus (*Ant.* 5, 3, 2) calls him

“*Chusarthus* (Χούσαρθος), king of the Assyrians.” The seat of his dominion was probably the region between the Euphrates and the modern Khabour, to which the name of Mesopotamia always attached in a special way. In the early cuneiform inscriptions this country appears to be quite distinct from Assyria; it is inhabited by a people called *Nairi*, who are divided into a vast number of petty tribes, and offer but little resistance to the Assyrian armies. No centralized monarchy is found, but as none of the *Assyrian* historical inscriptions date earlier than about B.C. 1100, which is some centuries later than the time of Chushan, it is, of course, quite possible that a very different condition of things may have existed in his day. In the weak and divided state of Western Asia at this time, it was easy for a brave and skillful chief to build up rapidly a vast power, which was apt to crumble away almost as quickly. Bunsen, however, calls him merely “a Mesopotamian satrap,” assuming that he must have been posterior to the Assyrian supremacy (*Egypt*, 3. 272). Chushan-Rishathaim’s yoke was broken from the neck of the people of Israel at the end of eight years by Othniel, Caleb’s nephew (<sup><ARB></sup>Judges 3:10), and nothing more is heard of Mesopotamia as an aggressive power. The rise of the Assyrian empire, about B.C. 1270, would naturally reduce the bordering nations to insignificance (see Rawlinson, *Histor. Evidences*, p. 300). **SEE MESOPOTAMIA.**

### Chu’si

(Χουσεΐ v. r. Χούς, Vulg. omits), a place named only in Judith 7:18, as near Ekrebel, and upon the brook Mochmur. If the history be at all genuine, this was doubtless in Central Palestine, but all the names appear to be very corrupt, and are not recognizable. **SEE JUDITH.**

### Chu’za

[pron. *Cuza*] (rather *Chuzas*, Χουζάς, for Chald. *awWj* , i.e. *awWj a* } *possession*), the “steward” (ἐπιτροπος) of Herod (Antipas), whose wife Joanna (q.v.), having been cured by our Lord either of possession by an evil spirit or of a disease, became attached to that body of women who accompanied him (A.D. 27) on his journeyings (<sup><ARB></sup>Luke 8:3); and, together with Mary Magdalen and “Mary the mother of James,” having come early to the sepulcher on the morning of the resurrection (A.D. 29), to bring spices and ointments to complete the burial, brought word to the

apostles that the Lord was risen (<sup><210></sup>Luke 24:10). These circumstances would seem to imply that she was at this time a widow.

## Chytraeus, David

(properly *Kochhaffe*), one of the most eminent of the Lutheran theologians of the second half of the sixteenth century, was born at Ingelfingen, Feb. 26, 1530. Having studied the ancient languages at Tübingen, he went to Wittenberg about 1545, and became a pupil of Melancthon in theology. In 1548 he began to lecture at Wittenberg on physics, and also on theology. After an extended journey in Germany, Switzerland, and Italy, he was called in 1551 to Rostock; and his character for scholarship and wisdom gained him great influence in Mecklenburg, and also in wider spheres. He was employed by Maximilian II to arrange ecclesiastical affairs in Austria. He was principal author of the statutes of the University of Helmstadt, and was one of the authors of the *Formula of Concord* (q.v.). He died June 25, 1600. Among his writings are, *Historia Confessimoi Augustance* (Frankfort, 1578, 8vo); *De Morte et Vita Aeterna* (Rostock, 1590, 8vo). His works were collected and printed in 2 vols. folio (Leipzig, 1599; Hanover, 1604). A biography of Chytrmeus, with a selection from his works, was published by Pressel in the 8th vol. of the work, *Leben u. ausgewdhlte Schriften der Vdter der luth. Kirche* (Elberfeld, 1863). See Schutzins, *De Vita D. Clhytrcei* (Hamburg, 1720-28, prefixed to the writings of Chytraeus, 3 vols. 8vo); Melchior Adam, *Vita Theologorum* (Francfort, 1705), p. 323; Herzog, *Real-Encyklopadie*, 2:701.

## Ciborium

(κιβώριον, *a cup*), a large chalice (a species of pyx, q.v.) or cup, often of gold or silver, with a cover, surmounted commonly by a cross. It is used to contain the host, or consecrated wafer, in the mass. The name *ciborium* was also given to a canopy on the altar, supported by four columns, to which the cup, in the shape of a dove, was attached by chains, containing the wafer for the communion of the sick. Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lexikon*, 2:545.

## Ciccar

(<sup>rKKj</sup>*kikkar*’, *circuit*, esp. of the Jordan)

*SEE TOPOGRAPHICAL TERMS; SEE TALENT.*

## Cieling

SEE CEILING.

## Cili'cia

(Κιλικία; on the deriv., see below), a maritime province in the south-eastern part of Asia Minor, bounded on the west by Pamphylia; separated on the north from Cappadocia by the Taurus range, and on the east by Amanus from Syria; and having the Gulf of Issus (Iskenderoon) and the Cilician Sea (~~44215~~Acts 27:5) on the south. These lofty mountain barriers can be surmounted only by a few difficult passes, the latter by the Portae Amanides, at the head of the valley of the Pinarus, the former by the Portae Ciliciae, near the sources of the Cydnus; towards the south, however, an outlet was afforded between the Sinus Issicus and the spurs of Amanus for a road, which afterwards crossed the Portne Syriae in the direction of Antioch (hence the close connection which existed between Syria and Cilicia. as indicated in ~~44523~~Acts 15:23, 41; ~~48021~~Galatians 1:21). The sea-coast is rock-bound in the west, low and shelving in the east; the chief rivers — Sarus, Cydnus, and Calycadnus — were inaccessible to vessels of any size from sand-bars formed at their mouths. By the ancients the eastern part was called *Cilicia Propria* (ἡ ἰδίως Κιλικία, Ptolemy), or the *level* Cilicia (ἡ πεδιάς, Strabo); and the western, the *rough* (1 τραχεῖα, Strabo, 14:5), or *mountainous* (ἡ ὄρεινή, Herod. 2:34). The former was well-watered, and abounded in various kinds of grains and fruits (Xenoph. *Anab.* 1:2, § 22; Ammianus Marcell. 14:8, § 1). The chief towns in this division were *Issus* (Xenoph. *Anab.* 1, 4), at the south-eastern extremity, celebrated for the victory of Alexander over Darius Codomanus (B.C. 333), and not far from the passes of Amanus (τῶν Ἀμανίδων λεγομένων Πυλῶν, Polyb. 12:8); *Sole*, originally a colony of Argives and Rhodians, the birthplace of Menander, the comic poet (B.C. 262), the Stoic philosopher Chrysippus (B.C. 206), and of Aratus (q.v.), author of the astronomical poem τὰ Φαινόμενα (B.C. 270); and *Tarsus*, the birthplace of the apostle Paul (q.v.). Cilicia Trachea furnished an inexhaustible supply of cedars and firs for shipbuilding; it was also noted for a species of goat (Martial, 14:138), of whose skins cloaks and tents were manufactured. Its breed of horses was so superior, that 360 (one for each day of the year) formed part of the annual tribute to the king of Persia (Herod. 3. 90). The neighborhood of Corycus produced large quantities of saffron (Pliny *Nat. Hist.* 21:17). Josephusi identified Cilicia with the *Tarshish* of ~~01104~~Genesis

10:4 (*Ant.* 1:6, 1). Herodotus says that the first inhabitants of the country were called *Hypachcei* (Υπαχαιοι); and derives the name of Cilicia from *Cilix* son of Agenor, a Phoenician settler (7, 91). This is confirmed by Phoenician inscriptions, on which the name is written *Chalak* (𐤉𐤋𐤊), Gesenius, *Monum. Phoen.* p. 279). Herodotus also states that the Cilicians and Lycians were the only nations within the Halys who were not conquered by Croesus (1, 28). Though partially subjected to the Assyrians, Medes, Persians, Syrians, and Romans, the Eleuthero — (or free) Cilicians, as the inhabitants of the mountainous districts were called, were governed by their own kings (“Reguli,” Tacit. 2:78), till the time of Vespasian. The seacoast was for a long time occupied by pirates, who carried on the appropriate vocation of slave-merchants, and found ample encouragement for that nefarious traffic among the opulent Romans (Mannert, *Geogr.* 6:1; Strabo, 14:5); but at last their depredations became so formidable that Pompey was invested with extraordinary powers for their suppression, which he accomplished in forty days. He settled the surviving freebooters at Solae, which he rebuilt and named Pompeiopolis. Cicero was proconsul of Cilicia (B.C. 52), and gained some successes over the mountaineers of Amanus, for which he was rewarded with a triumph (*Epist. ad Fam.* 15:3). As the more level portion was remarkable for its beauty and fertility, as well as for its luxurious climate, it became a favorite residence of the Greeks after its incorporation into the Macedonian empire, and its capital, Tarsus (q.v.), was elevated into the seat of a celebrated school of philosophy. The connection between the Jews and Cilicia dates from the time when it became part of the Syrian kingdom (see 1 Maccabees 11:14; 2 Maccabees 4:36; comp. Judith 1:7, 12; 2:21, 25). Antiochus the Great is said to have introduced 2000 families of the Jews into Asia Minor (Josephus, *Ant.* 12:3, 4), many of whom probably settled in Cilicia (Philo, *De legat. ad Caiurum*, 30). In the apostolic age they were still there in considerable numbers (Acts 6:9). Cilician mercenaries, probably from Trachea, served in the body-guard of Alexander Jannaeus (Joseph. *Ant.* 13:13, 5; *War*, 1:4, 3). The synagogue of “them at Cilicia” (Acts 6:9) was a place of Jewish worship in Jerusalem, appropriated to the use of the Jews who might be at Jerusalem from the province of Cilicia. **SEE SYNAGOGUE.** Cilicia was, from its geographical position, the high road between Syria and the West, and it was also the native country of Paul; it was visited by him, first, soon after his conversion (Galatians 1:21; Acts 9:30), on which occasion he probably founded the Church there (Neander, *Planting and Training*, 1:114; Conybeare and Howson, *St.*

*Paul*, 1:17-25, 249), and again in his second apostolical journey, when he entered it on the side of Syria, and crossed Anti-Taurus by the Pylae Ciliciae into Lycaonia (<sup><4154></sup>Acts 15:41). Christianity continued to flourish here until the 8th century, when the country fell into the hands of the Saracens, by whom, and by their successors the Turks, the light of true religion has been almost extinguished. According to the modern Turkish divisions of Asia Minor, Cilicia Proper belongs to the pashalic of Adana, and Cilicia Trachea to the Liwah of Itchil in the Mousselimlik of Cyprus (see *Penny Cyclopaedia*, s.v.; Smith, *Dict. of Class. Geogr.* s.v.; Vict. Langlois, *Voyage dans la Cilicee*, Par. 1861). **SEE ASIA MINOR.**

## Cimeliarch

**SEE CEIMELIARCHAE; SEE SACRISTAN.**

## Cinnamon

### Picture for Cinnamon 1

### Picture for Cinnamon 2

(<sup>^</sup>/mNqi; Gr. κινόμων; a word, according to Herodotus [3, 111], of Phoenician origin; according to Gesenius [*Thes. Heb.* p. 1223], from <sup>^</sup>Wq, to *stand* upright) occurs first in <sup><0232></sup>Exodus 30:23, where it is enumerated as one of the ingredients employed in the preparation of the holy anointing oil: "Take thou also unto thee powerful spices, myrrh, and of sweet *cinnamon* half as much (i.e. 250 shekels), together with sweet calamus and cassia." It is next mentioned in <sup><1077></sup>Proverbs 7:17: "I have perfumed my bed with myrrh, aloes, and *cinnamon*." Again, in Song of Solomon 14: "Spikenard and saffron, calamus and *cinnamon*, with all trees of frankincense; myrrh and aloes, with all the chief spices." In <sup><0383></sup>Revelation 18:13, among the merchandise of Babylon (Rome), we have "*cinnamon*, and odors, and ointments, and frankincense." Also in Ecclesiasticus 24:15, "I gave a sweet smell, like *cinnamon* and aspalathus." Cinnamon was probably an article of commerce in ancient Babylon. The Hebrews received this Indian production through the Midianites and Nabathaeans, who brought it from the Arabian Gulf. It seems that the Arabians at an early period had commercial intercourse with Ceylon and Continental India, as they were the first navigators of the Indian Ocean (<sup><0375></sup>Genesis 37:25). Many writers have doubted whether the *kinnamon* of the Hebrews is the same article that we now call cinnamon. Celsius quotes R. Ben-Melech (*ad*

~~(201)~~ *Song of Solomon* 3:14) and Saadias (~~(201)~~ *Exodus* 30) as considering it the *Lign Aloe*, or *Agallochum*. Others have doubted whether our cinnamon was at all known to the ancients. But the same thing has been said of almost every other drug which is noticed by them. The word κιννάμωμον occurs in many of the Greek authors, as Herodotus, Hippocrates, Theophrastus, Dioscorides, Galen, etc. The first of these, writing 400 years before the Christian aera, describes Arabia as the last inhabited country towards the south, and as the only region of the earth which produces frankincense, myrrh, cinnamon, cassia, and ledanum (3, 107). He states, moreover, that the Arabians were unacquainted with the particular spot in which it was produced, but that some asserted it grew in the region where Bacchus was educated. From all this we can only infer that it was the production of a distant country, probably India, and that it was obtained by the route of the Red Sea. Theophrastus (9, 5) gives a fuller but still fabulous account of its production; and it is not until the time of Dioscorides, Galen, and the *Periplus of the Erythrean Sea*, that we get more definite information. Galen says that cassia and cinnamon are so much alike that it is not an easy matter to distinguish the one from the other. Cinnamon of the best quality is imported in the present day from Ceylon, and also from the Malabar coast, in consequence of the cinnamon plant (*Cinnamomum Zeylanicum*) having been introduced there from Ceylon. An inferior kind is also exported from the peninsula of India, the produce of other species of *cinnamomum*, according to Dr. Wight. From these countries the cinnamon and cassia of the ancients must most likely have been obtained, though both are also produced in the islands of Sumatra and Borneo, in China, and in Cochin China. Cinnamon is imported in bales and chests, the bundles weighing about 1 lb. each. The pieces consist of compound quills, are about three feet long, slender, and inclose within them several smaller quills. These are thin, smooth, of a brownish color, of a warm, sweetish, and agreeable taste, and fragrant odor; but several kinds are known in modern markets, as they were in ancient times. In Ceylon cinnamon is carefully cultivated, the best cinnamon-gardens being on the south-western coast, where the soil is light and sandy, and the atmosphere moist from the prevalent southern winds. This little tree belongs to the laurel family, and the leaf is not unlike the laurel, though of a lighter green. The white blossom comes out with great profusion, and for many miles around Colombo brightens all the landscape in its season, although it diffuses hardly any perceptible odor through the air. The tree is about twenty feet in height, and spreads into numerous branches; the fruit

or nut is about the size of a damson, and when ripe is of a black color. The plants begin to yield cinnamon when about six or seven years old, after which the shoots may be cut every three or four years. The best kinds of cinnamon are obtained from twigs and shoots; those less than half an inch, or more than two or three inches in diameter, are not peeled. "The peeling is effected by making two opposite, or, when the branch is thick, three or four longitudinal incisions, and then elevating the bark by introducing the peeling-knife beneath it. In twenty-four hours the epidermis and greenish pulpy matter are carefully scraped off. In a few hours the smaller quills are introduced into the larger ones, and in this way congeries of quills are formed, often measuring forty inches in length. The bark is then dried in the sun, and afterwards made into bundles, with pieces of split bamboo twigs" (Percival's *Account of Ceylon*, p. 336-351). Besides cinnamon, an oil of cinnamon is obtained in Ceylon, by macerating the coarser pieces of the bark, after being reduced to a coarse powder, in sea-water for two days, when both are submitted to distillation. A fatty substance is also obtained by bruising and boiling the riper fruit, when an oily body floats on the surface, which, on cooling, concretes into a dirty-whitish, rather hard, fatty matter. As this oil burns with a delightful fragrance, when receiving ambassadors and on high state occasions, the kings of Candy used to have lamps of it burning in their audience-chamber. The wood itself is pervaded by the same grateful perfume, and walking-sticks of cinnamon-wood are highly prized, as well as little articles of cabinet-work. Some camphor may be procured from the roots. Cassia bark, as we have seen, was distinguished with difficulty from cinnamon by the ancients. In the present day it is often sold for cinnamon; indeed, unless a purchaser specify *true* cinnamon, he will probably be supplied with nothing but cassia. It is made up into similar bundles with cinnamon, has the same general appearance, smell, and taste; but its substance is thicker and coarser, its color darker, its flavor much less sweet and fine than that of Ceylon cinnamon, while it is more pungent, and is followed by a bitter taste; it is also less closely quilled, and breaks shorter than genuine cinnamon. Its decoction gives a blue color when treated with tincture of iodine which the true cinnamon does not. "The great consumers of cinnamon are the chocolate-makers of Spain, Italy, France, and Mexico, and by them the difference in the flavor between cinnamon and cassia is readily detected. An extensive dealer in cinnamon informs me that the Germans, Turks, and Russians prefer cassia, and will not purchase cinnamon, the delicate flavor of which is not strong enough for them. In illustration of this, I was told that some cinnamon



(valued at 3s. 6d. per lb.), having been by mistake sent to Constantinople, was unsalable there at any price, while *cassia lignea* (worth about 6d per lb.) was in great request" (Pereira's *Materia Medica*, p. 1306). From the various sources, independently of the different qualities, it is evident, as in the case of cinnamon, that the ancients might have been, as no doubt they were, acquainted with several varieties of cassia. These, we have no doubt, are yielded by more than one species. Besides cassia bark, there is also a cassia oil and cassia buds, supposed to be produced by the same tree. There can be no reasonable doubt, as cinnamon and cassia were known to the Greeks, that they must have been known to the Hebrews also, as the commerce with India can be proved to have been much more ancient than is generally supposed. (See the *Penny Cyclopaedia*, s.v. Cinnamon; Celsii *Hierobot.* 2:350 sq.; Bodsei a Stapel, *Comm. in Theophr.* p. 984; Knox, *Travels in Ceylon*, p. 32; also Ritter, *Erdk.* VI, 4, pt. 2, p. 123 sq.; Geiger, *Pharmac. Botan.* 1:330' sq.; especially Nees v. Esenbeck, *De Cinnanzomo* [Bonn, 1823], and Blume in Wiegmann's *Archiv fur Naturgesch.* 1831, 1:116 sq.; Martius, *Pharmakogn.* p. 132, 141; Smith's *Dict. of Class. Antiq.*, Amer. ed., s.v. Cinnamomum.) **SEE CASSIA.**

## Cin'nereth

(Heb. *Kinne'reth*, **trNKi** a harp; Sept. **Χενέρεθ**, Vulg. *Cenereth*, Auth. Vers." Chinnereth;" <sup><06411></sup>Numbers 34:11; <sup><06417></sup>Deuteronomy 3:17; <sup><06427></sup>Joshua 13:27; 19:35), or Cin'neroth (Heb. *Kinneroth'*, **twrNKi** harps; <sup><06412></sup>Joshua 11:2, Sept. **Χενερώθ**, Vulg. *Ceneroth*, Auth. Vers. "Chinneroth;" <sup><06428></sup>Joshua 12:3, Sept. **Χενέρεθ**, Vulg. *Ceneroth*, Auth. Vers. "Chinneroth;" <sup><06450></sup>1 Kings 15:20, Sept. **Χενέρεθ**, Vulg. *Cenneroth*, Auth. Vers. "Cineroth"), one of the "fenced cities" of the tribe of Naphtali (<sup><06425></sup>Joshua 19:35; compare <sup><06417></sup>Deuteronomy 3:17; <sup><06412></sup>Joshua 11:2; <sup><06450></sup>1 Kings 15:20). In the last two of the texts cited it seems to indicate a *district*, since it is named with the "land of Naphtali" and other northern places as having been laid waste by Benhadad, king of Damascus, the ally of Asa, king of Judah (<sup><06450></sup>1 Kings 15:20). It probably took its name from the adjacent city or lake of the same name, and was possibly the small enclosed district north of Tiberias, and by the side of the lake, afterwards known as "the plain of Gennesareth." The expression "All Chinneroth" is unusual, and may be compared with "All Bithron" — probably, like this, a district and not a town. It is also the earlier name of the lake *Gennesareth* (which is supposed to be a corruption of *Cinnereth*, Lightfoot, *Works*,

1:496), from which we may collect that the town lay on the western border of the lake, and was of sufficient consequence to give its own name to it (<sup><0612></sup>Joshua 12:3; 13:27; <sup><0641></sup>Numbers 34:11). Jerome says, but merely on rumor (“ferunt,” *Onomast.* s.v. Chennereth), that Tiberias was originally called Cinnereth; which Reland disputes (*Palaest.* p. 161), as being opposed to Matthew iiv. 13 The Jewish Rabbins, moreover, identify (Lightfoot, *Works*, 2, 223) Tiberias with the Rakkath (q.v.) of <sup><0625></sup>Joshua 19:35-38. **SEE CHINNERETH.** M. de Saulcy thinks he has identified the village of *Abu Shusheh*, lying on the western edge of the plain el-Ghuweir, on an eminence about at its midlength, at the entrance of wady Rubuduyeh, with the site of Cinnereth (*Narrative*, 2, 359, 364). **SEE GENNESARET.**

## Cippus

(Lat. a *post*), a small, low column used by the ancient Romans as a mile-post, or to mark divisions of land; also a tomb-stone of small dimensions, containing a diminutive orifice or place to receive the ashes of the dead, being thus the original of the modern tomb-stone.

## Cir'ama

a place whose people (<sup><0612></sup>ἔκ Κιραμᾶς; Vulg. *Gramas*), together with those of Gabdes, came up with Zorobabel from Babylon (1 Esdras 5:20); for which the Heb. texts (<sup><1523></sup>Ezra 2:26; <sup><1670></sup>Nehemiah 7:30) have RAMAH **SEE RAMAH** (q.v.).

## Circle

(<sup><0612></sup>gwj , *chug*), any part of a curve, an arch. The word is applied (<sup><1824></sup>Job 22:14, where, however, it is translated “circuit”) to the *heavens*, which the ancients supposed to be a hollow sphere. They imagined that the sky was solid, and extended like an arch over the earth. The word is also referred to the *earth* in <sup><2412></sup>Isaiah 40:22, and to the surface of the *ocean* in <sup><1027></sup>Proverbs 8:27, where it is rendered “compass;” in both which passages it still seems to mean the celestial vault, as spanning these. In Wisdom of Solomon 13:2, the Greek term κύκλος is so rendered, with reference to the path of the stars. **SEE CIRCUIT.**

## Circuit

(**hp#qT**] *tekuphah*’) signifies the act of going round, as, for example, the apparent diurnal revolution of the sun around the earth (<sup><1916></sup>Psalm 19:6); it is also used with reference to the completion of a year in the original of <sup><1423></sup>2 Chronicles 24:23; <sup><1232></sup>Exodus 34:22 (in which passages it is rendered “end”); or of the term of pregnancy in <sup><1023></sup>1 Samuel 1:20 (“when ... was come about”). The Scriptures, however, afford us very little information as to the astronomical knowledge of the Jews. *SEE ASTRONOMY*. In <sup><1824></sup>Job 22:14, the Heb. word is different. *SEE CIRCLE*. In <sup><1076></sup>1 Samuel 7:16, and <sup><2006></sup>Ecclesiastes 1:6, also, a different form of expression is used in the original to signify, in the former passage (**bb̄s**; elsewhere usually rendered “compass”), a regular tour of inspection, and in the latter (**byb̄s**) the periodical series of gyrations, or, rather, directions of the winds, which in the East are quite regular in their seasons. In Ecclesiasticus 24:5, the original word is γῦρος, the *rotation* of the heavens; but in 2 Maccabees 6:4, it is simply περίβολος, an *enclosure*, e.g. of the Temple.

## Circuit.

In the Methodist Episcopal Church, a single church, supplied by a pastor, is called a *station*; but when two or more appointments, within a definite territory, are united into one charge, under one or more ministers, it is called a “circuit.” The English minutes of 1746 give “the first intimation of definite circuits, though it is supposed they existed before. All England was mapped into seven of these itinerant districts.” In America the circuit system was universal in the beginning of Methodism, and it is still widely in use in rural districts and in the Western States. — Stevens, *History of Methodism*, 1, 318. *SEE METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH*.

## Circumcellians

a fanatical sort of Donatists in the fourth century, of uncertain origin. From their wandering habits, they were called *Circumcelliones* (from *celle*, the cottages of the peasants around which they hovered, *cellas circumientes rusticorum*). They rambled up and down, plundering, burning houses, and murdering all who resisted them, professing to seek the crown of martyrdom. They called themselves *Milites Christi Agonistici*. There is no evidence to show that their conduct was approved by the Donatists, but their proceedings brought great odium on that party. — Mosheim, *Ch.*

*Hist. cent. 4, pt. 2, ch. 5, and cent. 5, pt. 2, ch. 5; Gieseler, Ch. History, per. 2, div. 1, § 84; Gibbon, Decline and Fall, ch. 21, 23:SEE DONATISTS.*

## Circumcision

(*hl Wm, mulah'*; Sept. and N.T. technically περιτομή, which is translated by the Latin *circumcisio*, i.e. a *cutting around*), a custom among many Eastern nations of cutting off part of the prepuce, as a religious ceremony. The Jews, through Abraham, received the rite from Jehovah; Moses established it as a national ordinance; and Joshua carried it into effect before the Israelites entered the land of Canaan (see generally Michaelis, *Laws of Moses*, 4:30 sq.). Males only were subjected to the operation, and it was to be performed on the eighth day of the child's life; foreign slaves also were forced to submit to it on entering an Israelite's family. Those who are unacquainted with other sources of information on the subject besides the Scriptures might easily suppose that the rite was original with Abraham, characteristic of his seed, and practiced among those nations only who had learned it from them. This, however, appears not to have been the case (Celsus, ap. Orig. *contra Celsum*, 1:17, 250; Julian, ap. Cyril, *contra Julian*. 10:354; compare Marsham, *Canon Chron.* p. 73 sq.; Bauer, *Gottesdienstl. Verfass.* 1, 37 sq.; Jahn, I, 2, 277 sq.; see Borheck, *Ist die Beschneidung ursprünglich hebraisch?* [Duisb. and Lemgo, 1793]).

**I. Pagan Circumcision.** — First of all, *the Egyptians* were a circumcised people. Vonck (*Observ. miscell.* c. 1, p. 66), followed by Wesseling (*ad Herod.* 2, 37) and by numerous able writers, alleged that this was not true of the whole nation, but of the priests only; that at least the priests were circumcised is beyond controversy. No one can for a moment imagine that they adopted the rite from the despised shepherds of Goshen; and we are immediately forced to believe that Egyptian circumcision had an independent origin. A great preponderance of argument, however, appears to us to prove that the rite was universal among the old Egyptians, as long as their native institutions flourished, although there is no question that, under Persian and Greek rule, it gradually fell into disuse, and was retained chiefly by the priests, and by those who desired to cultivate ancient wisdom (see Origen, *ad* <sup><2449></sup> *Jeremiah* 4:19; *Ezekiel* 31:18; 32:19; and *ad* <sup><8113></sup> *Romans* 2:13; Jerome *ad Galatians* 4, p. 477; Horapoll. *Hierogl. .Eg.* 1, 14, p. 13, ed. Paun; Clem. Alex. *Strom.* 1, 130). Herodotus distinctly declares that the Egyptians practiced circumcision; and that he meant to

state this of the whole nation is manifest, not only since he always omits to add any restriction, but because, immediately following his first statement of the fact, he annexes this remark: "The *priests*, moreover, shave their whole body every other day," etc. (Herod. 2:37). It is difficult to suppose that the historian could have been mistaken on this point, considering his personal acquaintance with Egypt. (Artapanus, however, makes a distinction between Jewish and Egyptian circumcision, ap. Eusebius *Proep. Ev.* 4, 27.) Further, he informs us that the Colchians were a colony from Egypt, consisting of soldiers from the army of Sesostris. With these he had conversed (2, 104), and he positively declares that they practiced circumcision. Yet if the rite had been confined to the priestly caste of Egypt, it could hardly have been found among the Colchians at all. The same remark will apply to the savage Troglodytes of Africa, every branch of whom except one (the Kolobi), as Diodorus informs us (3, 31), was circumcised, having learned the practice from the Egyptians. The Troglodytes appear to have been widely diffused through Libya, which argues a corresponding diffusion of the rite; yet, from the silence of Diodorus concerning the *other* savage nations whom he recounts as African Ethiopians, we may infer that it was *not* practiced by them. The direct testimony of Diodorus (1, 28), Philo (*Opp.* 2, 310), and Strabo (12, 824; comp. Agatharch. ed. Hudson, 1, 46) is to the same effect as that of Herodotus respecting Egypt; yet this can hardly be called confirmatory, since in their days the rite was no longer universal. Josephus (*contra Ap.* 2, 13) speaks of it as practiced by the priests only; he, however, reproaches Apion for neglecting the institutions of his country in remaining uncircumcised. Origen, in the passage above referred to, confirms the statement of Josephus. In Kenrick's *Herodotus* (2, 37), the French commissioners who examined some Egyptian mummies are quoted as establishing from them the fact of Egyptian circumcision. Herodotus, moreover, tells us (2, 104) that the Ethiopians were also circumcised; and he was in doubt whether they had learned the rite from the Egyptians, or the Egyptians from them. By the Ethiopians we must understand him to mean the inhabitants of Meroe or Sennaar. In the present day the Coptic Church continues to practice it, according to C. Niebuhr (quoted by Michaelis); the Abyssinian Christians do the same (Ludolf. *Hist. Ethiop.* 1, 19, and *Comment.* p. 268 sq.); and that it was *not* introduced among the latter with a Judaical Christianity appears from their performing it upon both sexes. (It is scarcely worth while to invent a new name, recision, or resection, for accuracy's sake.) Oldendorp describes the rite as widely

spread through Western Africa — 16° on each side of the line — even among natives that are not Mohammedan. In later times it has been ascertained that it is practiced by the Kafir nations in South Africa, more properly called Kosa or Amakesa, whom Prichard supposes to form “a great part of the native population of Africa to the southward of the equator.” He remarks upon this: “It is scarcely within probability that they borrowed the custom from nations who profess Islam, or we should find among them other proofs of intercourse with people of that class. It is more probable that this practice is a relic of ancient African customs, of which the Egyptians, as it is well known, partook in the remote ages” (Prichard, *Physical Hist. of Man*, 3d ed. 2, 287). Traces of the custom have even been observed among the natives of some of the South Sea Islands (Pickering, *Races of Men*, p. 153, 199, 200, etc.).

How far the rite was extended through the Syro-Arabian races is uncertain (but see Strabo, 16:776; Epiphanius. *Hoer.* 9, 30; Origen ad *Genesis* 1, 10). In the 9th section of the Epistle of Barnabas (which, whether genuine or not, is very old), the writer comments as follows: “But you will say the Jews were circumcised for a sign. And so are all the Syrians, and the Arabians, and the idolatrous priests; ... and even the Egyptians themselves are circumcised.” This language is vague and popular; yet it shows how notorious was the wide diffusion of the custom (see Hug, in the *Freib. Zeitschrift*. 3. 213). The Philistines, in the days of Saul, were, however, uncircumcised; so also, says Herodotus (2, 104), were all the Phoenicians who had intercourse with the Greeks. That the Canaanites, in the days of Jacob, were not all circumcised, is plain from the affair of Dinah and Shechem. The story of Zipporah (<sup>Gen 17:25</sup> Exodus 4:25), who did not circumcise her son until fear came over her that Jehovah would slay her husband Moses, proves that the family of Jethro, the Midianite, had no fixed rule about it, although the Midianites are generally regarded as children of Abraham by Keturah. On the other hand, we have the distinct testimony of Josephus (*Ant.* 1, 12, 2) that the Ishmaelite Arabs, inhabiting the district of Nabathaea, were circumcised after their 13th year: this must be connected with the tradition, which no doubt existed among them, of the age at which their forefather Ishmael underwent the rite (<sup>Gen 17:25</sup> Genesis 17:25). St. Jerome also (quoted by Michaelis) informs us that, to his day, “*usque hodie*,” the tribes dwelling round Judaea and Palestine were circumcised, “especially all the Saracens who dwell in the desert.” Elsewhere he says that, “except the Egyptians, Idumaeans, Ammonites, Moabites, and Ishmaelites of the

desert, of whom *the greater part* are circumcised, all other nations in the world are uncircumcised.” A negative argument is more or less dangerous; yet there is something striking in the fact that the books of Moses, of Joshua, and of Judges never bestow the epithet *uncircumcised* as a reproach on any of the seven nations of Canaan, any more than on the Moabites or Ammonites, the Amalekites, the Midianites, or other inland tribes with whom they came into conflict. On the contrary, as soon as the Philistines become prominent in the narrative, after the birth of Samson, this epithet is of rather common occurrence. The fact also of bringing back as a trophy the foreskins of slain enemies never occurs except against the Philistines (<sup><9180></sup>1 Samuel 18). We may perhaps infer, at least until other proof or disproof is attained, that while the Philistines, like the Sidonians and the other maritime Syrian nations known to the Greeks, were wholly strangers to the practice, yet among the Canaanites, and all the more inland tribes, it was at least so far common that no general description could be given them from the omission; It appears from Josephus (*Ant.* 13, 9) that when Hyrcanus subdued the Idumaeans, he forced them to be circumcised on pain of expatriation. This shows that they had at least disused the rite. But that is not wonderful, if it was only a custom, and not a national religious ordinance; for, as Michaelis observes, the disuse of it may have dated from the edict of Antiochus Epiphanes, of which it is said (1 Maccabees 1:41, 42), “The king Antiochus wrote to all his kingdom that all should be one people; and that all should keep the ordinances of his country; and all the nations acquiesced according to the word of the king.” The rather obscure notices which are found in Jeremiah and Ezekiel of the circumcision of the nations who were in immediate contact with Israel admit of a natural interpretation in conformity with what has been already adduced (<sup><24925></sup>Jeremiah 9:25; <sup><27118></sup>Ezekiel 31:18; also 32:19, *et passim*). The difficulty turns on the new *moral* use made of the term “uncircumcised,” to mean simply *impure*. The passage in Jeremiah is thus translated by Ewald: “Behold, the days come that I visit all the uncircumcised circumcised ones; Egypt and Judah, Edom, and the children of Ammon and Moab; and all the dwellers in the wilderness that are shaven on the temples: for all the heathen are uncircumcised, and so is all the house of Israel uncircumcised in heart.” The shaving of the temples appears to be a religious custom of the same kind: Herodotus (3, 8) ascribes it to the Arabs generally, and Josephus rather strangely regards the epithet *τροχοκούριδες*, in the ancient Greek poet Choerilus (c. Ap. 1, 22), as a description of his own countrymen. Knowing that the Egyptians were circumcised, it no longer



remains doubtful how *the reproach of Egypt* (<sup><1818></sup>Joshua 5:9) should be interpreted.

How far the rite of circumcision spread over the south-west of Arabia no definite record subsists. The silence of the Koran confirms the statement of Abulfeda (*Histor. Ante-Islamica*, p. 180, ed. Fleischer, 1831) that the custom is older than Mohammed, who, it would appear, in no respect regarded it as a religious rite. Nevertheless it has extended itself with the Mohammedan faith, as though it were a positive ordinance. Pococke (*Specimen Hist. Arab.* p. 309) cites a tradition, which ascribes to Mohammed the words, "Circumcision is an ordinance for men, and honorable in women." This extension of the rite to the other sex might, in itself, satisfy us that it did not come to those nations from Abraham and Ishmael. We have already seen that Abyssinian circumcision has the same peculiarity; so that it is every way probable that Southern Arabia had the rite from the same source or influence as Ethiopia. In fact, the very closest relations are known to have subsisted between the nations on the opposite coasts of the Red Sea. Another passage of Abulfeda (*Annales Muslemici.* 1, 92) gives specific information on this subject. In the battle of Ohod, in the third year of the Hegira, "Hamza, the uncle of the Prophet, committed great slaughter. When Sabba' ben-Abd-ul-Uzza, whose mother was a circumciser in Mecca, passed by him, Hamza called out, Come on, you son of a she-circumciser [*resectricis nympharum*]!" The form of the word proves that this was strictly the trade of the old woman, and that the custom, as applied to females, was no innovation of those days. Niebuhr had ocular demonstration of female circumcision in Arabia (*Travels*, 2, 251).

Pococke quotes the ecclesiastical historian Philostorgius for the fact that the Himyarite Arabs circumcise their children on the *eighth day*. He adds a passage from Al Gazzali, in which the writer says that the Arabs differ from the Jews as to the time; for they postpone it until the child has teeth, which he thinks safer. Finally, he cites Ibn Athir, who, writing of the times antecedent to Mohammed, says that the Arabs were accustomed to circumcise between the tenth and fifteenth years. The origin of the custom amongst this large section of those Gentiles who follow it is to be found in the Biblical record of the circumcision of Ishmael (<sup><1175></sup>Genesis 17:25). Josephus relates that the Arabians circumcise after the thirteenth year, because Ishmael, the founder of their nation, was circumcised at that age (*Ant.* 1, 12, 2; see Lane's *Mod. Eg.* ch. 2). Though Mohammed did not



enjoin circumcision in the Koran, he was circumcised himself, according to the custom of his country; and circumcision is now as common amongst the Mohammedans as amongst the Jews.

The statement of Philostorgius may receive light from the Arab historians, who relate (Jost, *Geschichte der Israeliten*, 5, 236 sq.) that about a century before the Christian aera, several Jewish sovereigns reigned in the region called Sheba by the Jews, and Yemen by the moderns, where the Himyarites (or Homeritae) dwelt. The few facts preserved show that they were not close observers of the Mosaic law, and the suspicion might arise that they were called Jews chiefly from their having received Jewish circumcision. We have, however, a collateral evidence of much importance, to prove that the influence acting on them had really come from Judaea; namely, it is well known that in Abyssinia a nation called the Falasha still exists, which has very thoroughly adopted the Jewish religion, insomuch as to have invented legends that allege their descent from the Hebrews. They possess the Old Testament in the Gheez language and character, but their own language is said to be quite alien from the Hebrew; facts which prove that they were really *proselyted* by the Jews at some early period. **SEE ABYSSINIA**. At that same time, it is credible, the Hebrew faith met with similar success on the opposite coast of the Red Sea. Jost believes that, during the war of the Maccabees, great numbers of Jews migrated into Arabia; and it is certain that in later times they were very numerous in Yemen, and their influence great. Wherever they were settled proselytes must have been made; and great zeal was doubtless used to induce them to circumcise their children duly according to the Mosaic rite. We can then quite understand Philostorgius's fact, if we are allowed to suppose that he spoke loosely of "the Himyarites" doing that which was done by a great many of them. An interesting story is told by Josephus—the date so late as the reign of the Emperor Claudius (*Ant.* 20, 2) — how Izates, the young king of Adiabene, and his mother Helena, were converted by Jewish teachers to a belief in the one true God, the God of the Hebrews; and how, when Izates was desirous of being circumcised, and his mother dreaded that it would alienate his subjects, his Jewish Instructor Ananias warmly seconded her views, with a heart like that of Paul; telling him that if he was resolved to imitate Jewish institutions, he could, without being circumcised, adore the true divinity; and that this was far more important than circumcision. At the time he satisfied the young monarch; but afterwards, another Jew, named Eleazar, came from Galilee, and inveighed

so strongly on the impiety of his disobedience, that, without more delay, Izates submitted to the rite. It is evident that, in a controversy of this sort, the more narrow-minded teacher had the advantage; and, in consequence, it appears that “proselytes of righteousness” were always circumcised (Judith 14:10, and Tacit. *Hist.* 5, 5). The facility with which whole nations have adopted the practice from the Mohammedans proves that it is not so serious an obstacle to the spread of a religion as some have thought it (see the *Penny Cyclopaedia*, s.v.).

## II. Jewish Circumcision. —

**1. History.** — When God announced to Abraham that he would establish his covenant with him, he said to him, “This is my covenant, which ye shall keep between me and you, and thy seed after thee: Every man-child among you shall be circumcised. And ye shall circumcise the flesh of your foreskin; and it shall be a token of the covenant betwixt me and you” (<sup><0170></sup>Genesis 17:10, 11). It was also ordained that this should be extended to servants belonging to Abraham and his seed, as well as to their own children; and that in the case of children it was to be done on the eighth day after birth. This was appointed as an ordinance of perpetual obligation in the Abrahamic family, and the neglect of it entailed the penalty of being cut off from the people (12-14). In compliance with this, Abraham, though then ninety-nine years of age, was himself circumcised and all his household, including Ishmael. On the birth of his son Isaac, the rite was attended to with regard to him (<sup><0204></sup>Genesis 21:4); and it continued to be observed by his posterity, and distinctively to characterize them from the people amidst whom they dwelt (<sup><0344></sup>Genesis 34:14, 15). The usage thus introduced by Abraham was formally enacted as a legal institute by Moses (<sup><0123></sup>Leviticus 12:3; comp. <sup><0323></sup>John 7:23). Slaves, whether home-born or purchased, were circumcised (<sup><0172></sup>Genesis 17:12, 13); and foreigners must have their males circumcised before they could be allowed to partake of the passover (<sup><0248></sup>Exodus 12:48), or become Jewish citizens (<sup><0740></sup>Judges 14:10. See also <sup><0787></sup>Esther 8:17, where for Heb. **mydi — hÿitjñi** “became Jews,” the Sept. has **περιετέμοντο καὶ Ἰουδαῖον**). In short, it was appointed to be observed in relation to all who became proselytes from heathenism to Judaism (comp. Judith 14:10; Maimonides, *Issure Biah*, c. 13, cited by Lightfoot, *Harmonice Evang.* sec. 12). The penalty of death for a neglect of this ordinance appears in the case of Moses to have actually been demanded of the father, when the Lord “sought to kill him” because his

son was uncircumcised (<sup><0102></sup>Exodus 4:24-26). During the passage through the wilderness the practice fell into disuse, so that of those who entered Canaan none had been circumcised. As this was fatal to their title under the covenant to take possession of the land, Joshua, in obedience to God's command, caused all the males to be circumcised (<sup><0602></sup>Joshua 5:2-9). The most satisfactory explanation of this neglect appears to be, that the nation, while bearing the punishment of disobedience in its forty years' wandering, was regarded as under a temporary rejection by God, and was therefore prohibited from using the sign of the covenant. This agrees with the mention of their disobedience and its punishment, which immediately follows in the passage in Joshua (verse 6), and with the words (verse 9), "This day have I rolled away the reproach of Egypt from off you." The "reproach of Egypt" was the threatened taunt of their former masters that God had brought them into the wilderness to slay them (<sup><0302></sup>Exodus 32:12; <sup><0403></sup>Numbers 14:13-16; <sup><0603></sup>Deuteronomy 9:28), which, so long as they remained uncircumcised and wanderers in the desert for their sin, was in danger of falling upon them. (Other views of the passage are given and discussed in Keil's *Commentary on Joshua*, p. 129.) From this time forward it became the pride of the nation to observe this ordinance; on all those people who did not observe it they looked down with contempt, not to say abhorrence (<sup><0703></sup>Judges 14:3; 15:18; <sup><0906></sup>1 Samuel 14:6; 17:26; <sup><1003></sup>2 Samuel 1:20; <sup><2303></sup>Isaiah 52:1; <sup><2503></sup>Ezekiel 31:18; <sup><4001></sup>Ephesians 2:11, etc.); and so much did it become a rite distinctive of them, that their oppressors sought to prevent their observing it—an attempt to which they refused to submit, though threatened with the last penalties in case of disobedience (1 Maccabees 1:48, 50, 60-62). The introduction of Christianity was the signal for the abolition of this rite in the Church of God; as the old covenant had waxed feeble and was passing away, that which was the token of it also ceased to be binding; the rule was proclaimed that "in Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth anything nor uncircumcision, but a new creature" (<sup><4605></sup>Galatians 6:15; <sup><5101></sup>Colossians 3:11), though among the Jewish Christians were still found many who clung tenaciously to their ancient distinctive rite, and would have imposed it even on the Gentile converts to Christianity (<sup><4401></sup>Acts 15:1; <sup><4602></sup>Galatians 6:12, etc.). Our Lord himself was circumcised, because it became him who was of the seed of Abraham according to the flesh to fulfill all righteousness, and because he was "a minister of the circumcision for the truth of God, to confirm the promises made unto the fathers" (<sup><4503></sup>Romans 15:8); and Paul caused Timothy to be circumcised to avoid offense to the Jews, his mother being a

Jewess; but the spirit of Christianity was averse from such institutions (<4151> Acts 15:1-11; <4152> Galatians 2:3, etc.) — for the outward carnal circumcision it sought to substitute that of the heart (<4153> Romans 2:28, 29), “the circumcision not made with hands in putting off the sins of the flesh, even the circumcision of Christ” (<5121> Colossians 2:11).

Among the ancient Jews, the rule that circumcision should take place on the eighth day after birth was rigidly followed (<4154> Luke 1:59; 2:21; <4155> Philippians 3:5), save in such very exceptional cases as those mentioned <4156> Exodus 4:25; <4157> Joshua 5:6. Even their reverence for the Sabbath did not prevent the Jews from observing it on that day (<4158> John 7:22, 23); according to the Rabbins circumcision “pellit Sabbatum” (Lightfoot, *Hor. Heb. in Joan* 7, 22). The operation might be performed by any Israelite, but usually it was performed by the father of the child; in special cases women might perform it (<4159> Exodus 4:25). The instrument used in the earlier times was a sharp stone or a knife of flint (<4160> Exodus 4:25; <4161> Joshua 5:2, 3; comp. the λίθος Αἰθιοπικός, used by the Egyptians in preparing bodies for embalming, Herod. 2:86). *SEE KNIFE*. The operation was a painful one, at least to grown persons (<4162> Genesis 34:25; <4163> Joshua 5:8), and requires about three days for the inflammation to subside (Arvieux, 3, 146). It was usual to connect the naming of the child with the circumcision (<4164> Genesis 21:3, 4; <4165> Luke 1:59; 2:21), a practice which probably had respect to the fact that it was in connection with the institution of the rite that God gave to the ancestor of the race his name of Abraham (<4166> Genesis 17:5). *SEE NAME*.

**2. Obliteration by apostate Jews.** — Some of the Jews in the time of Antiochus Epiphanes, wishing to assimilate themselves to the heathen around them, built a gymnasium (γυμνάσιον) at Jerusalem, and, that they might not be known to be Jews when they appeared naked in the games, “made themselves uncircumcised” (1 Maccabees 1:15, ἐποίησαν ἑαυτοῖς ἀκροβυστίας; Vulg. *fecerunt sibi preputia*; Joseph. *Ant.* 12, 5, 1, τῆν τῶν αἰδοίων περιτομὴν ἐπικαλύπτειν). Sometimes this was done by a surgical operation, such as Celsus describes (*De Medic.* 7, 25; comp. Galen, *Meth. Med.* 14, 16; Paul A Egin. 6:53; Epiphanius, *De pond. et mens.* p. 538, ed. Basil. 1544), sometimes by other means (Dioscor. 4:157). The term for this was ἐπισπᾶσθαι (Talm. *hl dI 2ḡvīm*), i.e. *drawing over again*, sc. the prepuce (4 Maccabees 7; see Bartholin. *Morb. bibl.* xxvi). Against having recourse to this practice from an excessive and Judaistic tendency, the apostle Paul cautions the Corinthians in the words,

“Was any one called being circumcised, let him not become uncircumcised” (μὴ ἐπισπάσθω, <41718>1 Corinthians 7:18). See the Essay of Groddeck, *De Judeis pceptum attrahentibus* (Lips. 1699); also in Schöttgen’s *Hor. Hebr.* 2; and in Hasaei et Ikenii *Nov. Thes.* 2, 793 sq.; and in Ugolini *Thesaur.* 22; Engel, *De Judeorum pcep. attrah.* (Lips. 1699); Lossius, *De epispasmo Judaico* (Jen. 1665); also in Schlegeri *Diss. rar.* (Helmst. 1743, 2:89 sq.); Wedell, *Exercitt. med. philol.* I, 5, 1 sq.; Ludolf, *Comm. in Hist. AEth.* p. 270; Lubkert in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1835, 3. 657; comp. Fabricii *Bibliogr. Antiq.* p. 546 sq. **SEE FORESKIN.**

**3. Figurative Use of the Term.** — The moral meaning of the word “uncircumcised” was a natural result of its having been made legally essential to Hebrew faith. “Uncircumcised in heart and ears” was a metaphor to which a prophet would be carried, as necessarily as a Christian teacher to such phrases as “unbaptized in soul,” or “washed by regeneration.” It was a well-known and readily understood *symbol of purity.*

**4. Modern Usages.** — The ceremony of circumcision, as practiced by the Jews in our own times, is thus: If the eighth day happens to be on the Sabbath, the ceremony must be performed on that day, notwithstanding its sanctity. When a male child is born, the godfather is chosen from amongst his relations or near friends; and if the party is not in circumstances to bear the expenses, which are considerable (for after the ceremony is performed a breakfast is provided, even amongst the poor, in a luxurious manner), it is usual for the poor to get one amongst the richer, who accepts the office, and becomes a godfather. There are also societies formed amongst them for the purpose of defraying the expenses, and every Jew receives the benefit if his child is born in wedlock. The ceremony is performed in the following manner, in general.

The circumcisor being provided with a very sharp instrument, called the circumcising knife (see Quandt, *De cultris circumcisoriiis Judaeorum*, Regiom. 1713), plasters, cummin-seed to dress the wound, proper bandages, etc., the child is brought to the door of the synagogue by the godmother, when the godfather receives it from her and carries it into the synagogue, where a large chair with two seats is placed; the one is for the godfather to sit upon, the other is called the seat of Elijah the prophet, who is called the angel or messenger of the covenant. As soon as the godfather enters with the child, the congregation say, “Blessed is he that cometh to

be circumcised, and enter into the covenant on the eighth day.” The godfather being seated, and the child placed on a cushion in his lap, the circumciser performs the operation, and, holding the child in his arms, takes a glass of wine into his right hand, and says as follows: “Blessed be those, O Lord our God, King of the Universe, Creator of the fruit of the vine. Blessed art thou, O Lord our God! who hath sanctified his beloved from the womb, and ordained an ordinance for his kindred, and sealed his descendants with the mark of his holy covenant; therefore for the merits of this, O living God! our rock and inheritance, command the deliverance of the beloved of our kindred from the pit, for the sake of the covenant which he hath put in our flesh. Blessed art thou, O Lord, the Maker of the Covenant! Our God, and the God of our fathers! preserve this child to his father and mother, and his name shall be called in Israel, A, the son of B. Let the father rejoice in those that go forth from his loins, and let his mother be glad in the fruit of her womb; as it is written, ‘Thy father and mother shall rejoice, and they that begat thee shall be glad.’”

The father of the child says the following grace: “Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, King of the Universe! who hath sanctified us with his commandments, and commanded us to enter into the covenant of our father Abraham.” The congregation answer, “As he hath entered into the law, the canopy, and the good and virtuous deeds.” (See Buxtorf, *Synagoga Judaica*, ch. 2.)

**III.** *Design of the Institution.* — Herodotus long ago declared that it was adopted by the Egyptians for cleanliness (*καθαριότητος εἵνεκα*); and a slight acquaintance with the ideas of the Turks concerning personal defilement will make it easy to believe that an idea of cleanliness continued the practice among nations which had once become habituated to it. In the ancient Egyptians this Turkish spirit was carried to a great height; nor is it wonderful that in hot climates detailed precepts of cleanliness form a very large part of primitive religion. But we can hardly rest in this as a sufficient account of the *origin* of the rite (see Deyling, *Observatt.* 2, 38 sq. [also in Ugolini *Thesaur.* 22]; Buddei *Hist. Eccl.* V, I, 1, 175 sq.; Meyer, *De tempp. et fest. Hebr.* 2, 7, p. 512 [Ugolini *Thesaur.* 1]; Grappii *Diss. an circumcisio ab Eg. fuerit derivata* [Jen. 1722]; Witsii *Eeg.* 3. 6, p. 233 sq.; Bynaeus, *De circumcis. Christi* [Amst. 1689], p. 27 sq.; Carpzov, *Appar.* p. 602 sq.; Sturz, *Circumcisio a barbaris gentibus translata* [Ger. 1790]). It is more important to state that an adequate physical reason for performing the operation on females of several African races has been fully

substantiated. The curious reader will find in Laurence's *Lectures* (chap. 5) the decisive testimony of Mr. Barrow and Dr. Somerville on this point, with an allusion to the efforts of the Romish missionaries to forbid the practice in Abyssinia, and the unexpected consequences which thwarted them. No positive evidence has yet been obtained that the operation is equally expedient for the males in any of the same races; yet the analogy of the two cases forces us to believe that in both the custom has a physical or medical ground, especially when it is remarked to predominate so much in Africa, where alone (as far as yet appears) such physical peculiarities of structure exist. It was practiced, moreover, by the males of African tribes so savage, and so little addicted to religious ceremonialism, that a broader ground must be sought for it than simple cleanliness. We have already named the Troglodytes. Strabo mentions two other tribes of Africa, whom he calls Kreophagi and Kolobi (16, 4, p. 387-390, 392, ed. Tauch.), who practiced on themselves a yet more shocking mutilation (*κολοβοὶ τὰς βαλάνους*), ascribed to the Kolobi by Diodorus also. The fact, also, that most of these nations performed whatever operation it was, not on infants, but on those who were advancing towards marriageable age, conspires to indicate that some physical inconvenience gradually showed itself (as with the Bushmen females), of which they desired to get rid. Jost looks upon *infant* circumcision as the distinguishing mark of Judaism; and this may be nearly correct, though we have seen that, according to Abulfeda, some Arabs delayed it only till after teething. In fact, Diodorus (2, 31), when speaking of that branch of the Troglodyte nations which was called Kolobi, declares that they were subjected to the operation in infancy (*ἐκνηπίου*). Their unnatural and cruel custom is possibly to be referred to superstition. Some, indeed, have looked on circumcision itself as a softened form of the barbarous rite by which the Galli, or priests of Cybele, were qualified for their office. The Kolobite custom might, on the contrary, be a carrying out of that barbarity to the extremest point possible, short of exterminating the population of a tribe. Traditionary or superstitious reasons certainly can alone explain the presence of the custom among the Sandwich Islanders (Michaelis, *Orient. Biblioth.* 14, 50 sq.), and aboriginal Americans (Gumilla, *Histoire de l' Oroque*, Avign. 1708, 1:183 sq.), for physiological considerations, seem to fail (see Burdach, *Physiol.* 3. 386). If an independent and human origin has been discovered for Egyptian circumcision, the thought of necessity arises that the Israelites must have had it from the same sources as the nations around them, and it has been discussed (Speneer, *De Leg. Heb.* I, 4, 4, p. 70 sq.) whether they even



borrowed it from the Egyptians. (Movers thinks [*Phonic.* 1, 362] that the latter borrowed it from the Phoenicians, resting on the myth of Saturn, in Sanchoniatho, *Fragm.* p. 36.) The idea has naturally given much offense; but, in truth, the question involves no peculiar difficulty; it is only a part of another far wider inquiry. It is notorious that many other ancient nations had various ceremonies and institutions in common with the Jews, and that the Hebrew law is by no means in all points original. That sacrifice pre-existed is on the surface of the Bible history. The same, however, is true of temples, tabernacles, priests, ever-burning fire, oracles, etc. The fact has been often denoted by saying that the Jewish institutions are a selection, revision, and re-enactment of an older patriarchal religion. Other treatises on the Gentile origin of circumcision are by Hofmann (Altdorf, 1771), Rus (Jen. 1707), Zeibich (Ger. 1770), Anton (Lips. 1682).

Circumcision, then, as practiced by the Gentiles, was simply an expedient to promote health, facilitating cleanliness, and preventing certain painful afflictions, such as that of the *gonorrhoea spuria* (*froniphymosis*, or stricture), and especially the *ἄνθραξ*, or “carbuncle,” to which, in hot climates, men are subject (Josephus, *cont. Apion.* 2, 14; Niebuhr, *De l'Arabie*, ch. 19), or an unusual prolongation of the part in question (Thevenot, 1, 58; Haquet, in Voigt's *Magaz. fur Phys.* 6, 443; but see Danz, in Baldinger's *Magaz. fur Aerzte*, 14, 416 sq.). In so far as it served this end, the Irsaelites had, of course, the benefit of it; but that this formed the reason and design of its appointment by God, though asserted by some men of learning and ability, seems utterly untenable; for, in the first place, this opinion is without the slightest support from Scripture; often as the subject is referred to there, we find no hint as to this being the purpose of the observance; 2dly, This hypothesis is quite opposed to the account given by Moses of the introduction of the rite among the Israelites; 3dly, It is absurd to suppose that a mere prophylactic usage should by God be elevated to the solemnity of a religious ordinance; 4thly, Whatever advantages in a hygienic respect might accrue from the practice, these were confined to individuals; circumcision is not necessary for health to men generally in hot climates (Niebuhr, loc. cit.); and therefore to oblige the whole male community to undergo this process in infancy for purposes of health would have been to act as unwise a part as if it had been enjoined that every one should lose a limb, because it was possible that some one might contract severe disease in that limb if allowed to remain; and, 5thly, If circumcision was a mere hygienic precaution, why should it have been



abolished by Christianity? why should the apostles have held it to be so hostile to Christianity? and why should the difficulty of becoming a Christian have been increased by the prohibition to those who embraced Christianity of a necessary condition of their children's health? See Philo, *De Circumcis.* in *Opp.* 2, 210 sq.; Ackermann, in *Weise's Materialienfir Gottesgelartheit* (Gera, 1784), 1:50 sq.; Schulz, *Exercitatt.* 1, 2; Michaelis, *Orient. Bibl.* 22, 8 sq.; Rust, *Handb. d. Chirurgie*, v. 30; Hoffmann, *De causa focunditatis gentis circumcises* (Lips. 1739); Wolfsheimer, *De causisfecunditatis Hebraeor.* (Hal. 1742); Vogel, *Dubia de usu circumcisionib medico* (Gott. 1763); Meiners, *De circumcis. origine et causis* (in the *Comment. Soc. Gott.* 14, 207 sq.; and his *Krit. Gesch. d. Relig.* 2, 473 sq.). On the supposed tendency of the custom to prevent excessive venery (Michaelis in Bertholdt's *Journ.* 4, 356), especially onanism (Buxtorf, *Lex. Chald.* col. 112 sq.), see Schneider in Henke's *Zeitschriftf. Staatsarzneik.* V, 4, 223. For other reasons, see Photius, *Ep.* 205.

When first appointed by God, circumcision was expressly set forth as a token of the covenant which God had made with Abraham; and the apostle tells us that Abraham received "the sign of circumcision as a seal of the righteousness of that faith which he had, being yet uncircumcised" (<sup><6741></sup>Romans 4:11); so that to Abraham it was not only a sign or token of God's covenant, but also an obsignation or certificate that he was in a state of acceptance before he was circumcised. As a Mosaic institution, it was also the sign of the covenant which God made with Israel, which is hence called the "covenant of circumcision" (<sup><407></sup>Acts 7:8). In consequence of this, it became the medium of access to the privileges of the covenant, and entailed on all who received it an obligation to fulfill the duties which the covenant imposed (<sup><612></sup>Romans 2:25; 3:1; <sup><818></sup>Galatians 5:3). In a word, it was the token which assured to Abraham and his descendants the promise of the Messiah (<sup><017></sup>Genesis 17). It was thus made a necessary condition of Jewish nationality. Circumcision served also to separate the people of the Jews from the rest of the nations, as a people set apart to God. These were its *uses*. As respects its *meaning*, that was symbolical, and the things which it symbolized were two: 1. Consecration to God; and, 2. Mental and spiritual purification (<sup><062></sup>Exodus 6:12; <sup><192></sup>Leviticus 19:25; <sup><606></sup>Deuteronomy 10:16; 30:6; <sup><250></sup>Isaiah 52:1; <sup><240></sup>Jeremiah 4:4; 6:10; <sup><612></sup>Romans 2:25-29; <sup><1011></sup>Colossians 2:11, etc. Compare Philo, *De Circumcisione*; Jones, *Figurative Language of Scripture*, Lecture 5, p.

135). “There was thus involved the concept of *consecration*, and along with this that of reconciliation, in circumcision; and it was thereby, as Ewald rightly remarks (*Alterth.* p. 95), an offering of the body to Jehovah, which, according to the true meaning of all the offerings, as fully developed and raised to their true elevation by the prophets, had to be presented to him as an offering of the soul. Only as this inner offering was perfectly presented could the obligation to be a priestly kingdom and a holy people be fulfilled” (Vaihinger in Herzog’s *Real-Encykl.* 2, 110). — Kitto, s.v.

On this subject in general, see Spencer, *De Legibus Heb. ritualibus*, 1, 5; Michaelis, *Commentaries on the Laws of Moses*, 3. 58-93; Witsius, *De Fwdere*, bk. 4:6, 8; Lokevitz, *De circumcissione Judeorum* (Vitemb. 1769-80); Smeets, *De circumcissione Abrahamo divinitus data* (Franec. 1690); Bergson, *Beschneidung vom historischen, krit. u. med. Standpunkt* (Berlin, 1844); Brescher, *Die Beschneidung der Israeliten von der hist., praktisch-operativen u. ritualen Seite* (Vienna, 1845); Heymann, *Die Beschneidung inpathol. Bedeutung* (Magdeb. 1844); M. G. Salomon, *Die Beschneidung, hist. u. medicinisch beleuchtet* (Braunsch. 1844); S. Salomon, *Phimosis nebst Beschneidung* (Hamb. 1838); Schmid’s ed. of Maimonides, tract **hl yma** (Strasb. 1661, 1700); Wolfers, *Die Beschneidung der Juden* (Lamford. 1831).

**IV.** *Christian Views on the Subject.* — “The attitude which Christianity, at its introduction, assumed towards circumcision was one of absolute hostility, so far as the necessity of the rite to salvation, or its possession of any religious or moral worth were concerned (Acts 15; ~~418B~~ Galatians 5:2). But while the apostles resolutely forbade its imposition by authority on the Gentiles, they made no objection to its practice, as a mere matter of feeling or expediency. Paul, who would by no means consent to the demand for Titus, who was a Greek, to be circumcised (~~418B~~ Galatians 2:3-5), on another occasion had Timothy circumcised to conciliate the Jews, and that he might preach to them with more effect as being one of themselves (~~418B~~ Acts 16:3). The Abyssinian Christians still practice circumcision as a national custom (see Gibbon, *Decline and Fall*, N. Y. edition, 4:565). In accordance with the spirit of Christianity, those who ascribed efficacy to the mere outward rite are spoken of in the N.T. almost with contempt as ‘the concision’ or ‘amputation’ (τὴν κατατομήν); while the claim to be the true circumcision is vindicated for Christians themselves (~~318B~~ Philippians 3:2, 3). An ethical idea is attached to circumcision in the O.T., where

uncircumcised lips (<sup><162></sup>Exodus 6:12, 30), or ears (<sup><160></sup>Jeremiah 6:10), or hearts (<sup><134></sup>Leviticus 26:41) are spoken of, i.e. either stammering or dull, closed as it were with a foreskin, or rather rebellious and unholy (<sup><106></sup>Deuteronomy 30:6; <sup><104></sup>Jeremiah 4:4), because circumcision was the symbol of purity (see <sup><231></sup>Isaiah 52:1). Thus the fruit of a tree is called uncircumcised, or, in other words, unclean (<sup><1923></sup>Leviticus 19:23). In the N.T. the ethical and spiritual idea of purity and holiness is fully developed (<sup><1211></sup>Colossians 2:11, 13; <sup><123></sup>Romans 2:28, 29).”

## V. *Relation to Christian Baptism.* —

**1.** The ethical and spiritual value of circumcision did not depend on its existence or use prior to its adoption by God as a symbol of true religion. The condescension of Christ consecrated and elevated old rites to new spheres, upon the principle that “what God hath cleansed, that call not thou common.” On this principle he elected the baptismal purification, and the simple elements of his Supper. When the covenant with Abraham had reached its full development, including all the seminal elements for the future growth of his Church in the world, God ratified it by the seal of circumcision. Whatever was afterwards added to the polity of the Church or nation worked no modification of the great principles involved, but was rather called into being by the exigencies of times and circumstances. This rite, as a symbol, bespoke the consummation of the Abrahamic covenant in all its power and fullness of temporal, as well as eternal and heavenly interests.

**2.** This ordinance included in its significance, as a fitting and most impressive emblem, deep spiritual truths. The history of circumcision, in its connection with the Abrahamic covenant and religion, clearly exhibits the nature of the things it symbolized by the direction of its figurative applications. In involving and engaging moral and mental purity, through faith and worship towards Abraham’s God, it became the token of spiritual blessings to the pious Israelite in whatever foreign regions he might dwell, notwithstanding he might never be permitted to behold Palestine or the holy city. For he alone was a Jew and a real son of Abraham, entitled to the immunities of the Covenant, whose circumcision was “of the heart; in the spirit, and not in the letter; whose praise is not of men, but of God” (<sup><123></sup>Romans 2:28, 29). Profligacy in the national government, though it might bring afflictions, could not nullify the spiritual law, or make void the seal upon the faithful. “All are not Israel which are of Israel” (<sup><106></sup>Romans

9:6). The **Περιτομή καρδίας, ἐν Πνεύματι** — “Circumcision in heart, in spirit” — was then, as it is now, the only means of union with the Messiah; and, regarding the nation, therein was Abraham’s seed an *imperium in imperio*.

**3.** The relation, therefore, of CIRCUMCISION to CHRISTIAN BAPTISM is manifest. Both are initiations into peculiar religious privileges and immunities, the emblems of inward cleansing, the signs and seals of consecration to and faith in the God of Abraham. Baptism follows and succeeds to the ancient rite, not because of external likeness, but on account of identity of offices and import, in sealing and imaging the same spiritual truths. For the saving economy of Jehovah has been the same from the beginning; only the instruments, furniture, and external appliances have undergone change. The Zion of the old is the Zion of the newly-arranged Church; the ἄλλων has only been purged, its arena enlarged, and the machinery of the garnering process changed from a specific to a general object, from the national to the cosmical. The pious patriarch was a Christian in everything but name and extent of privilege. The longitude of the atonement is for all time, and the existence of the blessed; its latitude the breadth of the race. The change of the symbolic seal adapts it to a wider sphere, yet it is only in the visible form, not in the substance; it becomes a new and more eligible likeness of the same things.

“Circumcision and baptism correspond in meaning. They both relate to the renewal of the heart” (Carson, p. 367). It was a mark of distinction made upon those entering into covenant with God for worship and salvation; can baptism be either less or more? Compare Andrew Fuller, *Lect. Genesis 17*; Dr. L. Chase, *Design of Baptism*, in *Bapt. Tracts for the Times*, p. 26.

**4.** The writers of the N.T. bear testimony to the view here presented. St. Paul uses the very impressive words “buried with him” (Christ) “in baptism” — **συνταφέντες αὐτῷ ἐν τῷ βαπτίσματι** (<sup>5002</sup>Colossians 2:12), as synonymous with and explanatory of ἡ περιτομή τοῦ Χριστοῦ, “the circumcision of Christ.” Whatever intensity there is in the words “buried with him,” it was only the effort of the apostle to show how “baptism into Christ” was like circumcision; it “put off the body of the sins of the flesh.” Had such not been the scriptural meaning of circumcision, Paul would never have thus reasoned. What better testimony could be desired to prove the relation of the two rites, and that the one had succeeded the other? Objections from a want of external agreement or circumstances of administration can be of no force. The Greek **περιτομή**,

the Latin *circumcisio*, are etymological parities, but they are neither of them analogical forms with the Heb. **I Wm**, employed as a *technic* in Genesis 17. Yet the idea of the rite is, perhaps, as perfect under the Shemitic as under the European form.

**5.** The early ecclesiastical writers universally held these views here given. Their doctrine, made dependent on <sup>EBR</sup>John 3:5, that **βάπτισμα ἐξ ὕδατος καὶ πνεύματος**, *baptism of water and the Spirit*, was equivalent to **ἀναγέννησις ἐξ ὕδατος καὶ πνεύματος**, *regeneration by water and the Spirit*, caused them to speak of baptism as **ἡ περιτομή πνευματική**, *spiritual circumcision*, because the Spirit was always joined with the water in the baptism of an infant, or a converted, believing adult.

**6.** In Justin Martyr baptism is very frequently alluded to as the “true circumcision,” of which the ancient rite was a type (Apol. 1, 61; Dial. c. Trypho. 41). “*God commands you to be washed with this purification, and to be circumcised with the true circumcision*” (**λουσασθαι ὑμῖν τοῦτο τὸ λουτρὸν κελεύει ὁ Θεὸς, καὶ περιτέμνεσθαι τὴν ἀληθινὴν περιτομήν**) (Dial. c. Trypho. § 18). He says that Christians “had not received the fleshly circumcision, but the spiritual one, which Enoch and those like him made use of; and we received it — **διὰ τοῦ βαπτίσματος** — *through baptism*,” etc. (*ib.* § 43; comp. § 19). In § 29 of this dialogue he speaks of circumcision under the law as baptism. He says, “What need have I for circumcision who have the testimony of God in my favor?” (**Τίς ἐκείνου τοῦ βαπτίσματος χρεῖα ἀγίῳ πνεύματι βεβαπτισμένῳ;**) “What need have I of that other baptism, who have been baptized with the Holy Ghost?” This must be esteemed as a remarkable identification of the two rites, for we should not forget that, as the ordinance of baptism was to Justin “the water of life” (Dial. c. Trypho. § 14), so to receive it was to be baptized with the Holy Ghost. From the same point of view Basil asks certain ones who delayed baptism, “Do you put off the *circumcision made without hands* — **ἀχειροποιήτην περιτομήν** — *in putting off the flesh, which is performed in baptism?*” (**ἐν τῷ βαπτίσματι τελειουμένην**), *Orat. exhort. ad Bapt.* t. 2, ed. Ben. (Par. 1721). Cyprian and his council, Ep. 44, ad Fid., held in the baptism of infants that the analogy then followed of ancient circumcision should not be binding (*Nec spiritalem circumcisonem impediri carnali circumcissione debere*): “Nor ought the spiritual circumcision” (baptism) “to be hindered by the carnal circumcision.” On the principle that Christ was the real baptizer in the

Christian rite, Tertullian calls Christ *Novoe circumcisionis Purgator*, “the PURIFIER of the new circumcision” (*adv. Jud.* 3, 4; comp. Ambrose, lib. 2, *De Abrahamo Patr.* c. 11; Irenaeus, *Haer.* lib. 4, 30).

7. It remains to be observed, briefly, that the objection to circumcision (Acts 15; ~~AND~~ Galatians 5:2) was not to the rite itself, which was a seal of the covenant of promise, not of law, and must stand till abrogated by the perfection of the seed in Christ, and a new symbol be adopted in its stead. As the objects of the covenant were to be attained not by seminal propagation, but by moral and spiritual means, among all nations, it was fitting that the seal should correspond to these in its import. The “hostility,” therefore, was not to circumcision, but to the claim of salvation through the keeping of the law which it enjoined. In this, Christ would be set aside. Circumcision, in its proper sphere, was not “worthless,” or it never had been “the seal of the righteousness of faith.” The ancient symbol was gradually to melt away in the affections of the Jew, and by a wise moderation the apostles saw it accomplished. See, on this subject, Wardlaw, *Diss. on the Script. Authority of Infant Baptism*, p. 29-37; Hibbard, *Christian Baptism*, pp. 61-63; Pond, *On Baptism*, pp. 82-85; Rice, *On Baptism of Infants*, ch. 3; Fairbairn’s *Typology of Scripture*, 1, 274-277; Dwight, *Theology*, Sermon 148; Watson, *Institutes*, 2, 616-626; Wesley, *Works*, N. Y. ed. 6; Buchanan, *On Justification*, Edinb. 1867, p. 68-73.

### Circumcision, Festival Of The,

a festival celebrated in the Roman and English churches on the 1st of January, in commemoration of the circumcision of Christ. After the introduction of the festival of Christmas, the 1st of January was distinguished as *octava natalis Domini*, the octave of the nativity, as Christ was circumcised on the eighth day. “At first it was observed rather as a day of humiliation than of feasting; and this was designed to mark the difference between the manners of Christians and those of the heathen, who celebrated the kalends of January, as the chief day of their saturnalia, with great licentiousness” (Farrar, s.v.). The festival originated, probably, in the 7th century. — Siegel, *Handbuch d. kirchlich-christlichen Alterthümer*, 1, 207, and references there.

## Cis

(Κίς v.r. Κείς), the Graecized form (<4132>Acts 13:21) of the name of KISH (q.v.), the father of king Saul.

## Ci'sai

(rather *Cisceus*, Κισαῖος), another Graecized form (Esther 11:2) of the name of KISH (q.v.), the great-grandfather of Mordecai (<1705>Esther 2:5).

## Cisleu

*SEE CHISLEU.*

## Cisneros

*SEE XIMENES.*

## Cistercians

(or CISTERTIANS), an order of monks founded in the year 1098 by Robert, a Benedictine, and abbot of Moleme, in Burgundy. Finding it impossible to preserve discipline in his convent, he retired, with twenty of his best monks, to Citeaux, in the diocese of Chalons, where he laid the foundations of the famous order named from the place. Robert, being ordered by the pope to resume the government of the abbey of Moleme, was succeeded in that of Citeaux by Alberic; and pope Paschal II, by a bull of the year 1100, took Citeaux under his protection. Alberic drew up the first statutes for the monks of Citeaux, or Cistercians, in which he enjoined a strict observance of the rules of St. Benedict. The habit of the order was a white robe in the form of a cassock: it was at first black; but they pretend that the holy Virgin, appearing to Alberic, gave him a white habit, and from this time they changed the black for white, retaining the black scapular and hood: their garment was girt with a black girdle of wool: in the choir they had a white cowl, and over it a hood, with a rochet hanging down before to the waist, and in a point behind to the calf of the leg. In memory of the change of habit, a festival was observed on the 5th of August, called "The descent of the blessed Virgin at Citeaux, and the miraculous changing from black to white." The order made surprising progress. "From the very first, the Cistercians were the spoiled children of the apostolic see, and every conceivable privilege and exemption was heaped upon them" (*Christian Remembrancer*, July, 1867, p. 4). About

1128 the first Cistercian abbey in England was founded by Giffard, bishop of Winchester, at Waverley, Surrey. The order spread in England rapidly, and accumulated vast estates. Eighty-five abbeys in various parts of England owned the maternity either of Citeaux or Clairvaux. Fifty years after its institution the order had five hundred abbeys; and one hundred years after it boasted of one thousand eight hundred abbeys, most of which had been founded before the year 1200.

The government of the order was in the hands of twenty-five *definitores*, the first of whom was the abbot of Citeaux, who, as abbot general, was the head of the whole order. Next to him in dignity were the abbots La Ferte, Pontigny, Clairvaux, and Morimond, the four oldest convents after Citeaux. The abbot of Citeaux appointed four other *definitores*. The abbots of La Ferte, Pontigny, Clairvaux, and Morimond nominated together twenty (five each), four of whom, i.e. one of each nomination, were rejected by the abbot general. The legislative assembly, called the General Chapter, met originally annually. They did not settle in any diocese before the bishop had accepted the Charta Charitatis, the fundamental law of the order, which had been given in 1119 by abbot Stephen of Citeaux. In 1143 the king of Portugal imposed upon his whole kingdom the duties of vassalage towards the abbey of Clairvaux, so that (in 1578) claims were laid by the latter to all Portugal. The decay of the Cistercians began with the rise of the mendicant orders. Their history consists mostly in efforts of popes and some abbots to stay the flood of corruption which early overflowed the whole order. These efforts were usually unsuccessful, but led to the establishment of a number of reformed congregations, which received from the popes the privilege of an independent organization. The most important are those founded in Spain in 1469, in Tuscany in 1497, and that founded by pope Urban VIII in 1630. The present number of abbeys is very limited. There were in 1843 16 abbeys, with 499 members, in Austria; 9 in Italy, several of which have since been suppressed by the Sardinian government; 3 in Switzerland, of which one has since been suppressed; 1 in Belgium; and 1 in Poland. Since then they have re-established themselves also in England, at St. Susan's, Lullworth, and Mount St. Bernard, in Leicestershire. Several other monastic organizations owe their origin directly or indirectly to the Cistercians. The Templars received their rule from St. Bernard of Clairvaux. The Spanish knights of Calatrava, Alcantara, and Montesa, and the Portuguese of Avis and Christ, were affiliated to the Cistercians. The Feuillants took their origin in 1574 in



the reformed Cistercian abbey of Feuillans, near Toulouse. The austere congregation that sprung from them are the Trappists, founded in 1662. See Fehr, *Geschichte der Monchsorden*, 1, 90 sq.; *A concise History of the Cistercian Order* (London, 1852, sm. 8vo); Maillard, *Dark Ages*, p. 358; Luard, *Annales Monastici*, vols. 1, 2 (Lond. 1864, 1865); *Christian Remembrancer*, July, 1867, art. 1. **SEE TRAPPISTS.**

## Cistercian Nuns

### Picture for Cistercian Nuns

(*Bernardines*), a religious order founded in 1120 by abbot Stephen of Citeaux for the convent of Tarb. They followed the rule of Citeaux under the superintendence of the abbot general of the Cistercians. Later, they were frequently subjected to the jurisdiction of the bishops. Their habit was white, with a black veil, scapular, and girdle. They gradually amassed immense riches, and numbered as many as 6000 convents. In Germany some of the abbesses were raised to the dignity of princesses of the empire, and remained so until 1803. Among all their convents, that of *Port Royal* (q.v.), in France, became the most celebrated. Only a few convents are left, viz. in Switzerland (which has now by far the largest number), in Italy, Bavaria, Saxony, and France. **SEE TRAPPISTS.**

## Cistern

(**raB** or **r/B**, *bor'*, from **raB**; to *dig* or *bore*, Gesenius, *Thes. Heb.* p. 176; Sept. usually **λάκκος**; Vulg. *cisterna* or *lacus*; A. V. generally “pool”), a receptacle for water, either conducted from an external spring, or proceeding from rain-fall (<sup><24213></sup>Jeremiah 2:13; <sup><21615></sup>Proverbs 5:15; <sup><21126></sup>Ecclesiastes 12:6; <sup><24616></sup>Jeremiah 36:16; a *pit*, as often rendered; the mod. Arab. *birkeh*). Thus the cistern is essentially distinguished from the living spring **ʾyāʾin** *a'yin*; but from the well **raB]** *beer'*, only in the fact that *beer* is almost always used to denote a place ordinarily containing water rising on the spot, while **r/B**, *bor*, is often used for a dry pit, or one that may be left dry at pleasure (Stanley, *Palest.* p. 512, 514). See AIN. But the pit into which Joseph was cast by his brethren (<sup><01324></sup>Genesis 37:24) was a *beer* or dry well (Thomson, *Land and Book*, 1, 442).

The dryness of the summer months between May and September in Syria, and the scarcity of springs in many parts of the country, make it necessary

to collect in reservoirs and cisterns the rain-water, of which an abundance falls in the intermediate period (Shaw, *Travels*, p. 335; Jerome, quoted by Harmer, 1, 148; Robinson, 2:98; Kitto, *Thys. Geogr. of Palest.* p. 302, 303). See WELL. Hence the frequent mention of cisterns in Scripture, and more especially of those which are found in the open country. These were, it seems, the property of those by whom they were formed (<sup>0022</sup>Numbers 21:22). They are usually little more than large pits (see Ecclesiasticus 1:3), but sometimes take the character of extensive subterraneous vaults, open only by a small mouth, like that of a well. They are filled with rain-water, and (where the climate allows) with snow during winter, and are then closed at the mouth with large flat stones, over which sand is spread in such a way as to prevent their being easily discovered (comp. the “sealed fountain” of <sup>23412</sup>Song of Solomon 4:12). If by any chance the waters which the shepherd has thus treasured up are lost by means of an earthquake or some other casualty, or are stolen, both he and his flocks are exposed to great and imminent danger, as are also travelers who hasten to a cistern and find its waters gone (comp. Judith 7:21). For this reason a failure of water is used as the image of any great calamity (<sup>23417</sup>Isaiah 41:17, 18; 44:3). There is usually a large deposit of mud at the bottom of these cisterns, so that he who falls into them, even when they are without water, is liable to perish miserably (<sup>01572</sup>Genesis 37:22 sq.; <sup>24806</sup>Jeremiah 38:6; <sup>24883</sup>Lamentations 3:53; <sup>09412</sup>Psalms 40:2; 69:15). In cities the cisterns were works of much labor, for they were either hewn in the rocks or surrounded with subterraneous walls, and lined with a fine incrustation. **SEE BETHESDA.** The system which in this respect formerly prevailed in Palestine is doubtless the same that exists at present; and indeed there is every probability that most of the cisterns now in use were constructed in very ancient times. Dr. Robinson assures us that “the main dependence of Jerusalem at the present day is on its cisterns; and this has probably always been the case” (*Researches*, 1, 480). Both large and small cisterns are frequent throughout the whole of Syria and Palestine, and for the construction of them the rocky nature of the ground affords peculiar facilities, either in original excavations or by enlargement of natural cavities. Dr. Robinson remarks that the inhabitants of all the hill country of Judah and Benjamin are in the habit of collecting water during the rainy season in tanks and cisterns, in the cities and fields, and along the high roads, for the sustenance of themselves and their flocks, and for the comfort of the passing traveler. Many of these are obviously antique, and exist along ancient roads now deserted. On the long-forgotten way from

Jericho to Bethel “broken cisterns” of high antiquity are found at regular intervals. Jerusalem, described by Strabo as well supplied with water, in a dry neighborhood (16, 760), depends mainly for this upon its cisterns, of which almost every private house possesses one or more, excavated in the rock on which the city is built. The following are the dimensions of four belonging to the house in which Dr. R. resided: 1, 15 x 8 x 12 feet deep; 2, 8 x 4 x 15; 3, 10 x 10 x 15; 4, 30 x 30 x 20. The cisterns have usually a round opening at the top, sometimes built up with stone-work above, and furnished with a curb and a wheel for the bucket (<sup><2116></sup>Ecclesiastes 12:6), so that they have externally much the appearance of an ordinary well. The water is conducted into them from the roofs of the houses during the rainy season, and with care remains sweet during the whole summer and autumn. In this manner most of the larger houses and public buildings are supplied (*ib.*). Josephus (*War*, 4, 4, 4) describes the abundant provision for water supply in the towers and fortresses of Jerusalem, a supply which has contributed greatly to its capacity for defense, while the dryness of the neighborhood has in all cases hindered the operations of besiegers. Thus Hezekiah stopped the supply of water outside the city in anticipation of the attack of Sennacherib (<sup><433></sup>2 Chronicles 32:3, 4). The progress of Antiochus Sidetes (B.C. 134) was at first retarded by want of water, though this want was afterwards unexpectedly relieved (Joseph. *Ant.* 13, 8, 2; Clinton, 3, 331). Josephus also imputes to divine interposition the supply of water with which the army of Titus was furnished after suffering from want of it (*War*, 5, 9, 4). The Crusaders also, during the siege A.D. 1099, were harassed by extreme want of water, while the besieged were fully supplied (Matth. Paris, *Hist.* p. 46, 49, ed. Wat.). Benjamin of Tudela says very little water is found at Jerusalem, but the inhabitants drink rain-water, which they collect in their houses (Bohn’s ed. of *Early Travels*, p. 84). Barclay gives the most complete description of the subterranean reservoirs of Jerusalem, particularly those under the Haram enclosure (*City of the Great King*, p. 226, etc.). **SEE JERUSALEM.** The defense of Masada by Joseph, brother of Herod, against Antigonus was enabled to be prolonged owing to an unexpected replenishing of the cisterns by a shower of rain (Josephus, *Ant.* 14, 15, 2), and in a subsequent passage he describes the cisterns and reservoirs by which that fortress was plentifully supplied with water, as he had previously done in the case of Jerusalem and Malchaerus (*War*, 4, 4, 4; 4:6, 2: 7:8, 3). Burckhardt mentions cisterns belonging to private houses, among other places, at Sermein, near Aleppo (*Syria*, p. 121), El Bara, in the Orontes valley (p. 132), Dhami and Missema in the

Lejah (p. 110, 112, 118). Tiberias (p. 331), Kerek in Moab (p. 377), Mount Tabor (p. 334). Of some at Hableh, near Gilgal, the dimensions are given by Robinson (*Later Researches*, p. 137): 1, 7 X 5 X 3 feet deep; 2, nearly the same as 1; 3, 12 x 9 x 8. They have one or two steps to descend into them, as is the case with one near Gaza, now disused, described by Sandys as “a mighty cistern, filled only by the rain-water, and descended into by stairs of stone” (Sandys, p. 150; but see Robinson, 2, 376). Of those at Hableh, some were covered with flat stones, resting on arches, some entirely open, and all evidently ancient (Robinson, new ed. 3, 137). Dr. Olin (*Travels*, 2, 84) describes something of a better sort near Hebron: “Just without the city are some cisterns, which probably belong to a very early age. A large basin, forty-seven paces square, stands outside the gate by which we entered the city. It was nearly full of greenish water, and has been repaired at a period apparently not very remote. It is of very solid workmanship, built of hewn limestone, and may be eighteen or twenty feet deep. The descent is by flights of stairs situated at the four corners, by which the water is brought up in vessels and skins, and poured into troughs for the flocks, or carried away for domestic uses. It was not at this time fit for drinking. Another pool, of smaller dimensions, occupies higher ground on the north side of the city. These reservoirs are filled by the rains, and are unconnected with any perennial fountain.” Vitruvius (8, 7) describes the method in use in his day for constructing water-tanks, but the native rock of Palestine usually superseded the necessity of more art in this work than is sufficient to excavate a basin of the required dimensions. The city of Alexandria is supplied with water contained in arched cisterns supported by pillars, extending under a great part of the old city (Van Egmont, *Travels*, 2, 134). **SEE POOL.**

Empty cisterns were sometimes used as prisons and places of confinement. Joseph was cast into a “pit” (r/B, <sup><01572></sup>Genesis 37:22), and his “dungeon” is called by the same name (<sup><0414></sup>Genesis 41:14). Jeremiah was thrown into a miry though empty cistern, whose depth is indicated by the cords used to let him down (<sup><24816></sup>Jeremiah 38:6). To this prison tradition has assigned a locality near the gate called Herod’s gate (Hasselquist, p. 140; Maundrell, Bohn’s ed. of *Early Travels*, p. 448). **SEE PRISON.** According to Thomson (*Land and Book*, 2, 262-4), dry cisterns are often used in Palestine for granaries, and are very liable to be plundered of their wheat by ants. **SEE GRANARY.**

Various allusions by way of figure are made to cisterns in Scripture. The breaking of the wheel at the cistern — the wheel that was used to send down and pull up again the bucket which drew water from the larger cisterns — is used in <sup>(2126)</sup>Ecclesiastes 12:6, as an image of the- breaking up of the- animal economy, which perpetually sends, while it is at work, the flow of vital blood from the heart to the extremities. To drink waters out of one's own cistern is a proverbial expression (<sup>(3165)</sup>Proverbs 5:15) for confining one's self to the legitimate sources of pleasure which God has associated with our state, as contradistinguished from those which are the property of others. But the merely human and artificial nature of cisterns, which are of man's workmanship, and have no living spring within them, serve as a fit emblem of the insufficiency of creature confidences, and of the folly of preferring these to the infinite and everflowing fullness of God as in the solemn charge of the prophet, "My people have committed two evils: they have forsaken me, the fountain of living waters, and hewed them out cisterns, broken cisterns that can hold no water" (<sup>(2423)</sup>Jeremiah 2:13).  
**SEE WATER.**

### Cistertians

**SEE CISTERCIANS.**

### Citeaux

**SEE CISTERCIANS.**

### Cithern

#### Picture for Cithern

(κίθάρᾱ, 1 Maccabees 4:54, i.e. *cithara* or *guitar*), a musical instrument most probably of Greek origin, employed by the Chaldaeans at balls and routs, and introduced by the Hebrews into Palestine on their return thither after the Babylonian captivity. The cithern was of the guitar species, and was known at a later period as the *cittern*, under which name it is mentioned by the old dramatists as having constituted part of the furniture of a barber's shop. Of the sama species is the *Cither* or *Zither* of Southern Germany, the Tyrol, and Switzerland.

With respect to the shape of the cithern or cithara mentioned in the Apocrypha, the opinion of the learned is divided: according to some, it resembled in form the Greek delta, Δ; others represent it as a halfmoon; and others, again, like the

modern guitar. In many Eastern countries it is still in use with strings, varying in number from three to twenty-four. Under the name of *Koothir*, travelers describe it as a wooden plate or dish. with a hole beneath, and a piece of skin stretched above like a drum. Two sticks, joined after the manner of a fan, pass through the skin at the end, and where the two sticks stand apart, they are connected by a transversal piece of wood. From the upper end of this wooden triangle to the point below are fastened five chords, which, at a little distance above their junction, pass over a bridge, like the strings of a violin. The chords are made to vibrate by means of a leather thong fastened to one of the lateral sticks of the triangle (see Mendelssohn's edition of the *Psalms*, 2d Pref.).

The cithara, if it be not the same with, resembles very closely the instruments mentioned in the book of Psalms, under the denominations of  $\text{r/NK}\text{\AA} \text{b}\text{r}\text{e}\text{b}\text{G}\text{[}\mu$  respectively rendered in the A.V. "harp," "psaltery," "organ." In Chaldee, *cithara* is transferred as  $\mu/\text{r}\text{t}\text{h}\text{i}$  the *Keri* for  $\mu/\text{r}\text{t}\text{y}\text{\AA}^{\text{ZIB}}$  Daniel 3:5), in the A. V. rendered "harp," and the same Engl. word is employed instead of *cithern* (1 Maccabees 4:54) in Robert Barker's edition of the *English Bible* (London, 1615). Gesenius (*Theb. Heb.* p. 215) considers cithara as the same with harp; but Luther translates  $\text{κ}\text{i}\text{\theta}\text{\AA}\text{r}\text{a}\text{i}\text{c}$  by *mit Pfeifen*, "with pipes." **SEE HARP.**

## Cities

**SEE CITY.**

## Cit'im

( $\text{Κ}\text{i}\text{\tau}\text{i}\text{\AA}\text{o}\text{i}$  v. r.  $\text{Κ}\text{i}\text{\tau}\text{i}\text{\AA}\text{i}\text{o}\text{i}$ , Vulg. *Cetei*, A. V. "Citims"), a nation whose king Perseus is mentioned (1 Maccabees 8:5) as having been defeated by the Romans; evidently the CHITTIM **SEE CHITTIM** (q.v.), or Macedonians.

## Citizenship

the rights and privileges of a native or adopted citizen ( $\text{πο}\text{\lambda}\text{i}\text{\tau}\text{i}\text{\tau}\text{h}\text{s}$ , 2 Maccabees 4:50; 5:6; 9:15, 19;  $\text{L}\text{u}\text{k}\text{e}$  15:15; 19:14;  $\text{A}\text{c}\text{t}\text{s}$  21:39), in distinction from a foreigner. The laws in this respect are very different in different ages and countries. **SEE ALIEN.**

**I. Hebrew.** — Under the Mosaic constitution, which was framed on a basis of religious rather than of political privileges and distinctions, the idea of the commonwealth (πολιτεία, <sup><4012></sup>Ephesians 2:12) was merged in that of the congregation, to which every Hebrew, and even strangers under certain restrictions, were admitted. **SEE CONGREGATION.** Strict isolation did by no means, as some suppose, form the leading principle in the system of theocracy as laid down by Moses, since even non-Israelites, under various names **SEE STRANGER**, not only were allowed to reside in Palestine, but had the fullest protection of the law equally with the native Israelites (<sup><0219></sup>Exodus 12:19; <sup><0222></sup>Leviticus 24:22; <sup><04515></sup>Numbers 15:15; 35:15; <sup><0116></sup>Deuteronomy 1:16; 24:17: the law of usury, <sup><0231></sup>Deuteronomy 23:20, made, however, an exception), and were, besides, recommended in general terms by Moses to humanity and charity (<sup><0221></sup>Exodus 22:21; 23:9; <sup><0193></sup>Leviticus 19:33, 34; <sup><0108></sup>Deuteronomy 10:18; comp. <sup><0176></sup>Jeremiah 7:6; <sup><0185></sup>Malachi 3:5; see Josephus, *Apion*, 2, 28), as well as to a participation in certain prerogatives granted to the poor of the land, such as a share in the tithe and feast-offering, and the harvest in the jubilee-year (<sup><0149></sup>Deuteronomy 14:29; 16:10, 14; 26:11; <sup><0236></sup>Leviticus 25:6). In return, it was required on the part of non-Israelites not to commit acts by which the religious feelings of the people might be hurt (<sup><0210></sup>Exodus 20:10; <sup><0170></sup>Leviticus 17:10; 18:26; 20:2; 24:16; <sup><0154></sup>Deuteronomy 5:14. The eating of an animal which had died a natural death, <sup><0141></sup>Deuteronomy 14:21, seems to have been the sole exception). The advantage the Jew had over the Gentile was thus strictly spiritual, in his being a citizen, a member of the theocracy (the *h/hy|l hq|* *community of Jehovah*, <sup><0443></sup>Numbers 16:3; <sup><0232></sup>Deuteronomy 23:2), on whom positive laws were enjoined. But even to this spiritual privilege Gentiles were admitted under certain restrictions (<sup><0231></sup>Deuteronomy 23:1-9); thus we find among the Israelites, Doeg, an Edomite (<sup><0218></sup>1 Samuel 21:8), as also Uriah, a Hittite (a Canaanite). The only nations that were altogether excluded from the citizenship of the theocracy by especial command of the Lord were the Ammonites and Moabites, from a feeling of vengeance against them; and in the same situation were all castrated persons and bastards, from a feeling of disgrace and shame (<sup><0201></sup>Deuteronomy 23:1-6). In the time of Solomon no less than 153,600 strangers were resident in Palestine (<sup><4017></sup>2 Chronicles 2:17). **SEE GENTILE.**

**II. Roman.** — The right of citizenship (πολιτεία, “freedom,” <sup><4028></sup>Acts 22:28, i.e. to be considered as equal to natives of the city of Rome, *jus*



*civitatis, civitas*) was granted in the times of the emperors to whole provinces and cities (Dio Cass. 41:25; Suet. *Aug.* 47), as also to single individuals (Tacit. *Annal.* 1:58; Sueton. *Nero*, 12; Dio Cass. 43:39; Appian, *Civ.* 3. 26), for some service rendered to the state (Cic. *Balb.* 22) or the imperial family (Sueton. *Aug.* 47), sometimes through mere favor (Tacit. *Hist.* 3. 41), or even for a certain sum of money (<sup>4028</sup>Acts 22:28; Dio Cass. 41, 24; see Heinecc. *Antiq. jur. Romans* 1, 1, 11 sq.). The apostle Paul was a Roman citizen (*civis natus*, Sueton. *Calig.* 38; see Amntzen, *De civitate Romans apost. Pauli*, Utr. 1725) by family (Acts, 1.c.) **SEE TARSUS**, and hence his protesting against corporal or capital punishment (<sup>4167</sup>Acts 16:37; comp. Cic. *Verr.* v. 57, 65; Eusebius *Hist. Eccles.* 5, 1, etc.). It appears from a variety of passages in the classic writers that a Roman citizen could not legally be scourged (*virgis* or *flagellis coedi*); this punishment being deemed to the last degree dishonorable, and the most daring indignity and insult upon the Roman name. Such was the famous “*Porcia Lex.*” “A Roman citizen, judges,” exclaims Cicero, in his oration against Verres, “was publicly beaten with rods in the forum of Messina; during this public dishonor, no groan, no other expression of the unhappy wretch was heard amid the cruelties he suffered, and the sound of the strokes that were inflicted, but this: ‘I am a Roman citizen!’” “Neither was it lawful for a Roman citizen to be bound, or to be examined by the question, or torture, to extort a confession from him. These punishments were deemed servile; torture was only inflicted upon slaves; freemen were exempted from this inhumanity and ignominy. The right once obtained descended to a man’s children (<sup>4028</sup>Acts 22:28; see Zimmern, *Gesch. des rom. Privat-rechts*, 1, 2, 441). The Jews had rendered signal services to Julius Caesar in the Egyptian war (Josephus, *Ant.* 14, 8, 1 and 2), and it is not improbable that many obtained the freedom of the city on that ground; certain it is that great numbers of Jews who were Roman citizens were scattered over Greece and Asia Minor (*Ant.* 14, 10, 13 and 14). Among the privileges attached to citizenship, the most noteworthy was the above, that a man could not be bound or imprisoned without a formal trial (<sup>4019</sup>Acts 20:29), still less be scourged (<sup>4167</sup>Acts 16:37; Cic. *Verr.* 5:63, 66); the simple assertion of citizenship was sufficient to deter a magistrate from such a step (<sup>4025</sup>Acts 22:25; Cic. *Verr.* v. 62), as any infringement of the privilege was visited with severe punishment. A Jew could only plead exemption from such treatment before a Roman magistrate; he was still liable to it from Jewish authorities (<sup>4713</sup>2 Corinthians 11:24; Selden, *Syn.* 2, 15, § 11). Another privilege attaching to citizenship was the appeal from a provincial



tribunal to the emperor at Rome (<del>4251</del> Acts 25:11). **SEE APPEAL**. The rights of the Roman citizen included several other important privileges: he had a full right over his property, his children, and his dependents; he had a voice in the assemblies of the people, and in the election of magistrates; and his testament had full authority after his death. See Smith's *Dict. of Class. Antiq.* s.v. Civitas; Sigon. *De antiquojure civ. Roman.* (Par. 1572; Hal. 1715; also in Grasvii *Thesaur.* 1); Spanheim, *Orbis Romans* (London, 1703; Hal. 1728); Cellarii *Dissertatt.* p. 715 sq.; also Bittner, *De civ. Romans virgideniis exempt.* (Jen. 1672); Lange, *De immunitate civ. Roman.* (Hafn. 1710). **SEE FREEMAN**.

## Citron

### Picture for Citron 1

### Picture for Citron 2

(κίτριον, the tree is κιτρία or κιτρέα, but was long without a special name among the Greeks, although they were well acquainted with it; see Smith, *Dict. of Class. Antiq.* s.v. Citrus). In his account of Alexander Jannaeus, Josephus tells us, "His own people were seditious against him; for at a festival which was then celebrated, when he stood upon the altar and was going to sacrifice, the nation rose upon him, and pelted him with citrons, for the law of the Jews required that at the festival of tabernacles every one should have branches of the palm-tree and citron-tree" (*Ant.* 13, 13, 5). The late Lady Callcott, in her *Scripture Herbal*, mentions that, as the modern Jews still use citrons at the feast of tabernacles, "in London considerable sums of money are expended in importing them of the best kind for the purpose. They must be without blemish, and the stalk must still adhere to them. After the feast is over, the citrons are openly sold, and the money produced by the sale is placed in the common treasury, as part of the provision I for the poor of the congregation." Their anxiety to obtain them with the stalk still adhering is no doubt a faint effort to secure the "thick" branches and "boughs of goodly trees" required for that festival (Leviticus 33:40). But the chief importance of this fruit is its supposed identity with the הַיְּפֹתִי *tappu'ach*, or "apple" of the Bible, a conclusion, however, which has been ably disputed. **SEE APPLE**. The citron, or *Citrus medica*-so called because it was from Media' that the Romans first received it-belongs to the natural order of Aurantiaceae, a delightful group, including the orange, the lime, the lemon, and the shaddock (see the *Penny*

*Cyclopaedia*, s.v. Citrus). With its dark, glossy, laurel-looking leaves, its evergreen branches; often bearing simultaneously ripe fruits and newly-opened flowers, and thus vouchsafing to the pilgrim who rests in its deep shadow the twofold refreshment of a delicious banquet and a fragrant breeze, the citron may well claim pre-eminence “among the trees of the wood” (Song of Solomon 2: 3). Abounding in malic and citric acid, the juice of the orange and its congeners is one of the most agreeable antidotes which the Creator’s bounty has provided against the exhausting thirst and incipient fever of sultry climes. A settler in the torrid swamps of the Amazon will devour a dozen oranges before his morning meal (*Voyage up the Amazon*, in the “Home and Colonial Library”), and in tropical regions such acidulous fruits are invaluable on account of their and-febrile virtues. These were doubtless well known to the Hebrews, and, in common with all antiquity, they greatly prized the pleasant pungent odor emitted by the rind. Macrobius speaks of “citrosa vestis,” showing that it was usual to keep citrons in wardrobes for the sake of their perfume; and, like the modern Oriental ladies, whose favorite vinaigrette is a citron, in England two or three centuries ago an orange was so commonly used as a scentbottle that it may often be seen in old pictures of their queens and peeresses. It was also believed to have a disinfecting potency; and during the plague of London, people walked the streets smelling at oranges. Understood as belonging to this beautiful family, there is a peculiar felicity in the comparison, “A word fitly spoken is like citrons of gold in salvers (or baskets) of silver” (<sup><1015></sup>Proverbs 25:11). The famous golden apples which grew in the gardens of the Hesperides were unquestionably either citrons or oranges. *SEE BOTANY*.

## City

The Hebrews term most frequently thus rendered is **ry[** אר, literally something *raised up*, i.e. having walls *reared*; or from **rW[** , to *keep guard* [Gesenius, *Thes. Heb.* p. 1004]; Sept. and N.T. πόλις), a word of very extensive signification, embracing not only the idea of an encampment, as a nomade hamlet (<sup><1017></sup>Genesis 4:17), but also that of small fortifications, as watch-posts or watch-towers (comp. <sup><1039></sup>Numbers 13:19; <sup><1279></sup>2 Kings 17:9; <sup><2008></sup>Isaiah 1:8), and thence extended to regular towns. Nearly equivalent to this is **hyrḥa** (kiryah’), which, with a few exceptions (<sup><1026></sup>Deuteronomy 2:26; <sup><1041></sup>1 Kings 1:41, 45), is found only in the poetic style; and analogous (in sense, as probably also in derivation) to this last is **trq**, (*ke’reth*),

found only in <sup><8207></sup>Job 29:7; <sup><2108></sup>Proverbs 8:3; 9:3, 14; 11:11. The word rendered “city” in <sup><8811></sup>Ruth 3:11, is *r [vi](sha’ar)*, properly *gate*. (as it is elsewhere rendered), and there means those assembled in *the forum* or place of public business at the town gates. The second of these terms (perhaps from *hrq;* to *approach* as an enemy, or rather [Gesenius, *Thes. Heb.* p. 1236] to *fortify*), is often “prefixed to the names of towns on both sides of the Jordan existing before the conquest, as Kirjath-Arba, probably the most ancient name for city, but seldom used in prose as a general name for town (Stanley, *Palest. App.* § 80). The classification of the human race into dwellers in towns and nomade wanderers (<sup><0001></sup>Genesis 4:20, 22) seems to be intimated by the etymological sense of both words, *Ar*, or *Ir*, and *Kirjath*, as places of security against an enemy, distinguished from the unwall’d village or hamlet, whose resistance is more easily overcome by the marauding tribes of the desert. *SEE IR-; SEE KIRJATH.* This distinction is found actually existing in countries, as Persia and Arabia, in which the tent-dwellers are found, like the Rechabites, almost side by side with the dwellers in cities, sometimes even sojourning within them, but not amalgamated with the inhabitants, and in general making the desert their home, and, unlike the Rechabites, robbery their undissembled occupation (<sup><0717></sup>Judges 5:7; <sup><2830></sup>Jeremiah 35:9, 11; see Fraser, *Persia*, p. 366, 380; Malcolm, *Sketches of Persia*, p. 147-156; Burckhardt, *Notes on Bedouins*, 1, 157; Wellsted, *Travels in Arabia*, 1, 335; Porter, *Damascus*, 2, 96, 181, 188; Vaux, *Nineveh and Persepolis*, c. 2, note A; Layard, *Nineveh*, 2, 272; *Nin. and Bab.* p. 141).” *SEE VILLAGE.*

**1.** Towns are a natural result of the aggregative principle in human nature. Necessity led the early races of men to build their towns on lofty spots, where, with the aid of the natural advantages of the ground, they could easily protect themselves against beasts of prey and human foes. A town, and a stronghold or fort, would thus be originally identical. As population increased and agriculture spread, so some degree of security came, which permitted the inhabitants of the castle to diffuse themselves over the hill-side, and take up their abode in the valley, and by the side of the stream that lay nearest their acropolis; still the inhabitants kept at no great distance from the center of strength, in order not to be deprived of its protection. The town, however, would thus be enlarged, and as the necessity for self-defense still existed, so would the place soon be surrounded with walls. Thus there would be outer and inner bulwarks, and in some sort two species of community — the townspeople, who tilled the ground and

carried on trade, and the soldiers, whose business it was to afford protection: these two, however, in the earliest stages of civilization, were one, the peasant and tradesman taking arms when the town was put in danger. How early towns were formed cannot be determined by any general principle: they were obviously a work of time. The primary tendency in population was to diffuse itself. Aggregation on particular spots would take place at a later period. When, then, Cain is said to have built a city (<sup>COCH17</sup>Genesis 4:17), we have evidence which concurs with other intimations to show that it is only a partial history of the first ages that we possess in the records of the book of Genesis. In the time of the Patriarchs we find towns existing in Palestine which were originally surrounded with fortifications, so as to make them “fenced cities.” (See below.) In these dwelt the agricultural population, who, by means of these places of strength, defended themselves and their property from the nomad tribes of the neighboring desert, who then, as they do now, lived by plunder. Nor were works of any great strength necessary. In Palestine at the present day, while walls are in most parts an indispensable protection, and agriculture can be advantageously prosecuted only so far as sheltered by a fortified town, erections of a very slight nature are found sufficient for the purpose, the rather because the most favorable localities offer themselves on: all sides, owing to the natural inequality of the ground. Hence we find that hills or eminences were almost invariably chosen as sites for this purpose, a fact which even grew into a proverb “a city upon a hill.” (See Hackett’s *Illustra. of Script.* p. 70.)

Of the ancient method of building in towns and cities we have no accurate knowledge, any farther than we may gather information from the ruins which still lie on the soil of Palestine. But these ruins can afford only general notions, as, though they are numerous, and show that the Land of Promise was thickly peopled and highly flourishing in its better days, the actual remains of ancient towns are to be ascribed to different and very distant periods of history. The Crusades left many strongholds which are now in a state of dilapidation; but the Crusades are of modern days compared with the time of the Savior, which itself is remote from the proper antiquity of the nation. The law of sameness, however, which prevails so rigidly in Eastern countries, gives us an assurance that a modern town in Palestine may be roughly taken as a type of its ancient predecessors. (See Olin’s *Travels*, 2, 423.) To distinguish cities that bore the same name, the name of the tribe was added. In “the latter days,”

especially under the Herods, it was the fashion to give to ancient towns new Greek names, as Diospolis, Neapolis, Sebaste, Cmesarea, Tiberias. Jerusalem, at a later period, was denominated AELia Capitolina. These innovations indicated the slavish disposition of the age, and were tokens of the bondage in which the nation was held.

Palestine underwent constant changes in regard to its towns from the earliest ages; one consequence of which is, that there are names of towns that belong exclusively to certain eras. The period of the Roman domination gave existence, as to structures of great splendor, so to many towns and fortified places. Galilee was especially rich in towns and villages, which, according to Josephus (*Life*, 45), amounted in all to the number of 204. The names of the. Palestinian cities, for the most part, have meaning, reference being made to the nature of the locality or the character of the inhabitants. The population of towns cannot now be ascertained with any degree of accuracy, for the materials are not only scanty and disconnected, but in a measure uncertain. *SEE CENSUS.*

**2.** The earliest notice in Scripture of city-building is of that of the city called Enoch (q.v.) by Cain, in the land of his “exile” (*Nod*, <sup>חֵוֹחַ</sup>Genesis 4:17). After the confusion of tongues, the descendants of Nimrod founded Babel, Erech, Accad, and Calneh, in the land of Shinar; and Asshur, a branch from the same stock, built Nineveh, Rehoboth-by-the-river, Calah, and Resen, the last being “a great city.” A subsequent passage mentions Sidon, Gaza, Sodom, Gomorrah, Admah, Zeboim, and Lasha, as cities of the Canaanites, but without implying for them antiquity equal to that of Nineveh and the rest (<sup>חֵוֹחַ</sup>Genesis 10:10-12, 19; 11:3, 9; 36:37). Sir H. Rawlinson supposes, (1.) that the expedition of Chedorlaomer (<sup>חֵוֹחַ</sup>Genesis 14) was prior to the building of Babylon or Nineveh, indicating a migration or conquest from Persia or Assyria; (2.) that by Nimrod is to be understood, not an individual, but a name denoting the “settlers” in the Assyrian plain; and (3.) that the names Rehoboth, Calah, etc., when first mentioned, only denoted sites of buildings afterwards erected. He supposes that Nineveh was built about B.C. 1250, and Calah about a century later, while Babylon appears to have existed in the 15th century B.C. If this be correct, We must infer that the places then attacked, Sodom, Gomorrah, etc., were cities of higher antiquity than Nineveh or Babylon, inasmuch as when they were destroyed a few years later they were cities in every sense of the term. The name Kirjathaim, “double city” (Gesenius, *Thesaur. Heb.* p. 1236), indicates an existing city, and not a site only. It may be added

that the remains of civic buildings existing in Moab are evidently very ancient, if not, in some cases, the same as those erected by the aboriginal Emim and Rephaim. (Compare also the name Avith, "ruins," Gesenius, *ib.* p. 1000; <sup><0190></sup>Genesis 19:1, 29; 36:35; <sup><0233></sup>Isaiah 23:13; see Wilkinson, *Anc. Egypt.* 1, 308; Layard, *Nin. and Bab.* p. 532; Porter, *Damascus*, 1, 309; 2:196; Rawlinson, *Outlines of Assy. Hist.* p. 4, 5.) But though it appears probable that, whatever dates maybe assigned to the building of Babylon or Nineveh in their later condition, they were in fact rebuilt at those epochs, and not founded for the first time, and that towns in some form or other may have occupied the sites of the later Nineveh or Calah; it is quite clear that cities existed in Syria prior to the time of Abraham, who himself came from "Ur," the "city" of the Chaldaeans (Gesenius, *ib.* p. 55; Rawlinson, p. 4).

The earliest description of a city, properly so called, is that of Sodom (<sup><0190></sup>Genesis 19:1-22); but it is certain that from very early times cities existed on the sites of Jerusalem, Hebron, and Damascus. The last, said to be the oldest city in the world, must, from its unrivalled situation, have always commanded a congregated population; Hebron is said to have been built seven years before Zoan (Tanis) in Egypt, and is thus the only Syrian town which presents the elements of a date for its foundation (<sup><0432></sup>Numbers 13:22; see Stanley, *Palest.* p. 409; Josephus, *Ant.* 1, 6, 4; Conybeare and Howson, *St. Paul*, 1, 94, 96). But there can be no doubt that, whatever date may be given to Egyptian civilization, there were inhabited cities in Egypt long before this (<sup><0124></sup>Genesis 12:14, 15; see Martineau, *Eastern Life*, 1, 151; Wilkinson, 1:307; Smith, *Dict. of Class. Geog.* s.v. Tanis). The name, however, of Hebron, Kirjath-Arba, indicates its existence at least as early as the time of Abraham, as the city, or fortified place of Arba, an aboriginal province of Southern Palestine (<sup><0232></sup>Genesis 23:2; <sup><0445></sup>Joshua 14:15). The "tower of Edar," near Bethlehem, or "of flocks," indicates a position fortified against marauders (<sup><0321></sup>Genesis 35:21). Whether "the city of Shalem" be a site or an existing town cannot be determined; but there can be no doubt that the situation of Shechem is as well identified in the present day, as its importance as a fortified place is plain from the Scripture narrative (<sup><0338></sup>Genesis 33:18; 34:20, 26; see Robinson, 3, 114). On the whole, it seems plain that the Canaanite, who was "in the land" before the coming of Abraham, had already built cities of more or less importance, which had been largely increased, by the time of the return from Egypt. Even before the time of Abraham there were cities in Egypt (<sup><0124></sup>Genesis

12:14, 15; <sup><04132></sup>Numbers 13:22; see Wilkinson, 1:4, 5). The Israelites, during their sojourn there, were employed in building or fortifying the “treasure cities” of Pithom (Abbasieh) and Raamses (<sup><04111></sup>Exodus 1:11; Herod. 2:158; see Robinson, 1:79); but their pastoral habits make it unlikely that they should build, still less fortify, cities of their own in Goshen (<sup><04454></sup>Genesis 46:34; 47:1-11). Meanwhile the settled inhabitants of Syria on both sides of the Jordan had grown in power, and in number of “fenced cities.” In the kingdom of Sihon are many names of cities preserved to the present day; and in the kingdom of Og, in Bashan, were sixty “great cities with walls and brazen bars,” besides unwallled villages; and also twenty-three cities in Gilead, which were occupied, and perhaps partly rebuilt or fortified, by the tribes on the east of Jordan (<sup><04212></sup>Numbers 21:21, 32, 33, 35; 32:1-3, 34, 42; <sup><04804></sup>Deuteronomy 3:4, 5, 14; Joshua 11, 13; <sup><1043></sup>1 Kings 4:13; <sup><1322></sup>1 Chronicles 2:22; see Burckhardt, *Syria*, p. 311, 457; Porter, *Damascus*, 2, 195, 196, 206, 259, 275). On the west of Jordan, whilst 31 “royal” cities are enumerated (Joshua 12), in the district assigned to Judah 125 “cities” with villages are reckoned (Joshua 15); in Benjamin, 26; to Simeon, 17; Zebulun, 12; Issachar, 16; Asher, 22; Naphtali. 19; Dan 17 (Joshua 18, 19). But from some of these the possessors were not expelled till a late period, and Jerusalem itself was not captured till the time of David (<sup><04086></sup>2 Samuel 5:6-9). From this time the Hebrews became a city-swelling and agricultural rather than a pastoral people. David enlarged Jerusalem; and Solomon, besides embellishing his capital, also built or rebuilt Tadmor, Palmmyra, Gezer, Beth-horon, Hazor, and Megiddo, besides storecities (<sup><04087></sup>2 Samuel 5:7, 9, 10; <sup><1095></sup>1 Kings 9:15-18; <sup><4486></sup>2 Chronicles 8:6). To Solomon also is ascribed by Eastern tradition the building of Persepolis (Chardin, *Voyage*, 8, 390; Mandelslo, 1:4; Kuran, c. 38). The works of Jeroboam at Shechem (<sup><1125></sup>1 Kings 12:25; <sup><07095></sup>Judges 9:45), of Rehoboam (<sup><4416></sup>2 Chronicles 11:5-10), of Baasha at Rama, interrupted by Asa (<sup><1157></sup>1 Kings 15:17, 22), of Omri at Samaria (16, 24), the rebuilding of Jericho in the time of Ahab (16, 34), the works of Jehoshaphat (<sup><4472></sup>2 Chronicles 17:12), of Jotham (<sup><4274></sup>2 Chronicles 27:4), the rebuilding of Jerusalem, and, later still, the works of Herod and his family, belong to their respective articles.

**3.** Collections of houses in Syria for social habitation may be classed under three heads: (1.) cities; (2.) towns, with citadels or towers for resort and defense; (3.) unwallled villages. The cities may be assumed to have been in almost all cases “fenced cities,” i.e. possessing a wall with towers and gates



(<sup><1829></sup>Leviticus 25:29; <sup><1801></sup>Deuteronomy 9:1; <sup><1825></sup>Joshua 2:15; 6:20; <sup><1827></sup>1 Samuel 23:7; <sup><1043></sup>1 Kings 4:13; <sup><1265></sup>2 Kings 6:26; 7:3; 18:8, 13; <sup><4825></sup>Acts 9:25); and that, as a mark of conquest was to break down a portion at least of the city wall of the captured place, so the first care of the defenders, as of the Jews after their return from captivity, was to re. build the fortifications (<sup><1243></sup>2 Kings 14:13, 22; <sup><4812></sup>2 Chronicles 26:2, 6; 33:14; Nehemiah 3, 4, 6, 7; 1 Maccabees 4:60, 61; 10:45; Xen. *Hell.* 2, 2, 15). But around the city, especially in peaceable times, lay undefended suburbs (<sup><1365></sup>1 Chronicles 6:57 sq.; <sup><1631></sup>Numbers 35:1-5; Joshua 21), to which the privileges of the city extended. (See below.) The city thus became the citadel, while the population overflowed into the suburbs (1 Maccabees 11:61). The absence of walls as indicating security in peaceable times, combined with populousness, as was the case in the flourishing period of Egypt, is illustrated by the prophet Zechariah (<sup><3104></sup>Zechariah 2:4; <sup><1025></sup>1 Kings 4:25; see Martineau, *East. Life*, 1, 306).

According to Eastern custom, special cities were appointed to furnish special supplies for the service of the state: cities of store, for chariots, for horsemen, for building purposes, for provision for the royal table. Special governors for these and their surrounding districts were appointed by David and Solomon (<sup><1007></sup>1 Kings 4:7; 9:19; <sup><1375></sup>1 Chronicles 27:25; <sup><4172></sup>2 Chronicles 17:12; 21:3; 1 Maccabees 10:39; Xen. *Anab.* 1, 4, 10). To this practice our Lord alludes in his parable of the pounds, and it agrees with the theory of Hindoo government, which was to be conducted by lords of single townships, of 10, 100, or 1000 towns (<sup><2197></sup>Luke 19:17, 19; see Elphinstone, *India*, ch. 2, 1, 39, and *App.* 5, p. 485). To the Levites 48 cities were assigned, distributed throughout the country, together with a certain amount of suburban ground, and out of these 48, 13 were specially reserved for the family of Aaron, 9 in Judah and 4 in Benjamin, and 6 as refuge cities (<sup><1213></sup>Joshua 21:13, 42), but after the division of the kingdoms the Levites in Israel left their cities and resorted to Judah and Jerusalem (<sup><4413></sup>2 Chronicles 11:13, 14). (See below.)

**4.** The internal government of Jewish cities was vested before the Captivity in a council of elders, with judges, who were required to be priests: Josephus says seven judges, with two Levites as officers, **ὑπηρέται** (<sup><1205></sup>Deuteronomy 21:5, 19; 16:18; 19:17; <sup><18412></sup>Ruth 4:2, Josephus, *Ant.* 4, 8, 14). Under the kings a president or governor appears to have been appointed (<sup><11226></sup>1 Kings 22:26; <sup><44825></sup>2 Chronicles 18:25); and judges were sent out on circuit, who referred matters of doubt to a council composed



of priests, Levites, and elders at Jerusalem (<sup><1204></sup>1 Chronicles 23:4; 26:29; <sup><4495></sup>2 Chronicles 19:5, 8, 10, 11). After the Captivity, Ezra made similar arrangements for the appointment of judges (<sup><15075></sup>Ezra 7:25). In the time of Josephus there appear to have been councils in the provincial towns, with presidents in each, under the directions of the great council at Jerusalem (Josephus, *Ant.* 14, 9, 4; *War*, 2, 21, 3; *Life*, 12, 13, 27, 34, 57, 61, 68, 74). *SEE SANHEDRIM.*

In many Eastern cities much space is occupied by gardens, and thus the size of the cities is much increased (Niebuhr, *Voyage*, 2, 172, 239; Conybeare and Howson, 1:96; *Eothen*, p. 240). The vast extent of Nineveh and of Babylon may thus be in part accounted for (Diod. 2:70; Quint. Curt. 5, 1, 26; <sup><3041></sup>Jonah 4:11; see Chardin, *Voy.* 7:273, 284; Porter, *Damascus*, 1, 153; P. della Valle, 2:33). In most Oriental cities the streets are extremely narrow, seldom allowing more than two loaded camels, or one camel and two foot passengers to pass each other, though it is clear that some of the streets of Nineveh must have been wide enough for chariots to pass each other (<sup><3404></sup>Nahum 2:4; see Olearius, *Trav.* p. 294, 309; Burckhardt, *Trav. in Arabia*, 1, 188; Buckingham, *Arab Tribes*, p. 330; Mrs. Poole, *Englishwoman in Egypt*, 1, 141). The word for “streets” used by Nahum — ( **t/bhōj** from **bhīr**; *broad*, **πλατείαι**) — is used also of streets or broad places in Jerusalem (<sup><3003></sup>Proverbs 1:20; <sup><3481></sup>Jeremiah 5:1; 22:4; <sup><2482></sup>Song of Solomon 3:2); and it may be remarked that the thoroughfares (**πλατείαι**) into which the sick were brought to receive the shadow of Peter (<sup><4485></sup>Acts 5:15) were more likely to be the ordinary streets than the special *plazze* of the city. It seems likely that the immense concourse which resorted to Jerusalem at the feasts would induce wider streets than in other cities (see <sup><12184></sup>1 Kings 20:34). Herod built in Antioch a wide street paved with stone, and having covered ways on each side. Agrippa II paved Jerusalem with white stone (Josephus, *Ant.* 16, 5, 2 and 3; 20:9, 7). The streets of most cities of Palestine would not need paving, in consequence of the rocky nature of the foundations on which they lay. The Straight Street of Damascus is still clearly defined and recognizable (Irby and Mangles, v. 86; Robinson, new ed. of *Res.* 3. 454, 455). In building Caesarea, Josephus says that Herod was careful to carry out the drainage effectually (Josephus, *Ant.* 15, 9, 6). The internal commerce of Jewish cities was probably carried on as now by means of bazaars (q.v.); for we read of the bakers’ street (<sup><3572></sup>Jeremiah 37:21), and Josephus speaks

of the wool market, the hardware market, a place of blacksmiths' shops, and the clothes market, at Jerusalem (War, 5, 8, 1). *SEE STREET.*

The open spaces (*πλατεῖαι*) near the gates of towns were in ancient times, as they are still, used as places of assembly by the elders, of holding courts by kings and judges, and of general resort by citizens (<sup><0130></sup>Genesis 23:10; <sup><0100></sup>Ruth 4:1; <sup><0152></sup>2 Samuel 15:2; 18:24; 21:12; <sup><1370></sup>2 Kings 7:1, 3, 20; <sup><0189></sup>2 Chronicles 18:9; 32:6; <sup><0100></sup>Nehemiah 8:1, 13, 16; <sup><0130></sup>Job 29:7; <sup><0179></sup>Jeremiah 17:19; <sup><0105></sup>Matthew 6:5; <sup><0133></sup>Luke 13:26). They were also used as places of public exposure by way of punishment (<sup><0102></sup>Jeremiah 20:2; <sup><0150></sup>Amos 5:10). *SEE GATE.* Prisons were, under the kingly government, within the royal precinct (<sup><0130></sup>Genesis 39:20; <sup><0127></sup>1 Kings 22:27; <sup><0132></sup>Jeremiah 32:2; <sup><0105></sup>Nehemiah 3:25; <sup><0134></sup>Acts 21:34; 23:35).

Great pains were taken to supply Jerusalem with water, both by tanks and cisterns for rain-water, and by reservoirs supplied by aqueducts from distant springs. Such was the fountain of Gihon, the aqueduct of Hezekiah (<sup><0120></sup>2 Kings 20:20; <sup><0129></sup>2 Chronicles 32:30; <sup><0129></sup>Isaiah 22:9), and of Solomon (<sup><0106></sup>Ecclesiastes 2:6), of which last water is still conveyed from near Bethlehem to Jerusalem (Maundrell, in Bohn's ed. of *Early Trav.* p. 457; Robinson, 1:514 sq.; Olin, 2:119 sq.). Josephus also mentions an attempt made by Pilate to bring water to Jerusalem (*Ant.* 18, 3, 2). *SEE CONDUIT.* Other cities appear to have been mostly contented with the fountains whose existence had probably led to their formation at the first. *SEE WATER.*

Burial-places, except in special cases, were outside the city (<sup><0191></sup>Numbers 19:11, 16; <sup><0108></sup>Matthew 8:28; <sup><0172></sup>Luke 7:12; <sup><0194></sup>John 19:41; <sup><0132></sup>Hebrews 13:12). *SEE GRAVE.*

**5.** A city and its inhabitants are frequently described in the sacred writings under the similitude of a mother and her children; hence the phrase "Children of Zion" (<sup><0123></sup>Joel 2:23). Cities are also characterized as virgins, wives, widows, and harlots, according to their different conditions. Thus Jerusalem is called a virgin (<sup><0132></sup>Isaiah 37:22); and the term harlot is used of Jerusalem (<sup><0121></sup>Isaiah 1:21), also of Tyre (<sup><0136></sup>Isaiah 23:16), of Nineveh (<sup><0104></sup>Nahum 3:4), and of Samaria (<sup><0125></sup>Ezekiel 23:5).

FENCED CITY (seldom simply *hrwxm*] *metsurah*'), a mound or intrenchment of besiegers; "mount," <sup><0138></sup>Isaiah 29:3; "munition," <sup><0101></sup>Nahum 2:1), a town with walls of fortification (<sup><0111></sup>2 Chronicles 11:11; oftener with *yrē*; *cities*

of, <sup><4446></sup>2 Chronicles 14:5; or both words in the plur., 11:10, 11, 23; 12:4; 21:3). From the foregoing remarks, it will be understood how the phrases to *build* a city, and to *fortify* or fence it, in the Oriental idiom, mean generally the same thing. **SEE FORTRESS**. The fencing or fortification was usually with high walls, and watch-towers upon them (<sup><6886></sup>Deuteronomy 3:5). **SEE FORTIFICATION**. The walls of fortified cities were formed, in part at least, of combustible materials (Amos 1:7, 10, 14), the gates being covered with thick plates of iron or brass (<sup><9476></sup>Psalms 107:16; <sup><2862></sup>Isaiah 45:2; <sup><4420></sup>Acts 12:10). There was also within the city a citadel or tower, to which the inhabitants fled when the city itself could not be defended (<sup><6796></sup>Judges 9:46-52). They were often upon elevated ground, and were entered by a flight of steps (<sup><1202></sup>2 Kings 10:2; <sup><2301></sup>Isaiah 36:1). **SEE WALL**.

### City With Suburbs

(in the plur. **μυναῖμαραῖ**; *arey' migrashim'*, *cities of pastures*, 1 Chronicles 42:2), i.e. a town surrounded by open pasture-grounds or commons. The forty-eight cities which were given to the Levites were thus denominated; the extent of the suburbs appertaining to each city is accurately defined in <sup><6851></sup>Numbers 35:1-8; <sup><6244></sup>Joshua 21:41, 42. They were evidently the surrounding districts to which the city gave the means of protection and safety. **SEE SUBURB**.

### City Of Refuge

(usually in the plur. **פל קמליר**; *arey' ham-miklat'*, from **פל ק**; *contracted*, Gesenius, *The. Heb.* p. 1216; Sept. **πόλεις τῶν φυγαδευτηρίων, φυγαδευτήρια, φυγαδεῖα**; Vulg. *oppida in fugitivorum auxilia, prvesidia, separata, or urbesfugitivorum*).

**I.** Among the Hebrews, six Levitical cities specially chosen for refuge to the involuntary homicide until released from banishment by the death of the high-priest (<sup><6856></sup>Numbers 35:6, 13, 15; <sup><6212></sup>Joshua 20:2, 7, 9). **SEE BLOOD-REVENGE**. There were three on each side of Jordan.

**1.** KEDESH, in Naphtali, now *Kedes*, about twenty miles E.S.E. from Tyre, twelve S.S.W. from Bania (<sup><1356></sup>1 Chronicles 6:76; see Robinson, 3: 355; Benj. of Tudela, in the *Early Trav.* p. 89).

**2.** SHECHEM, in Mount Ephraim, *Nabulus* (<sup><6222></sup>Joshua 21:21; <sup><1362></sup>1 Chronicles 6:67; <sup><4402></sup>2 Chronicles 10:1; see Robinson, 3:113).

- 3.** HEBRON, in Judah, *el-Khulil*. The last two were royal cities, and the latter sacerdotal also, inhabited by David, and fortified by Rehoboam (<sup><0213></sup>Joshua 21:13; <sup><0185></sup>2 Samuel 5:5; <sup><0165></sup>1 Chronicles 6:55; 29:27; <sup><0410></sup>2 Chronicles 11:10; see Robinson, 1:314; 2:454).
- 4.** On the E. side of Jordan — BEZER, in the tribe of Reuben, in the plains of Moab, said in the Gemara to be opposite to Hebron, perhaps the later *Bosor*, and the present *Burazin* (<sup><0143></sup>Deuteronomy 4:43; <sup><0218></sup>Joshua 20:8; 21:36; 1 Maccabees 5:26; Josephus, *Ant.* 4, 7, 4; see Reland, p. 662).
- 5.** RAMOTH-GILEAD, in the tribe of Gad, supposed to be on or near the site of *es-Szalt* (<sup><0143></sup>Deuteronomy 4:43; <sup><0213></sup>Joshua 21:38; <sup><0228></sup>1 Kings 22:3; see Reland, p. 966).
- 6.** GOLAN, in Bashan, in the half-tribe of Manasseh, a town whose site has not been ascertained, but which doubtless gave its name to the district of Gaulonitis, *Jaulan* (<sup><0143></sup>Deuteronomy 4:43; <sup><0227></sup>Joshua 21:27; <sup><0367></sup>1 Chronicles 6:71; Josephus, *Ant.* 4, 7; see Reland, p. 815; Porter, *Damascus*, 2, 251, 254; Burckhardt, Syria, p. 286). The Gemara notices that the cities on each side of the Jordan were nearly opposite each other, in accordance with the direction to divide the land into three parts (<sup><0392></sup>Deuteronomy 19:2; Reland, p. 662). Maimonides says all the forty-eight Levitical cities had the privilege of asylum, but that the six refuge-cities were required to receive and lodge the homicide gratuitously (Calmet *On Numbers* 35).

The directions respecting the refuge-cities present some difficulties in interpretation. The Levitical cities were to have a space of 1000 cubits (about 583 yards) beyond the city wall for pasture and other purposes. Presently after, 2000 cubits are ordered to be the suburb limit (<sup><0394></sup>Numbers 35:4, 5). The solution of the difficulty may be, either the 2000 cubits are to be added to the 1000 as “fields of the suburbs” (<sup><0234></sup>Leviticus 25:34), as appears to have been the case in the gift to Caleb, which excluded the city of Hebron, but included the “fields and villages of the city” (<sup><0211></sup>Joshua 21:11, 12, Patrick), or that the additional 2000 cubits were a special gift to the refuge-cities, while the other Levitical cities had only 1000 cubits for suburb. Calmet supposes the line of 2000 cubits to be measured parallel, and the 1000 perpendicular to the city wall; an explanation, however, which supposes all the cities to be of the same size (Calmet *On Numbers*, 35).

**II.** Places of refuge where, under the cover of religion, the guilty and the unfortunate might find shelter and protection were not unknown among the ancient heathen. The *jus asyli*, or right of shelter and impunity, was enjoyed by certain places reputed sacred, such as groves, temples, and altars. This protective power commonly spread itself over a considerable district round the holy spot, and was watched over and preserved by severe penalties. Among the Greeks and Romans the number of these places of asylum became in time very great, and led, by abuse, to a fresh increase of criminals (Tacitus, *Ann.* 3. 60, 63). Tiberius, in consequence, caused a solemn inquiry into their effects to be made, which resulted in a diminution of their number and a limitation of their privileges (Suetonius, *Tib.* 37, compared with Ernesti, *Excursus ad h. l.*; Osiander, *De Asyulis Gentium*, in Gronov. *Thesaur.* t. 6). In the Apocrypha (2 Maccabees 4:33) mention is made of a city having the *jus asyli* — “Onias withdrew himself into a sanctuary at Daphne that lieth by Antiochia.” The temple of Diana at Ephesus (~~4827~~ Acts 19:27) was also a heathen asylum, whose privileges in this respect increased with the progress of time.

This pagan custom passed into Christianity. As early as Constantine the Great, Christian churches were asylums for the unfortunate persons whom an outraged law or powerful enemies pursued (Smith’s Gibbon, c. 20). Theodosius, in 431, extended this privilege to the houses, gardens, and other places which were under the jurisdiction of the churches, and the synod of Toledo, in 681, widened the right of asylum to thirty paces from each church. Since then this ecclesiastical privilege prevailed in the whole of Catholic Christendom, and was preserved undiminished, at least in Italy, so long as the papal independence remained (Hallam’s *Middle Ages*, c. 9, pt. 1). The right acted beneficially in ages when violence and revenge predominated, and fixed habitations were less common than now; but its tendency to transfer power from the magistrate to the priesthood was injurious to the inviolability of law and the steady administration of justice. It has accordingly in recent times been abrogated by most governments (*Conversations-Lexikon*, s.v.).

**III.** Among the Jews, the “cities of refuge” bore some resemblance to the asylum of the classic nations, but were happily exempt from the evil consequences to which reference has been made, and afford, even to the present day, no mean proof of the superior wisdom and benignant spirit of the Jewish laws. The institution was framed with a view to abate the evils

which ensued from the old-established rights of the blood-avenger, *SEE AVENGER OF BLOOD*, and thereby to further the prevalence in the nation of a mild, gentle, and forgiving spirit. An inspection of the map will show how wisely these places were chosen so as to make a city of refuge easy of access from all parts of the land. To any one of these cities a person who had unawares and unintentionally slain any one might flee, and, if he reached it before he was overtaken by the avenger of blood, he was safe within its shelter, provided he did not remove more than a thousand yards from its circuit, nor quit the refuge till the decease of the high-priest under whom the homicide had taken place. If, however, he transgressed these provisions, the avenger might lawfully put him to death. The roads leading to the cities of refuge were to be kept in good repair. Before, however, the fugitive could avail himself of the shelter conceded by the laws, he was to undergo a solemn trial, and make it appear to the satisfaction of the magistrates of the place where the homicide was committed that it was purely accidental. Should he, however, be found to have been guilty of murder, he was delivered “into the hand of the avenger of blood, that he might die.” The benefit of the protection afforded was common to strangers and sojourners with native Israelites.

According to the Rabbins, in order to give the fugitive all possible advantage in his flight, it was the business of the Sanhedrim to make the roads that led to the cities of refuge convenient by enlarging them, and removing every obstruction that might hurt his foot or hinder his speed. No hillock was left, no river was allowed over which there was not a bridge, and the road was at least two-and-thirty cubits broad. At every turning there were posts erected bearing the words *Refuge, Refuge*, to guide the unhappy man in his flight; and two students in the law were appointed to accompany him, that, if the avenger should overtake him before he reached the city, they might attempt to pacify him till the legal investigation could take place. When once settled in the city of refuge, the manslayer had a convenient habitation assigned him gratuitously, and the citizens were to teach him some trade whereby he might support himself. To render his confinement more easy, the mothers of the high-priests used to feed and clothe these unfortunate fugitives, that they might not be impatient and pray for the death of their sons, on whose decease they were restored to their liberty and their property. If the slayer died in the city of refuge before he was released, his bones were delivered to his relations, after the death of the high-priest, to be buried in the sepulcher of his fathers (Lewis, *Origines*

*Hebraicae*). If the homicide committed a fresh act of manslaughter, he was to flee to another city; but if he were a Levite, to wander from city to city. An idea prevailed that when the Messiah came three more cities would be added — a misinterpretation, as it seems, of <sup><6508></sup>Deuteronomy 19:8, 9 (Lightfoot, *Cent. Chor.* 152, 208). Jerusalem, to some extent, possessed the privilege of asylum under similar restrictions — a privilege accorded to Shimei, but forfeited by him (<sup><1026></sup>1 Kings 2:36, 46).

That the right of asylum among the Jews was in later periods of their history so extended as to open the door to great abuses may be inferred from 1 Maccabees 10:43, where unqualified impunity and exemption from both liabilities and penalties are promised, under the influence, not of the Mosaic law, but of heathen morals and ambition, to “whosoever they be that flee unto the Temple at Jerusalem, or be within the liberties thereof.” In the words now cited, reference appears to be made to a custom which prevailed from very early times, both among the chosen people and the nations of the world, of fleeing, in case of personal danger, to the altar. With the Jews, it was customary for the fugitive to lay hold of the horns of the altar, whether in the tabernacle or Temple; by which, however, shelter and security were obtained only for those who had committed sins of ignorance or inadvertence (<sup><0214></sup>Exodus 21:14; <sup><1055></sup>1 Kings 1:50; 2:28). From the last two passages, it seems that state criminals also sought the protection of the altar, probably more from the force of custom than any express law. Their safety, however, depended on the will of the king; for in the passages referred to it appears that in one case (that of Adonijah) life was spared, but in the other (that of Joab) it was taken away even “by the altar.” Compare <sup><0235></sup>Matthew 23:35. A similar instance is found in Grecian history, in the case of Pausanias, who fled from the populace, incensed on account of his public treachery, to the temple of Minerva, where he was starved to death by order of the Ephori, by blocking up the entrance and taking off the roof (compare Smith’s *Dict. of Class. Antiq.* s.v. Asylum).  
**SEE ASYLUM.**

### City Of David,

a section in the southern part of Jerusalem, embracing Mount Zion, where a fortress of the Jebusites stood. **SEE JEBUS.** David reduced the fortress, and built a new palace and city, to which he gave his own name (<sup><3105></sup>1 Chronicles 11:5). Bethlehem, the native town of David, is also called, from that circumstance, the city of David (<sup><0211></sup>Luke 2:11).



## City Of God,

one of the names of ancient Jerusalem (<sup><3940></sup>Psalm 46:4), and its appropriateness is evident from <sup><6126></sup>Deuteronomy 12:5.

HOLY CITY. The sacredness of the Temple extended itself in some measure over the city, and hence Jerusalem itself was called the *Holy City*, and is so distinguished in the East at the present day (<sup><6101></sup>Nehemiah 11:1; <sup><27024></sup>Daniel 9:24). *SEE JERUSALEM.*

## Levitical City

*SEE LEVITE.*

## City Of Palm-Trees

*SEE IR-HATTEMARIM.*

## Sacerdotal City

*SEE PRIEST.*

## City Of Salt

*SEE IR-HAMMELAH.*

## Treasure-City

(in the plur. *twNKšimærē*; *cities of provisions*, “store-cities,” <sup><1009></sup>1 Kings 9:19). Pithom and Raamses (q.v.) are mentioned in <sup><0011></sup>Exodus 1:11, as treasure-cities built by Pharaoh by the unpaid labor of the Hebrews; they were probably magazines or depots for the royal revenue (which was doubtless paid in kind), such as are intimated in <sup><0448></sup>Genesis 41:48; see 48:26. The Jewish kings had similar places of public deposit (<sup><4404></sup>2 Chronicles 8:4, 6; 16:4; 17:2). *SEE TREASURE.*

## Civil Administration

*SEE GOVERNMENT OF THE HEBREWS.*

## Clagett, William, D.D.,

a divine of the Church of England, was born at St. Edmundsbury, Suffolk, 1646; entered Emmanuel College, Cambridge, 1659; and took his degrees



there, the final one of D.D. in 1683. After preaching seven years in his native town he became preacher of Gray's Inn, London, and rector of Farnham Royal in 1683. He died March 28, 1688. Among his writings are, *A Discourse concerning the Operations of the Holy Spirit*, against Dr. Owen (Lond. 1680, 2 vols. 8vo); *Sermons* (Lond. 1704-1720, 4 vols. 8vo); and several pamphlets on the Romish controversy. — Kippis, *Biographia Britannica*, 3. 592 sq.; Darling, *Cyclopaedia Bibliographica*, 1, 666.

### Claggett, Thomas John, D.D.,

a bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church, was born in Prince George County, Md., on the 2d of October, 1743, and graduated at Princeton 1764. He went to England for ordination in 1767, and on his return to America became rector of All Saint's parish, Md. On the breaking out of the Revolution he retired to Prince George's, and in 1779 began to officiate there in St. Paul's parish. In 1792 he was elected to the episcopate, being the first bishop that was consecrated on this side the Atlantic. In 1800 he was chaplain to the Senate of the United States; in 1808 he became rector of Trinity Church, Upper Marlborough, Md. He died on the 2d of August, 1816. — Sprague, *Annals*, v. 252.

### Clairvaux

(CLARAVALLIS), the name of a celebrated Cistercian abbey, in a valley of the Department Aube, in France. Bernard became its abbot in 1115, and the monastery was the model of monasticism in the 12th and 13th centuries. — Neander, *Ch. History*, 4, 254. **SEE BERNARD; SEE CISTERCIANS.**

### Clap, Thomas,

a Congregational minister, was born at Scituate, Mass., June 26, 1703, and graduated at Harvard 1722. He was ordained pastor at Windham, Aug. 3, 1726; was elected to the rectorship of Yale College in 1739, and entered upon the duties of the office April 2, 1740. He devoted himself energetically to the work of the college; framed its code of laws (1748, Latin, "the first book ever printed in New Haven"); improved its library, and in various ways strengthened the institution. He was especially noted for his knowledge of mathematics and physics, and constructed the first orrery made in America. His opposition to Whitefield, and other causes, raised up a party against him, and in 1765 he resigned his office; the

corporation, however, passing a vote “expressive of their high estimation of his character and services.” He died in New Haven, January 7, 1767. President Clap published *An Introduction to the Study of Philosophy, exhibiting a general View of all the Arts and Sciences* (1743); *The Religious Constitution of Colleges, especially of Yale College, New Haven* (1754); *A brief History and Vindication of the Doctrines received and established in the Churches of New England, with a Specimen of the new scheme of Religion beginning to prevail* (1755); *An Essay on the Nature and Foundation of moral Virtue and Obligation* (1765); *Annals or History of Yale College* (1766); *Conjectures upon the Nature and Motions of Meteors which are above the Atmosphere* (post, 1781). — Sprague, *Annals*, 1, 343; Allen, *American Biography*, s.v.

### Clara, Or Clare

a saint of the Roman Catholic Church, was born at Assisi, Italy, 1193, of a noble family. She abandoned her home in 1212, and was received by Francis of Assisi, who cut off her hair, and replaced her fine clothing by a piece of sackcloth tied about her with a cord. Her parents strenuously resisted this step; but, under the guidance of Francis, she disobeyed them, and devoted herself to monastic life. She practiced unheard of austerities, mournful to read of as described by Butler (cited below). Clara was the founder of the Clarisses, or nuns of St. Clara (q. v). See Butler, *Lives of Saints*, August 12; Lewis, *Bible, Missal, and Breviary*, 1, 110.

### Clara

*SEE ABRAHAM À SANCTA CLARA.*

### Clare, St., Nuns Of,

an order sometimes called Clarisses or Clarissines. from their founder St. Clara (q.v.). The reputation of St. Clara soon gained her a large number of followers, for whom several monasteries were built in various parts of Italy. In the year 1219 the order passed into Spain, and soon after into France. The rules of the order were drawn up by St. Francis of Assisi in 1224: the Clarisses were forbidden to have any possessions, and silence was enjoined upon them from the compline till the tierce of the following day. Their habit was three tunics and a mantle. After the death of the founder the order made still greater progress, and counted for some time 2000 convents, with 54,000 nuns. After the Reformation there remained in

Europe 900 convents, with about 25,000 nuns. In Italy there are monasteries of Clarisses, some of which take the name of "Nuns of the Strict Observance," others that of "Solitaries of the Institution of St. Peter of Alcantara." After Cortez had conquered Mexico, Isabella of Portugal, wife of Charles V, sent thither some nuns of the order of St. Clara, who made several settlements there. Near their monasteries were founded communities of Indian young women, to be instructed by the Clarisses in religion, and such works as were suitable to persons of their sex. When Pope Urban IV mitigated the original rule, those who adopted the mitigated rule were called Urbanists, while the name of Clarisses remained to those who adhered to the original rule. A still stricter rule was observed by the *Congregation of St. Colette*, founded by St. Colette, who died in 1447, which was again surpassed in austerity by the discalceate Congregation of the Strictest Observance, founded in 1631 in Italy, and the Hermitesses of St. Peter of Alcantara (or Alcantarines), founded in 1676. According to the statistics of 1862, convents were found in Italy, France, Austria, Bavaria, Switzerland, Poland, Belgium, Holland, England, Scotland, Spain, Prussia, Ireland, at Macao and Manilla in Asia, in Mexico, and in Central and South America. The number of members was about 6000. — Fehr, *Geschichte der Monchsorden*, 1, 456 sq. *SEE FRANCIS OF ASSISI*.

## Clarenbach

*SEE KLARENBACH.*

## Clarendon Constitutions

1164. A struggle between the crown and the hierarchy in England began with the elevation of Thomas à Becket to the archiepiscopal chair (June, 1162). The pomp-loving courtier, brave warrior, and powerful statesman, the favorite and confidant of Henry II, had become a severe ascetic, a zealous hierarch, and the opponent of the king. At the council held by Alexander III in May, 1163, at Tours, Becket, with other English prelates, appeared, and was received with distinction by the pope. As soon as he returned, he attempted to execute the resolutions of the council in his province. He claimed certain possessions, which, as he asserted, had been long alienated from the see of Canterbury, and protested against the levy of a universal tax on real estate which the king demanded for state purposes. This already had occasioned a contest with the king, and a breach was

almost effected at the Imperial Diet in Westminster, called by the king to reform the abuses of the ecclesiastical courts, which were made inaccessible to the arm of justice. Cases of this kind had often occurred within a few years, and the archbishop now again opposed the demands of the king and the barons, while almost all the bishops answered in the affirmative to the question of the king if they would further support the “old customs of the kingdom,” but with the addition of the dangerous clause, *salvo ordine suo et jure ecclesie*. At the prayers of the bishops and others high in office, perhaps also under admonitions from the pope, Becket also yielded at length.

To ratify the concessions made by the bishops with due solemnity, and in general to settle the points at issue between Church and crown, the king, in January, 1164, summoned an assembly of prelates and barons at Clarendon, a royal summer residence near Salisbury. The attendance was large. Becket appeared, but only to revoke the concessions he had made, and to declare them treason to the inalienable rights of the Church. But at last, overwhelmed by prayers and threats, Becket once more pledged his priestly word to support faithfully the ancient customs. The conferences were soon ended. Their results were the *Clarendon Constitutions*, or, as they were called, *consuetudines recognitae*, in sixteen chapters, the contents of which are substantially the following (with the judgment of the pope upon them appended in italics): —

1. Disputes concerning the right of patronage between laymen, or between clergymen and laymen, or between clergymen only, shall be discussed and settled at the court of the king. (*Condemned by the pope.*)
2. Churches belonging to the king’s fief cannot be given permanently away without his consent. (*Tolerated.*)
3. Clergymen accused of any crime must, upon a summons from a royal judge, appear at the king’s court, where it will be decided whether the matter is to be handed over to a civil or ecclesiastical court; in the latter case, a delegate appointed by the king’s judge is to be present at the trial. If the accused is found guilty, or confesses, the Church shall not further protect him. (*Condemned.*)
4. Archbishops, bishops, or high officials of the kingdom shall not leave the kingdom without the king’s permission; and, even in case of permission,

must give security that on their journey they will undertake nothing to the disadvantage of the king or the kingdom. (*Condemned.*)

**5.** Excommunicated persons need not give bonds to remain where they are, nor to promise by oath to do so, but only to give bonds or a pledge to abide by the decision of the Church, that they may be absolved. (*Condemned.*)

**6.** Laymen can only be accused by trustworthy and legitimate witnesses in the presence of the bishop, yet so that the archdeacon does not lose his right. In cases where no one appears as the accuser, the sheriff, at the command of the bishop, is to assemble twelve respectable men from the neighborhood, who are to swear before the bishop to tell the truth according to their best understandings (*Tolerated.*)

**7.** Vassals of the crown, and the officers of their households, shall not be excommunicated, nor their lands laid under interdict, without previous notice to the king or his judges, that they may decide if the case is to be handed over to a civil or ecclesiastical tribunal. (*Condemned.*)

**8.** Appeals are to be made from the archdeacon to the bishop, from the bishop to the archbishop, and from him to the king, upon whose command the matter shall then be settled in the archiepiscopal court of justice. No further appeal allowed without the king's leave. (*Condemned.*)

**9.** In case of any dispute between a layman and clergyman concerning a tenement which the latter declares to be a lay fee, if it prove upon trial before twelve respectable men to be a *lay* fee, and not an ecclesiastical fee, the cause to be finally tried in the king's court, unless both claim tenure under the same bishop or baron, in which case the plea shall be in his court. (*Condemned.*)

**10.** If any one belonging to a royal court or demesne is summoned by an archdeacon or a bishop on account of some misdemeanor for which he is amenable to them, and he appear not, he may be put under an interdict, but under the ban only after a previous notification of the royal official of the place, and after the latter has vainly attempted to induce the accused to give the Church satisfaction. (*Condemned.*)

**11.** Archbishops, bishops, and vassals of the crown must, as holders of royal fiefs, appear before the judges and officers of the king, and preserve all the privileges and customs of the crown-fief, and be present also, like

the other barons, at the proceedings of the royal court of justice, except at capital trials. (*Tolerated.*)

**12.** In case of a vacancy of an archbishopric, bishopric, an abbey, or a priorate, the revenues shall accrue to the king. At the reappointment, the king shall assemble the ecclesiastical dignitaries; the election shall take place in the royal chapel, with the king's consent, and the advice of the grandees of the kingdom assembled by him. In the same place the elect shall, while preserving his ecclesiastical state, take the oath of fealty to the king, his feudal lord, before he is consecrated. (*Condemned.*)

**13.** If any baron or tenant *in capite* should encroach upon the rights or property of a prelate, the king shall see justice done, and if any one encroach upon the possessions of the king, the prelates shall treat with that person that he may give satisfaction. (*Tolerated.*)

**14.** Forfeited possessions the Church dare not refuse to make over to the king, as such belong to him, whether they be inside or outside of the Church. (*Tolerated.*)

**15.** Pleas of debt are to be made in the king's court, whether due upon contract or not. (*Condemned.*)

**16.** Sons of peasants cannot be ordained without the consent of their feudal lords. (*Tolerated.*)

The high importance of these decrees of the Diet, for those times, is very obvious. On the one hand, the king intended by them to make the dignitaries of the Church as dependent upon the crown as the barons, and not only to put a limit to their jurisdiction, but also to secure the election and investiture of the prelates, and, by limitations of the appeals to the pope, to preserve his own paramount rights. On the other hand, his aim was to put the exercise of justice upon a sure footing, by subjecting the whole clergy to the common law of the country. The Constitutions contain the germs of the highly important institution of the wandering assizes, founded by him twelve years later at the Diet in Northampton. The barons willingly gave their consent to this improvement of the administration of justice, and still more to the limitation of the powers of the Church, but Becket did everything in his power to destroy the effect of the Constitutions. Above all, the sixteenth article was directed against the lower clergy, who were his principal support. When the Constitutions were

submitted to him that he might put his seal to them, as all the other prelates did in token of their consent, he refused. Afterwards, when one of the three copies made of the document was handed to him for his seal and signature, he seems to have yielded, after some resistance, to the command of the king; but he had scarcely left Clarendon when he showed the bitterest repentance. He suspended himself from all his clerical functions for forty days, until he had received from the pope absolution for his oath; and the condemnation of the Constitutions. After twice vainly attempting to fly across the sea, he was accused of the violation of the Constitutions at the Diet in Northampton, in October of the same year, and was commanded to give an account of the expenditure of considerable sums he had been entrusted with during his administration as lord chancellor. The crucifix in his hand, he declared that he would not listen to the sentence, and left the chamber, followed by calumnies, but received outside with enthusiasm by the people. A few days later he had fled to Flanders. After an exile of six years, he returned to England on the 1st of December, 1170, as, apparently at least, a reconciliation had been effected between him and the king. But only four weeks later he was assassinated in his cathedral. The consequences of this murder are well known. In October, 1172, at Avranches, the king had to take an oath of purification before the papal legate, and revoke all which displeased the pope in the Clarendon Constitutions. — Herzog, *Real-Encyklopadie*, Supplement, 1:327 (from which this article is translated); Wilkins, *Concilia Magnae Britanniae*, 1:435; Landon, *Manual of Councils*, p. 132; Mosheim, *Church History*, cent. 12, bk. 3. pt. 2, ch. 2, § 12; Hume, *Hist. of England* (Harpers' ed.), 1, 303-306.

## Clarenines

a monastic order founded in the neighborhood of Ancona in 1302 by Angelo di Cordova, after the suppression of the Celestines (q.v.), of which he had been a member. Angelo was cited before pope John XXII as a separatist in 1317, but was acquitted, He died at Naples 1340. After his death the Clarenines submitted themselves to the ordinaries, and made great progress in several dioceses of Italy. In 1472, however, a large number of them joined the Minorites (q.v.). Finally, when pope Julius II reorganized the Franciscans (q.v.), dividing them into Observants and Conventuals, the Clarenines, after inclining for a while toward the latter, at last connected themselves with the Observants. See Wadding, *Annal.*

*Minor; Henrion; Fehr, Allg. Gesch. der Monchsorden, 1, 285; Wetzler u. Welte, Kirchen-Lexikon, 2, 567.*

### Clario, Or Clarius Isidore,

a Benedictine monk, bishop, and writer, was born at the castle of Clario, near Brescia, 1495, and at an early age entered the monastery of Monte Cassino, where he studied especially the original languages of Scripture. Paul III sent him to the Council of Trent. where he greatly distinguished himself, especially in the discussions in the Vulgate. The pope made him bishop of Foligno. He died May 28, 1555. His chief literary labor was a correction of the Vulgate, with annotations (*Vulgata editio V. et N.T.*, Venice, 1542, 1557, 1564, fol.). He asserts that he had corrected 8000 places; and his first edition (1542) was put into the Index Expurgatorius. He borrowed largely, in his notes, from Sebastian Munster (q.v.). — Hoefler, *Nouvelle Biog. Generale*, 9, 662; Hook, *Eccl. Biog.* 4, 77.

### Clark, Daniel A.

A.M., a Congregational and Presbyterian minister, was born at Rahway, N. J., March 1, 1779, and graduated at Princeton in 1808. While a student at Andover Theological Seminary he was licensed by the Presbytery of New Jersey, and in 1812 he was ordained and installed pastor of the Congregational Union Ch. of Braintree and Weymouth, Mass. Thence he removed in 1815 to Hanover, N. J., and in 1816 to Southbury, Conn., where, in addition to his work as a minister, he taught gratuitously “with a view of elevating the standard of education.” In 1820 he was installed pastor of the west parish of Amherst, Mass., where he was involved in certain difficulties, and in 1826 he accepted a call to Bennington, Vt., where he was very active and useful. Leaving Bennington in 1830, he supplied Dr. Beman’s pulpit in Troy, labored for a time in Utica, N.Y., and was installed pastor in Adams, Jefferson Co., N. Y., in 1832. In 1833 his health obliged him to withdraw from the ministry. He devoted the remainder of his days to literary pursuits, and died March 3, 1840. “Though practically a Congregationalist while he exercised his ministry in New England, he always retained his preference for the Presbyterian form of Church government, and resumed his relations with the Presbyterian Church as soon as he had the opportunity.” Dr. Osgood (in Sprague, cited below) says: “The published sermons of Mr. Clark, I believe it is generally admitted, take rank with the ablest sermons which our country has



produced.” For his publications, see *His Complete Works, with a Biographical Sketch*, etc., by Revelation Geo. Shepard, D.D. (1846, 2 vols. 8vo); 5th edit. edited by his son J. H. Clark, M.D. (N. Y. 1855, 2 vols. 8vo). — Sprague, *Annals*, 4, 460.

### Clark, John

a Baptist minister, was born near Inverness, Scotland, Nov. 29th, 1758. Having from his early boyhood a strong propensity for a seafaring life, he was for about one year on board of a privateer, afterwards sailed as second mate to the West Indies, and arriving at Barbadoes, was impressed into the British navy. Here he deserted, and the next vessel on which he engaged being captured by the Spaniards, he was for nineteen months a prisoner of war at Havana. Soon after his exchange he was a second time impressed, and, deserting again, reached Charleston, A. C. In 1785 he taught school in the back settlements of Carolina. Revisiting England, he became acquainted with Mr. Wesley, and after his return to this country in 1789 he became an itinerant preacher in Georgia. Finally he became a Baptist, and a member of the so-called “*Baptized Church of Christ*,” or “*Friends of Humanity*,” on account of their opposition to slavery. Remaining a few months in the “Florida Parishes,” Louisiana, where he preached almost daily and with great acceptance, he traveled to Illinois on foot, and in 1811 revisited Louisiana, preaching wherever he had an opportunity, and travelling great distances, always on foot. He died in St. Louis Co., Mo., Oct. 11th, 1833. Sprague, *Annals*, 6, 490.

### Clark, John

a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Washington County, N. Y., July 30, 1797; was converted in 1817, and in 1820 entered the New York] Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church as an itinerant. Having labored within its bounds for sixteen years, he was in 1836 transferred to the Illinois Conference, and in 1841 to Texas. In 1844 he was a delegate to the General Conference of that year, and at its close was at his own request transferred to the Troy Conference. He was again transferred, in 1852, to the Rock River Conference, and stationed in Chicago, where he died of cholera, July 11, 1853. In all parts of the country he was eminently well received, and wherever he was stationed he left behind him the reputation of an able and earnest Christian minister. His frontier labors, full of toil and peril, which he met with abounding courage and energy, are amply

described in Hall's *Life of Rev. John Clark* (N.Y. 8vo). See also *Minutes of Conferences*, v. 485; Sprague, *Annals*, 7, 626; *Methodist Quarterly*, Jan. 1857, p. 148.

### Clark, John Alonzo D.D.,

a Protestant Episcopal minister, was born in Pittsfield, Mass., May 6, 1801, and graduated in Union College, July, 1823. He studied in the General Theological Seminary, New York, and was ordained deacon April 12, 1826, when he took charge of a missionary station at Palmnyra, N. Y. In 1829 he became assistant of Christ Church, New York City. In 1832 he accepted the rectorship of Grace Church, Providence, R. I., and in 1835 became rector of St. Andrew's, Philadelphia, where he labored for ten years with great acceptance and usefulness. His health failing, he made a visit to Europe, and on his return published *Glimpses of the Old World* (2 vols. 12mo, 1838). In 1843 he was compelled by the decline of his health to resign his rectorship, and on the 27th of November of that year he died. His publications, besides the *Travels* named above, are the following: *Christian Experience as displayed in the Life and Writings of St. Paul*; *The Pastor's Testimony* (1835); *The Young Disciple, or a Memoir of Anzonetta B. Peters* (12mo, 1836); *Gathered Fragments* (12mo, 1836); *A Walk about Zion* (12mo, 1836); *Gleanings by the Way* (12mo, 1842); a posthumous volume of sermons, entitled *Awake, thou Sleeper* (12mo). — Sprague, *Annals*, v. 674.

### Clark, Peter

a Congregational minister, was a native of Watertown, Mass., born 1693, graduated at Harvard 1712, and was ordained pastor in Salem village (now Danvers) June 3, 1717. He published several controversial pamphlets concerning "Original Sin" in opposition to the Rev. Samuel Webster and Dr. Chauncy (1757-1760); *Scripture Grounds of the Baptism of Christian Infants asserted and defended in a Letter, etc.* (1735); also several occasional sermons. He died in June, 1768. — Sprague, *Annals*, 1, 291.

### Clark, Samuel

a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born about 1800, in Frederick County, Va., of pious parents; entered the Baltimore Conference in 1821, located in 1834; entered the Ohio Conference in 1836, located in 1841, and emigrated to Iowa (then a Territory); entered the Iowa Conference in

1844, and, after various relations to this conference, died at his post, in Van Buren County, Iowa, Feb. 9, 1857. "This venerable man of God ... had gone up and down for nearly forty years, preaching 'Christ and the resurrection' to thousands, from the Atlantic to the western borders of civilization." He was formidable in debate, and ranked high as a minister and public speaker. — *Minutes of Conferences*, 1859, p. 243.

### Clarke, Adam LL.D.,

a Wesleyan Methodist minister, distinguished as a divine, an antiquarian, and an Oriental scholar, was born at Moybeg, Londonderry Co., Ireland, in 1760 or 1762 (his own mother could not fix the date). His father, who was a classical teacher, was a member of the Church of England, but his mother, who was of Scottish origin, was a Presbyterian. Adam, when a boy, was remarkable for physical vigor, but seemed rather stupid than otherwise, until about his eighth year, when the sarcasms of a school-fellow upon his dullness seemed to rouse him from a lethargy. From that time he made rapid progress in learning, especially in the Latin language. In his 17th year his mind was brought, by the ministry of Mr. Brettell and Mr. Barber (Methodist preachers), under religious impressions, and in 1778 he joined the Methodist society at Mullica Hill, near Coleraine. He soon became a class-leader and home-missionary. Having been recommended to the notice of Wesley, he was sent by him in 1782 to Kingswood School, where he did not remain long. His sufferings there are amusingly detailed in his autobiography. While digging one day in the garden at Kingswood he found a half guinea, with which he bought a Hebrew Bible; and this (he says in his *Autobiography*) "laid the foundation of all his knowledge of the sacred writings of the Old Testament." Towards the end of 1782 he was sent out by Wesley as an itinerant preacher, and he remained in this laborious work with few interruptions until 1815. A more earnest, faithful, and diligent preacher never lived, and few more popular have ever appeared in England. To the last the chapels where he preached were filled to overflowing. Every part of Great Britain and Ireland, as well as Guernsey, Jersey, and the Shetland Islands, shared in his toils as preacher and missionary. In 1795 he was appointed to London, and again in 1805; and he now remained in the metropolis ten years, full of labors in the pastoral work, in the benevolent enterprises of the day, and in literary pursuits. He was thrice elected (1806, 1814, 1822) president of the British Conference.

While a traveling preacher, he found time for much study, especially in Oriental literature. In 1802 he published a *Bibliographical Dictionary* (6 vols. 12mo), which at once gave him a literary reputation. Before this, as early as 1798, he began to gather materials for a *Commentary on the Bible*, the first part of which was published in 1810, and the last in 1825. "In this arduous work," he says, "I have had no assistants, not even a single week's help from an amanuensis; no person to look for commonplaces, or refer to an ancient author, to find out the place and transcribe a passage of Latin, Greek, or any other language (which my memory had generally recalled), or to verify a quotation, the help excepted which I received in the chronological department from my own nephew, Mr. John Edward Clarke. I have labored alone for twenty-five years previously to the work being sent to the press, and fifteen years have been employed in bringing it through the press, so that nearly forty years of life have been so consumed" (*Autobiography*).

His literary labors in London from 1805 to 1815 (during which he "was abundant also in labors as pastor and preacher") were enormous. Soon after his settlement in the city he was called into the committee Of the British and Foreign Bible Society, and for years he directed largely its publications in Oriental languages. In 1806 he published *The Bibliographical Miscellany* (2 vols.;.), a supplement to his *Bibliographical Dictionary*. In 1807 the University of Aberdeen gave him the degree of M.A., and in 1808 that of LL.D. In 1808 also appeared his *Succession of Sacred Literature*, vol. 1 (vol. 2 by his son, J. B. B. Clarke, 1830, 8vo). At the end of that year the Bible Society requested that the rule of the Conference under which Dr. Clarke would be compelled to leave London might be suspended in his case, in order that he might remain in their service longer. The request was granted. In the same year the British government entrusted to him the arrangement, for publication, of old state papers, in continuation of Rymer's *Foedera*. On this laborious and comparatively unprofitable task he spent the best part of ten years, being relieved from it in 1819. After the organization of the Wesleyan Missionary Society in 1814, he preached, spoke, and traveled largely in its service. During all this time he was working on his *Commentary*, and in studying for it made himself more or less completely master, not only of Greek and Hebrew, but also of the Oriental languages. He had long been acquainted with the languages of modern Europe. These varied and extraordinary labors at length injured his health, and in 1815 he withdrew from London

to a small estate at Millbrook, Lancashire. Here he continued to prosecute his literary labors, and especially his *Commentary*, which was now in an advanced state of preparation. In 1823 he returned to the vicinity of London, and fixed his residence at Haydon Hall, where he spent the remainder of his days, engaged in literary labor, and also in the service of the Church in various ways. Among his most important labors of this period was the organization of Methodism in the Shetland Islands, to which he made two missionary journeys (1826 and 1828). During the summer of 1832 he exerted himself too much, and died at Bayswater, Middlesex, August 26 of that year, of cholera.

Dr. Clarke's life was one of almost unparalleled industry as preacher, pastor, student, and author. His literary reputation rests chiefly upon his *Commentary* (last ed. Carlton and Porter, N. Y. 1866, 6 vols. 8vo), which has had a wider circulation than any other in the English language, except, perhaps, Matthew Henry's. It is now superseded by later works, but will always be cited with respect for its multifarious learning, and for the frequent originality and acuteness of its annotations. As a theologian, Dr. Clarke was an Arminian, and held the Wesleyan theology entire, with the exception of the doctrine of the Eternal Sonship of Christ. His error on this point drew out those admirable works, Watson's *Remarks on the Eternal Sonship* (Works, Lond. ed. vol. 7), and Treffry's *Inquiry into the Doctrine of the Eternal Sonship* (3d ed. Lond. 1849).

Besides the works mentioned, Dr. Clarke also published *Discourse on the Eucharist* (Lond. 1808, 8vo); *Memoirs of the Wesley Family* (Lond. 8vo, N. Y. 12mo, several editions). He also edited, with numerous additions, Baxter's *Christian Directory* Fleury's *Manners of the Israelites* Shuckford's *Sacred and Profane History*; Sturm's *Reflections on the Being and Attributes of God*; and Harmer's *Observations on various Passages of Scripture* (1808, 4 vols. 8vo). His contributions to periodicals, and his minor writings, pamphlets, etc. are too numerous to be mentioned. His *Miscellaneous Works* have been collected since his death (Lond. 13 vols. 8vo). See Clarke, J. B. B., *Life of A. Clarke* (Lond. 3 vols. 8vo); Southey, *Quarterly Revelation* 51, 117; Etheridge, *Life of A. Clarke* (Lond. 1858, N. Y. 1859, 12mo); Everett, *Adam Clarke portrayed* (Lond. 1843; 2d ed. 1866, 2 vols.); Stevens, *History of Methodism*, 2:291, et al. A monument to the memory of Dr. Clarke was erected at Port Rush, Ireland, in 1859, by contributions from both the Old and the New World.

## Clarke, Edward Daniel LL.D.,

an English divine, of note as a writer of travels, was born at Willingdon, Sussex, in 1769, and was educated at Jesus College, Cambridge. From 1790 to 1799 he acted as tutor and traveling companion in several families traveling in France, Italy, Switzerland, and Germany. "In 1799 he set out on an extensive tour with Mr. Cripps, a young man of fortune; they traversed Denmark, Norway, Sweden, Lapland, Finland, Russia, the country of the Don Cossacks, Tartary, Asia Minor, Syria, Egypt, Greece, and did not return to England till 1802." He was ordained in 1805, and received the college living of Harlton; in 1809 he was presented to the living of Yeldham by his father-in-law. His *Travels* appeared between 1810 and 1819 (5 vols.). A sixth volume, edited by Robert Walpole, was brought out after his death, 4to (also in 11 vols. 8vo, 1816). In 1803 he published *Testimonies of different Authors respecting the colossal Statue of Ceres*, and in 1805 *A Dissertation on the Sarcophagus in the British Museum*. He died at London, March 9th, 1822 (*English Cyclopaedia*, s.v.). See Otter, *Life and Remains of Edward Daniel Clarke* (Lond. 1825, 2 vols. 8vo).

## Clarke, John

a distinguished Baptist minister, was born in England, Oct. 8, 1609. He practiced medicine in London for some time, and came to Boston as a physician (date unknown). Dissatisfied with the management of the colony of Massachusetts, he left it, and with others purchased Aquetneck of the Indians, and called it Rhode Island. The deed dates March 24, 1638. In 1639 he, with eight others, founded Newport, R. I. It is not known when he became a Baptist or a preacher, but in 1644 he became first pastor of the Baptist church in Newport. In 1651 he visited a friend (William Witter) at Lynn, Mass.; held a religious meeting there; was arrested and fined by Judge Endicott twenty pounds, under penalty of public whipping in case the fine was not paid. Some of Mr. Clarke's friends paid his fine, but one of his companions (Mr. Holmes) was severely whipped. In 1651 he went to England to promote the interests of religious freedom in R. Island, and to have Mr. Coddington's commission as governor revoked. He accomplished this object. While in England he published *Ill News from New England, or a Narrative of New England's Persecution; wherein it is declared, that while Old England is becoming New, New England is becoming Old; also, Four Proposals to Parliament and Four Conclusions, touching the Faith and Order of the Gospel of Christ out of his last Will and Testament*, 4to,

p. 76. In 1664 he returned to Newport, where he remained as pastor and physician until his death, April 20, 1676. — Backus, *Church History of New England*, vol. 3; Benedict, *History of the Baptists*, vol. 1; Allen, *Am. Biog. Dictionary*, s.v.; Sprague, *Annals*, 6, 21.

### Clarke, John

dean of Sarum (brother of Dr. Samuel Clarke), was born at Norwich, and bred a weaver, but was afterwards educated at Cambridge, where he received the degree of D.D. He obtained a prebend at Norwich, was appointed chaplain to the king, and, finally, dean of Salisbury. He died in 1759. His principal writings are, *An Inquiry into the Cause and Origin of Evil* (Boyle Lecture, Lond. 1720-21, 2 vols. 8vo); a *Demonstration of Newton's Philosophy* (Lond. 1730, 8vo). His translation of *Grotius de Veritate* is still reprinted. He furnished the notes to Wharton's *Religion of Nature*.

### Clarke, Samuel

a Nonconformist, was born in Warwickshire, 1599; educated at Emmanuel College, Cambridge, and after preaching as an evangelist at Shotwick, and Coventry, and at Warwick (where he was chaplain to the earl), he became minister of Bennet Fink, London. He was ejected in 1662, and lived in studious retirement until his death in 1682. His chief works are *Marrow of Ecclesiastical History* (Lond. 1675, 2 vols. fol.); *A General Martyrology* (Lond. 1677, 3d ed. fol.); *Mirror for Saints and Sinners* (Lond. 1671, 2 vols. fol.); *Medulla Theologies* (1659, fol.). — Hook, *Eccles. Biography*, 4, 79; Calamy, *Nonconformists' Memorial*, 1, 83.

### Clarke, Samuel D.D.,

a celebrated English divine and metaphysician, was born at Norwich, October 11, 1675. He received his first education in the free-school of Norwich, but was entered at 1691 in Caius College, Cambridge. (The following account, so far as the facts of Clarke's life are concerned, is modified from the *English Cyclopaedia*, which is based on the *Biographia Britannica*.) At twenty-one, after closely studying and justly appreciating the reasonings of Newton's "Principia," which had then just appeared, he published a new version of the text of Rohault's *Physics*, with numerous critical notes, added with the view of bringing the Cartesian system into disrepute by exposing its fallacies. After passing through four editions as

the University text-book, it gave place, as Clarke desired, to the adoption of undisguised Newtonian treatises. He now went through a diligent course of Biblical reading in the original languages, in the course of which he carefully studied the early Christian fathers. On his ordination he was introduced to Dr. More, bishop of Norwich, by Whiston, whom he succeeded as domestic chaplain to that bishop for twelve years. In 1699 he published three essays on *Confirmation, Baptism, and Repentance*, together with *Reflections on Toland's Amyntor*, concerning the uncanonical Gospels. Two years afterwards followed his *Paraphrase on the Four Gospels*, which induced Bishop More to present him with the living of Drayton, near Norwich. In 1704 he was appointed to preach the Boyle lecture at Oxford, when he chose for his subject *The Being and Attributes of God*. The satisfaction which he gave on this occasion led to his reelection the following year, when he read a series of lectures on the *Evidences of natural and revealed Religion*. These discourses passed through several editions. Clarke's argument for the being of God "rests upon the fact that we have the conceptions of *time* and *space*, expressive of certain attributes or qualities—the one eternal, the other illimitable in its nature. But every quality must have a coexistent subject to which it belongs, and therefore, he argues, there must exist a *being* who possesses these attributes of infinity — that is, there must be a God. The similarity between Clarke's argument and that of Spinoza, in many points, is at once evident. They both started with the idea of necessary *existence*, showing that if any thing exist *now*, *something* must have existed from eternity. The distinction between the two arguments arises from their different determination of the *absolute idea* from which our reasoning must commence. Clarke affirmed the idea of infinite *attributes* to be fundamental, and then inferred an infinite substance. Spinoza began with the infinite substance, and inferred the attributes. The result was that the latter rested finally in the notion of substance as identical with God, and reduced the common theism to pantheism; the former, reasoning from the attributes, was open upon other evidence to conceive of them as existing in a divine personality — in the God of Christianity. The clearness, however, with which both grasped the idea of *the infinite*, as one of the necessary conceptions of the human mind, is in either case abundantly manifest" (Morell, *History of Modern Philosophy*, chap. 2, § 2).

Numerous replies and objections to this *a priori* argument appeared at the time of its first publication. (See a list in Kippis's *Biog. Britannica*, and the



correspondence between Butler, afterwards bishop of Durham, and Clarke, printed at the end of Bishop Butler's Works.) One of the principal was 'An Inquiry into the Ideas of Space, Time,' etc., by Bishop Law. The *Evidences* also met with strong opposition. **SEE GOD; SEE NATURAL THEOLOGY.** The foundation of morality, according to Clarke, consists in the immutable differences, relations, and eternal fitness of things. The last expression, being of frequent occurrence in this discourse, acquired a fashionable usage in the ethical vocabularies of the day. Regardless of moral sentiment, so fully developed since by Shaftesbury, Hutcheson, and Adam Smith, Clarke insists solely upon the principle that the criterion of moral rectitude is in the conformity to, or deviation from, the natural and eternal fitness of things; in other words, that an immoral act is an irrational act—that is, an act in violation of the actual ratios of existent things. The endeavor to reduce moral philosophy to mathematical certainty was characteristic of that age, and led to the formation of theories remarkable perhaps more for their ingenuity than utility. Dr. Price is an apologist for the moral theory of Clarke, and among its opposers we may instance Sir James Mackintosh, *Progress of Ethical Philosophy*, p. 78 sq.; see also Whewell, *Hist. of Moral Philosophy*, lect. 5.

In 1706 Clarke obtained the rectory of St. Bennett's, in London. He published in the same year an answer to the treatise of Dr. Dodwell "On the Soul," in which that divine contends that it is not immortal until made so by baptism. Several rejoinders followed on each side. His patron, Dr. More, next procured for him the rectorship of St. James's and a chaplaincy to Queen Anne, which induced him to take his degree of D.D. In 1712 appeared his *Scripture Doctrine of the Trinity*, a work which involved him for the remainder of his life in a controversy, in which his principal adversary was Dr. Waterland. A full account of the controversy may be found in Van Mildert's *Life of Waterland*, **SEE WATERLAND.** The Lower House of Convocation, in 1714, complained to the bishops of the heterodox and dangerous tendency of its Arian tenets, and Clarke was prevailed upon to apologize, and to declare his intention not to write any more upon the Trinity. A circumstantial account of this proceeding is given in the *Apology for Dr. Clarke*, 1714.

"Clarke's views were, in reality, a reproduction of the Origenistic and High-Arian doctrine of subordination, as distinguished from the Athanasian. His positions were the following: The supreme and only God is the Father — the sole origin of all being, power, and authority.

‘Concerning the Father, it would be the highest blasphemy to affirm that he could possibly have become man, or that he could possibly have suffered in any sense, in any supposition, in any capacity, in any circumstance, in any state, or in any nature whatever.’ With the Father there has existed ‘from the beginning’ a second divine Person, who is called his Word or Son; who derives his being or essence, and all his attributes, from the Father, not by *mere necessity of nature*, but by an act of the Father’s optional will. It is not certain whether the Son existed from all eternity, or only before all worlds; neither is it certain whether the Son was begotten from the same essence with the Father or made out of nothing. ‘Both are worthy of censure who, on the one hand, affirm that the Son was made out of nothing, or, on the other, affirm that he is the self-existent substance.’ Clarke will not be positive upon these points, because of the danger of presuming to be able to define the particular metaphysical manner of the Son’s deriving his essence from the Father. With the Father a third Person has also existed, deriving his essence from him through the Son. This Person has higher titles ascribed to him than to any angel, or other created being whatsoever; but is nowhere called God in Scripture, being subordinate to the Son, both by *nature* and by the *will* of the Father. The error of Clarke originated in his failure to discriminate carefully between the essence and the hypostasis. Hence, in quoting from the Scriptures and the fathers, he refers to the *essential nature* phraseology that implies subordination, and which was intended by those employing it to apply only to the *hypostatical character*. He even cites such high Trinitarians as Athanasius and Hilary as holding and teaching that the subordination of the Son to the Father relates to the Son’s *essence*. The term ‘unbegotten’ he also held, as did the Arians, to be a synonym with ‘uncreated,’ so that the term ‘begotten’ must necessarily signify ‘created.’ Thus, misconceiving the Nicene use of these two terms, he endeavors to prove that the Nicene Trinitarians taught that the Father alone possesses necessary existence, while the Son exists contingently. But both of these terms, as we have seen, were limited by the Council of Nice to the Person, and have no relation to the essence. The essence, as such, neither begets nor is begotten. They merely indicate the peculiar manner in which the first and second hypostasis participate in one and the same eternal substance or nature. In this use of the terms, consequently, ‘begotten’ signifies ‘uncreated’ as much as does ‘unbegotten.’ The Begotten Son is as necessarily existent as the Unbegotten Father, because the essence is the seat and source of necessary existence, and this is possessed alike by both-

in the instance of the first Person by paternity, and of the second by filiation” (Shedd, *History of Christian Doctrine*, 1, 386-388).

“The point on which Clarke’s philosophical fame chiefly rests, and to which he devoted a very considerable portion of his life, was his controversy upon *Liberty and Necessity* — a controversy in which he stood Opposed to Leibnitz and Collins, and by which he endeavored to overturn, finally, the fatalistic conclusions of Spinozism. Throughout this contest, the victory in which was claimed on both sides, Clarke maintained most powerfully the doctrine of Free-will, and, accordingly, here also manifested his opposition to the philosophy which tends to merge the idea of self either into that of nature or of God. Of the three fundamental conceptions, therefore, from which all philosophy springs, those of finite self and the infinite held in the writings of Clarke by far the most prominent place, so that we may properly regard him as the chief representative of the idealistic tendency during the age immediately succeeding Locke, as Cudworth was during the age that immediately preceded him” (Morell; *History of Modern Philosophy*, pt. 1, ch. 2, § 2).

In 1724 Clarke obtained the mastership of Wigston Hospital, and published a volume of sermons. He died rather suddenly in May, 1729. His *Exposition of the Church Catechism* and *Sermons* were published after his death (London, 1730, 10 vols. 8vo). In the *Catechism* he teaches that worship should be paid to the Father only, through the Son, and in the Holy Spirit. The moral character of Clarke is praised by all his biographers. His principal works were translated into German by Semler, and prepared the way for German Rationalism. “He was a wary and very skillful disputant, well disciplined in the scholastic logic. Inferior to Locke in comprehensiveness and originality, he was greatly superior to him in acquirements, being eminent as a divine, a mathematician, a metaphysician, and a philologist” (*English Cyclopaedia*). His *Works* were published in 1738, in 4 vols. fol., of which the first contains his Life (by Hoadley), and 114 Sermons, published from his MS.; the second contains 76 Sermons and the Boyle Lectures; the third, a paraphrase of the Four Evangelists, with minor pieces; the fourth, the *Scripture Doctrine of the Trinity*, and a number of controversial tracts. Of the separate works numerous editions have been published. See, besides the writers already cited, (especially) Fairbairn’s *Appendix to Dorner’s Person of Christ* (Edinburgh translation, div. ii, vol. 3:370 sq.); Hoadley, *Life of Clarke* (prefixed to *Works*, 4 vols.); Hook, *Ecclesiastes Biography*, 4, 88; Watson, *Theological Institutes*, 1,

331 (N. Y. ed.); Hagenbach, *History of Doctrines* (ed. by Smith), § 234, § 262.

### Claromontanus, Codex

SEE CLERMONT MANUSCRIPT.

### Clarkson, Thomas

was born March 26, 1760, at Wisbeach, Cambridgeshire, where his father, a clergyman, was master of the free grammar-school. He studied at St. John's College, Cambridge, and became a promoter of the anti-slavery agitation in Great Britain by a Latin prize-essay which he wrote in 1785, on the question, "Is it right to make slaves against their will?" In order to pursue the agitation of the question, he relinquished his chances of advancement in the Church, for which he was intended, and in which he had taken deacon's orders. His essay was translated into English, and had an extensive circulation. Thenceforth his life was devoted to the anti-slavery cause. He labored indefatigably to bring to light the iniquities and cruelties of the slave-trade, traveling some years thousands of miles in furtherance of his benevolent designs, and publishing on the subject almost every year. He lived to see not only the slavetrade abolished (in 1807), but the abolition of slavery itself in the British West Indies in 1833. He also took an active part in other benevolent schemes, particularly in the establishment of institutions for seamen. He died Sept. 26, 1846. His principal writings are, *History of the Abolition of the Slave-trade* (2 vols. 8vo, 1808; new ed., with Preface by Brougham, 1839); *A Portrait of Quakerism*, 1807; and *a Life of William Penn*, 1813. See Taylor, *Biog. Sketch of T. Clarkson* (Lond. 1847, 12mo).

### Class-Leader

SEE CLASS-MEETINGS.

### Class-Meetings

In the Methodist Episcopal Church, and indeed in all Methodist churches throughout the world, each congregation is divided into smaller companies, called *classes*. One of the more experienced members is appointed by the pastor to be *leader* of the class. "It is his duty," in the Methodist Episcopal Church,

**I.** To see each person in his class once a week at least; in order

- (1.) To inquire how their souls prosper.
- (2.) To advise, reprove, comfort, or exhort, as occasion may require.
- (3.) To receive what they are willing to give towards the relief of the preachers, church, and poor.

**II.** To meet the ministers and the stewards of the society once a week; in order

- (1.) To inform the minister of any that are sick, or of any that walk disorderly, and will not be reproved.
- (2.) To pay the stewards what they have received of their several classes in the week preceding” (*Discipline*, pt. 1, ch. 2, § 1).

A rudiment of the “class-meeting” may perhaps be found in the *Prophecyings* begun at Northampton. These were religious meetings for discussions on the Scriptures, prayer, and mutual instruction, conducted by clergymen under fixed rules. Bishop Grindal, Bishop Parkhurst, and other bishops highly approved them, but Queen Elizabeth prohibited them (May 7, 1577; Wilkins, *Concil.* 4:289); they were, however, kept up in many places until Whitgift (who became archbishop of Canterbury in 1583) succeeded, in his violent way, in putting them down. Marsden (*Churches and Sects*, 1, 250) remarks that these meetings gave Wesley “the idea of those social meetings in which the laity were to sustain an important part, though still under the guidance of their pastors, and in which the strength of Methodism consists” (see also Grant, *History of the English Church*, 1, 426, London, 1811). A nearer approach to the “class-meeting” is to be found in the “*religious societies*” so widely diffused in the Church of England toward the close of the 17th century. According to Woodward (*Rise and Progress of the Religious Societies*, etc., Lond. 1744), it was “about 1666 that several young men in London, being brought to serious convictions by the preaching of their clergy, and applying to their ministers for religious counsel, were advised by them to meet together once a week, and apply themselves to good discourse and things wherein they might edify one another.” These societies soon multiplied, and in 1678 a digest of rules for their conduct was adopted. Horneck, Beveridge, Stillingfleet, and Tillotson were among the promoters of these societies. By 1691 there were forty of these religious societies in London, and many in other parts of

England. For their rules see Woodward (cited above), and also Hook, *Ecclesiastical Biography*, 2, 363; 6:166. Dr. Clarke (*Memoirs of the Wesley Family*, Lond. 1843, vol. 1, p. 144) gives a letter from Samuel Wesley, *Concerning the Religious Societies* (1699), in which they are named as supplying the lack of confraternities, sodalities, etc., in the Church of England, and their objects and methods are highly commended. On the Continent of Europe, the *Collegia Pietatis*, begun by Spener at about the same time, had ends and methods somewhat like those of the later class-meeting, *SEE PIETISM; SEE SPENER*. Woodward's book was translated into German by the excellent D. E. Jablonski (q.v.), and similar societies were formed in various parts of Germany (*Christian Remembrancer*, July, 1854, 200). The nearest approach to the "class-meeting" in the Roman Church is perhaps to be found in the "Society of St. Vincent de Paul," which is composed of laymen, whose objects are mutual edification at periodical meetings, and the promotion of active charity. *SEE VINCENT DE PAUL, SOCIETY OF*.

When Wesley commenced his itinerant labors, the *religious societies* "received Mr. Wesley with open arms" (Coke and Moore, *Life of Wesley*, 1792, p. 6, 7). It is not at all unlikely that Wesley's views as to the true "social" life of Christianity received an impulse from these organizations. But, according to his own account, the "class-meeting" arose out of what was at first a merely fiscal plan to pay a church debt in Bristol (1742). "It was agreed

- (1.) That every member of the society that was able should contribute a penny a week;
- (2.) That the whole society should be divided into little companies or classes, about twelve in each class; and
- (3.) That one person in each should receive that contribution of the rest, and bring it in to the stewards weekly. Thus began that excellent institution, merely upon a temporal account, from which we reaped so many spiritual blessings that we soon fixed the same rule in all our societies" (Wesley, *Works*, N. Y. ed., 7, 350). Some time after, complaints being made to Wesley of the conduct of some members of the societies, it struck his mind, "This is the very thing we need. The leaders are the persons who may not only receive the contributions, but also watch over the souls of their brethren" (Wesley, *Works*, 7, 350). All Mr. Wesley's

societies were soon divided into these classes, under rules which are still substantially observed (see above).

Much of the energy, unity, and stability of Methodism is due to the class system. The most intelligent and advanced Methodists hold it in high esteem. "Methodism holds that the communion of saints is part of a man's duty before he can claim to be a partaker of the body and blood of Christ, which is the public sign of fellowship with the whole body; and it says to a man that we hold that it is part of God's will that we should exhort one another, edify one another, confess our faults one to another, commune one with another on God's dealings with us and our walk with God. I am prepared to stand before members of the Lutheran Church, members of Presbyterian or Episcopal churches, and say, as I constantly do, You omit from your Church organization a vital part of New Testament Christianity. Your Church provides for the individual life; it provides for the public life of the Church, but it altogether leaves out the social life of the Church; and that is in the New Testament as I hold" (Arthur, *Speech at Wesleyan Conference, Sheffield*, 1863). "Nothing is so little understood amongst Christians as the nature of the 'communion of saints,' and its vitalizing influence in the conservation of religious life, and the enlargement of the kingdom of Christ. The class-meeting amongst the Methodists is nothing but the realization of this idea; it is the concert of souls actuated by religious feeling to carry out the great purpose of their 'high calling.' It has been the true life of every thing in Methodism, in every part of the world, like those agencies of nature which lie out of sight, but, by their penetrating influence, give vitality alike to the flower and the forest tree" (*Lond; Quar. Review*, Oct. 1854, p. 131). "Even if the class-meeting were less inseparably bound up with the entire disciplinary and financial economy of Methodism, still its advantages are so numerous that to sever it from the Methodistic system would be to inflict a paralyzing stroke, if not a death-blow. It affords opportunity for instruction more individual and personal than can be offered from the pulpit, for Christian fellowship more intimate than can be enjoyed in the congregation, for the needful outpourings of a mind burdened either with sorrow or with joy, for watching the progress of young disciples, for preventing backsliding by timely admonition, and for special oversight of the sick and the poor." See Keys, *Class leaders' Manual* (N. Y. 1851, 18mo); Miley, *Treatise on Class-meetings* (Cincinnati. 1851, 18mo); Rosser, *On Class-meetings* (Richmond, 1855); Fish, *On Class-meetings* (Lond. 1850, 18mo); Wesley, *Works* (N. Y. edit.),

v. 179, and often; Porter, *Compendium of Methodism*, 47, 458; Stevens, *History of Methodism*, 2, 430, 452; *Wesleyan Methodist Magazine*, July, 1863, p. 619; August, 1855, p. 704; Smith, *History of Wesleyan Methodism*, 1, 660-672 (Lond. 1857, 8vo); *Meth. Quar. Rev.* 1862, 559, 662; *Life of Father Reeves, the Class-leader* (N. Y. Carlton and Porter).

## Clau'da

(Κλαύδη), a small island off the S.W. coast of Crete, which Paul passed on his tempestuous voyage to Rome (<sup>476</sup>Acts 27:16); called also *Gaudos* by Mela (2, 7) and Pliny (*Hist. Nat.* 4, 42), *Claudus* (Κλαῦδος) by Ptolemy (in, 7), and *Claudia* (Κλαυδία) in the *Stadiasmus Maris Magni*: it is still called *Clauda-nesa*, or *Gaudonesi*, by the Greeks, which the Italians have corrupted into *Gozzo* of Candia, to distinguish it from another island of the same name (anciently likewise called *Claudos*) near Malta. It is said to have been the Calypso's isle of mythic fame (Callin. ap. Strabo, p. 299). According to Pococke, it is now inhabited only by some thirty families (*East*, 2, 347; Prokesch, *Denkwird.* 1, 598). This otherwise insignificant islet is of great geographical importance in reference to the removal of some of the difficulties connected with Paul's shipwreck at Melita. The position of *Clauda* is nearly due W. of Cape Matala, on the S. coast of Crete, **SEE FAIR HAVENS**, and nearly due S. of Phoenice (q.v.). (See Ptol. 3:17, 1; *Stadiasm.* p. 496, ed. Gail.) The ship was seized by the gale a little way after passing Cape Matala, when on her way from Fair Havens to Phoenice (<sup>477</sup>Acts 27:12-17). The storm came down from the island (κατ' αὐτῆς, v. 14), and there was danger lest the ship should be driven into the African Syrtis (v. 17). It is added that she was driven to *Clauda*, and ran under the lee of it (v. 16). We see at once that this is in harmony with, and confirmatory of, the arguments derivable from: all the other geographical circumstances of the case (as well as from the etymology of the word Euroclydon, or Euro-Aquilo), which lead us to the conclusion that the gale came from the N.E., or, rather, E.N.E. This island is about seven miles long and three broad. Its W. shore, which trends in a N.W. direction, and is prolonged by "some rocks adjacent," would "afford the advantage of comparatively smooth water for some twelve or fifteen miles" (Adm. Penrose's MS. in Conybeare and Howson's *St. Paul*, 2, 327) to a ship "caught," as Paul's was, with "a tempestuous wind" from the N.E. Accordingly, under the lee shore of *Clauda* were taken those skillful precautions of "hoisting in the boat," "undergirding [or frapping] the ship," and making her snug by "lowering the gear;" which kept the ship (q.v.)



from foundering under the pressure of a fortnight's "gale in Adria," and preserved her for the rough remedy of a wreck on the island of Melita (Smith, *Voy. and Shipwreck of St. Paul*, 2d ed. p. 92, 98, 106, 253). **SEE SHIPWRECK.**

### Claude, Jean

one of the most eminent of French Protestant divines, was born at La Sauvetat, near Agen, in the south of France, in 1619. He studied theology at Montauban, was ordained in 1645, and began his pastoral labors at La Tregue in the same year. In 1654 he was called to the church at Nismes, where he also taught in the theological school. In 1661 he was interdicted from his functions by the government, as a penalty for opposing, in the provincial synod, a project of union between Romanists and Protestants proposed by the governor of Languedoc. He went to Paris to have this penalty revoked, and while there was prevailed upon by Madame Turenne (who wished to save her husband from Romanism) to write against Arnauld on the Eucharist, which led to a controversy of great note. Claude's tractate was circulated in MS.; but in 1664 Arnauld published his celebrated *Perpetuite de la Foi*, etc. **SEE ARNAULD**, to which Claude replied in 1667 in his *Reponse au Traite de la Perpetuite de la Foi*, etc. (see an account of the controversy in Bayle, translation of 1736, 10 vols., 4:366). He had previously been appointed minister at Montauban (1662), and also professor of theology. In 1666 he was interdicted again, and in that year he became pastor of the Reformed church at Charenton, near Paris. Here he remained, popular and useful, regarded as the chief literary defender of French Protestantism, until 1685. The eminent Port-Royalists, Arnauld and Nicole, found him a capable and worthy opponent. "In 1673 appeared his *Defense de la Reformation, ou Response aux Prejuges legitimes de Nitcole* (latest ed. Paris, 1844, 8vo). In 1681 Claude had a controversial conference with Bossuet, after which he published *Reponse a la Conference de Bossuet* (La Haye, 1683, 8vo). The conference, as usual, led to no approximation between the contending parties." In 1685 the revocation of the edict of Nantes by Louis XIV obliged Claude to seek refuge in Holland, where he was well received, on account both of his talents: and his personal character, and the prince of Orange granted him a pension. He died Jan. 13, 1687. His *Plaintes des Protestans cruellement opprimes dans le Royaume de France* was published after his death (best ed. by Basnage, Cologne, 1763, 8vo). His style, though simple, was vigorous, being sustained by logical skill and erudition. La Devezé wrote a

biography of Claude (Amsterdam, 1687)” (*Eng. Cyclopaedia*). Several of his works are translated, viz. Townsend, *Claude’s Historical Defence of the Reformation, with Life of Claude* (Lond. 1815, 2 vols. 8vo): — *Essay on the Composition of a Sermon* (latest ed. N. Y. 1853, 12mo) . — *Account of the Complaints of the Protestants* (London, 1707, 12mo). — Haag, *La France Protestante*, 3, 473; Mosheim, *Ch. Hist.* cent. 17, sec. 2, pt. 1, ch. 1, § 12, note; Bayle, l. c. On Claude’s qualities as a preacher, and his homiletical services, see Vinet, *Histoire de la Predication*, p. 303 sq. (Paris, 1860, 8vo).

### Claude Of Turin.

*SEE CLAUDIUS, CLEMENS.*

### Clau’dia

(*Κλαυδία*, femn. of *Claudius*), a Christian female mentioned in <sup><sup>2</sup> Timothy 4:21, as saluting Timotheus, A.D. 64. She is thought to have become the wife of Pudens, who is mentioned in the same verse (although Linus is named between). It has been supposed that this Claudia was a British maiden, daughter of king Cogidunus, an ally of Rome (Tacitus, *Agricol.* 14), who took the name of his imperial patron, Tiberius Claudius. Pudens, we gather from an inscription at Chichester, and now in the gardens at Goodwood, was at one time in close connection with king Cogidunus, and gave an area for a temple of Neptune and Minerva, which was built by that king’s authority. Claudia is said in Martial (11, 53) to have been of British extraction (*caeruleis Britannis edita*). Moreover, she is there also called *Rufina*. Now Pomponia, wife of the late commander in Britain, Aulus Plautius, under whom Claudia’s father was received into alliance, belonged to a house of which the Rufi were one of the chief branches. If she herself were a Rufa, and Claudia her protegee, the latter might well be called Rufina; and we know that Pomponia was tried for having embraced a foreign religion (*superstitionis externae rea*) in the year 57 (Tacitus, *Ann.* 12:32), so that there are many circumstances concurrent tending to give verisimilitude to the conjecture. On the other hand, it may be said that the attempt to identify this Claudia with the British lady Claudia, whose marriage to Pudens is celebrated by Martial (*Epig.* 4, 13), rests on no foundation beyond the identity of the names of the parties, and the fact that Martial calls Pudens “sanctus,” and says he was a corrector of his verses. But the identity of names so common as Pudens and Claudia</sup>

may be nothing more than a mere accidental coincidence; as for the term “sanctus,” it is precisely one which a heathen would *not* have applied to a Christian, whom he would have regarded as the adherent of a “prava superstitio” (Pliny, Ep. *ad Traj.*); and as respects Pudens’s correction of Martial’s verses, until we know whether that was a correction of their style or a correction of their morals (in which case Pudens really must have done his work very badly), we can build nothing on it. On the other hand, the immoral character of Martial himself renders it improbable that he should have had a Christian and a friend of Paul among his friends. Further, Paul’s Pudens and Claudia, if husband and wife, must have been married before A.D. 67, the latest date that can be assigned to Paul’s writing. But Martial’s epigram must have been written after this, perhaps several years after, for he came to Rome only in A.D. 66; so that, if they were married persons in 67, it is not likely Martial would celebrate their nuptials years after this. In fine, if Paul’s Pudens and Claudia were unmarried at the time of his writing, they must at least have been persons of standing and reputation among the Christians; and, in this case, can it be supposed that a poet meaning to gratify them would invoke on them the favor of heathen deities, whom they had renounced with abhorrence? See Archdeacon Williams’s pamphlet, *On Pudens and Claudia* (Lond. 1848); an article in the *Quart. Rev.* for July, 11858, entitled “The Romans at Colchester;” and an Excursus in Alford’s *Greek Testament* (vol. 3. prolegg. p. 104), in which the contents of the two works first mentioned are embodied in a summary form. See also Conybeare and Howson’s *St. Paul*, 2, 484 n.

### Claudianus Mamertus

a presbyter of Vienne, 5th century (died about 470), was a man of speculative talent, and well acquainted with the theology of Augustine. He wrote a treatise, *De statu Animve* (*Bib. Max. Patr.* 6; *Bib. Patr. Galland.* 10) against the anthropomorphism of Faustus of Rhegium (q.v.). He shows that “thought is inseparable from the essence of the soul, and that its spiritual activity is indestructible” (Neander, *History of Dogmas*, ed. Ryland, 1:340). For an analysis of the tract, see Dupin, *Eccles. Writers*, 2, 150 (Lond. 1693), and Clarke, *Succession of Sacred Literature*, 2, 249. Certain Latin hymns are attributed to Claudius, viz., *Contra Poetas vanos* (in the *De Statu* above), and *Pange lingua gloriosi*, which last, however, is more properly ascribed to Venatius Fortunatus. Sidonius Apollinaris, to whom the *De Anima* is dedicated, gives a glowing panegyric upon the talents of Claudianus.

## Clau'dius

### Picture for Clau'dius

(Κλαύδιος, for Lat. *Claudius*, perh. from *claudus*, *lime*), the name of two Romans mentioned in the N.T. *SEE FELIX*.

**1.** The fourth Roman emperor (excluding J. Caesar), who succeeded Caligula Jan. 25, A.D. 41. His full name was TIBERIUS CLAUDIUS DRUSUS NERO CAESAR AUGUSTUS GERMANICUS. He was the son of Drusus and Antonia, and was born Aug. 1, B.C. 10, at Lyons, in Gaul. Losing his father in infancy, he was abandoned to the care and society of domestics, and despised by his imperial relatives (Tacitus, *Ann.* 6, 46, 1 Suetonius, *Claud.* 2). Notwithstanding the weakness of intellect resulting from this neglect, he devoted himself to literary pursuits, and was the author of several treatises. On the murder of Caligula, he hid himself through fear of sharing his relative's fate, but was found by a soldier, at whose feet he fell a suppliant, but who saluted him emperor; and he was thus unexpectedly, and almost by force, hurried into the popular assembly, and constituted emperor chiefly by the Praetorian Guards, under promise of a largess to each soldier (Suetonius, *Claud.* 10). According to Josephus (*Ant.* 19, 2, 1, 3 and 4), the throne was in a great measure finally secured to him through the address and solicitations of Herod Agrippa I (q.v.). This obligation he returned by great and peculiar favors to that personage, for he enlarged the territory of Agrippa by adding to it Judaea, Samaria, and some districts of Lebanon, and appointed his brother Herod to the kingdom of Chalcis (Josephus, *Ant.* 19, 5, 1; Dion Cassius, 60:8), giving to this latter also, after his brother's death, the presidency over the Temple at Jerusalem (Josephus, *Ant.* 20, 1, 3). Indeed, the Jews were generally treated by him with indulgence, especially those in Asia and Egypt (*Ant.* 19, 5, 2, 3; 20:1, 2), although those in Palestine seem to have at times suffered much oppression at the hands of his governors (Tacitus, *Hist.* 5, 9, etc.); but about the middle of his reign those who abode at Rome were all banished thence (<sup>488B</sup>Acts 18:2; see Hebenstreit, *De Judaeo Roma exule*, Lips. 1714). From the language of Suetonius in relating this event (*Claud.* 25), it is evident that the Christians were also indiscriminately included in the execution of the edict as a sect of the Jews, if, indeed, they were not the more numerous part of that portion of the inhabitants: "Judaeos, imlulsore Chresto [i.e. Christo, see Rossal, *De Christo, in Chrestum commutato*, Gron. 1717] assidue tumultuantes, Roma expulit" ("He banished the Jews

from Rome on account of the continual disturbances they made at the instigation of one Chrestus"). *SEE CHRESTUS*. The historian has evidently, in his ignorance of the merits of the case, attributed the proverbial insurrectionary spirit of the Jews to the influence of Christianity, a confusion which the disputes between the Jews and Christians on the subject of the Messiah may have contributed to increase. Suetonius does not give the exact year of this event, nor can it be made out from any other classical authority; he mentions it, however, in connection with other events which are known to have taken place at different dates between A.D. 44 and 53: a comparison of the associated events in the Acts appears to fix it in the year A.D. 49. Orosius (*Hist.* 7, 6) fixes it in the ninth year of Claudius, A.D. 49 or 50, referring to Josephus, who, however, says nothing about it. Pearson (*Annal. Paul.* p. 22) thinks the twelfth year more probable (A.D. 52 or 53). Anger remarks (*De ratione temporum in Actis App.* p. 117) that the edict of expulsion would hardly be published as long as Herod Agrippa was at Rome, i.e. before the year 49. The Jews, however, soon returned to Rome. Several famines occurred under Claudius from unfavorable harvests (Dion Cass. 60:11; Eusebius. *Chron. Armen.* 1, 269, 271; Tacit. *Ann.* 12, 43), one of which, in the fourth year of his reign, under the procurators Cuspius Fadus and Tiberius Alexander (Joseph. *Ant.* 20, 2, 6; 5, 2), extended to Palestine and Syria, and appears to be that which was foretold by Agabus (~~411B~~ Acts 11:28; see Biscoe, *On Acts*, p. 60, 66; Lardner, *Credibility*, 1, 11; Kitto, *Daily Bible Illust.*, last vol., p. 229-232; compare Kuinol, in loc.; also Krebs, *Obs. in N.T.* p. 210). The conduct of Claudius during his government, in so far as it was not under the influence of his wives and freedmen, was mild and popular, and he made several beneficial enactments (see Merivale, *Romans under the Empire*, 5 474 sq.). He also erected numerous public buildings, and carried out several important public works. Having married his niece Agrippina, she prevailed upon him to set aside his own son Britannicus in favor of her own son Nero by a former marriage; but, discovering that he regretted this step, she poisoned him on the 13th of October, A.D. 54. (See Smith's *Dictionary of Classical Biography*, s.v.) During the reign of Claudius several persecutions of Christians by Jews took place in the dominions of Herod Agrippa, and in one of them the apostle James was executed. These dominions embraced by far the largest number of Christian congregations which were established up to the time of his death (A.D. 44). After his death, most of the territory over which he had ruled was reincorporated with the Roman empire, his son, Agrippa II, receiving only Trachonitis and

Gaulonitis. Thus the Christian congregations began to attract to a larger degree the attention of the Roman authorities. At the same time, the apostle Paul began to establish congregations in many of the larger cities of the empire, while those of earlier origin assumed much larger dimensions. Nevertheless, the difference between Jews and Christians was not generally understood by the Roman authorities, and this circumstance had some beneficial, but also some injurious consequences as regarded the Christians. On the one, hand, the missionary activity of the apostles and their helpers met with no opposition on the part of the Roman state (see Kraft, *Prolus. II de nascenti Christi ecclesia sectae Judaicae nomine tuta* [Erlang. 1771], and J. H. Ph. Seidenstucher, *Diss. de Christianis ad Trojanum usque a Caesaribus et Senatu Romano pro cultoribus religionis Mosaicae semper habitis* [Helmstadt, 1790]); on the other hand, many who might have been willing to join the Christian Church were deterred from doing so by the fear that the yoke of all the Jewish law would be placed upon them. (See Wetzer und Welte, *Kirchen-Lexikon*, s.v.)

2. CLAUDIUS LYSIAS (~~4235~~ Acts 23:26). *SEE LYSIAS*.

### Claudius, Clemens

bishop of Turin, sometimes called the “first Protestant Reformer,” was born in Spain about the close of the eighth century, and educated under Felix of Urgel; whom he accompanied into France, Germany, and Italy, but whose errors there is no evidence that he adopted (Neander, *Church History*, 3. 430, Torrey’s). Called to the court of Louis le Debonnaire to expound the Scriptures, he was sent by that monarch, when emperor, to the see of Turin (an event variously dated from 814 to 823) in order to oppose the prevailing tendency to image-worship. Not only against this form of idolatry, but against the worship of saints, of relics, and of the cross, against the abuse of pilgrimage, against the rising claims of tradition, prelacy, and the Romish see, he maintained a vigorous and able opposition till his death in 839, with such success and such results as usually attend those, whose errors fall on the side of boldness rather than of timidity. Pope Paschal I reproved Claudius; he replied that so long as “the pope did the works of an apostle, he recognized his apostolical character, but otherwise, then ~~4232~~ Matthew 23:2, 3, applied to him.” His writings are chiefly commentaries on several books of Scripture, composed principally of extracts from the fathers, and especially from Augustine. Many remain in MS. in various French libraries. His *Comm. in Galatas*, and excerpts

from his *Apologeticum*, are given in *Bibl. Max. Patr.* 14: See Neander, *Ch. Hist.* 3. 429 sq.; Gieseler, *Ch. Hist.* per. 3. div. 1, § 12; Hagenbach, *Hist. of Doctrines*, 2, 422; Murdoch's Mosheim, *Ch. Hist.* 1, 218, 225; Rudelbach, *Claud. Taur. Episcop. inedit. opp. specimina* (Copenhagen, 1824, 8vo); Schmidt, in *Zetschrift für die hist. Theol.* 1843.

### Claudius, Matthias

better known under the *nom de plume* of *Asmus*, or *Der Wandsbecker Bote* (the Wandsbeck Messenger), a German writer, was born at Rheinfeld, in Holstein, Jan. 2, 1740. He studied law at Jena, and, after having held for a short time an office at Darmstadt, became, in 1778, "revisor" at the Schleswig-Holstein Bank in Altona. He resided at the village of Wandsbeck, near Altona (hence his *nom de plume*), where he spent the greater part of his life. He died on the 21st of January, 1815, at Hamburg, in the house of his son-in-law, the publisher, Frederick Perthes. Claudius is still regarded as one of the most gifted popular writers of Germany, and his books had a very large circulation during his lifetime. He was on terms of intimacy with Voss, Herder, Jacobi, Hamann, Lavater, Stollberg, and many other prominent literary men of his times. In the Church history of Germany he bears an honorable name as one of the most effective opponents of the vulgar rationalism which at that time threatened to obtain — absolute sway over the whole of Protestant Germany. In his earlier writings, he, on the whole, confined himself to ridiculing the arrogance and intolerance of the Rationalists; but he steadily grew warmer and more emphatic in his opposition to rationalism, and in his attachment to a strict Lutheranism, and on that account fell out with some of his former friends, as Voss and Jacobi. Claudius began in 1765 a complete edition of his works, under the title *Asmus omnia sua secumportans*, 8 vols., to which some addition was made in 1812 (latest edition, 1844). A biography of Claudius has been written by Herbst (Gotha, 1857). — Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 2, 712; Brockhans, *Conversations Lexikon*, 4, 547.

### Claudius Of Savoy

a Unitarian of the sixteenth century, who, in a disputation at Berne, 1534, maintained that Christ was a man, who "was called God inasmuch as he had received the fullness of the divine Spirit beyond all other beings. The Father dwelt in him through the divine Spirit, and all through him might be animated by the Father" (Neander, *History of Dogmas*, Ryland's transl.,



2:647). He was expelled from Berne, imprisoned at Strasburgh, returned to Switzerland, and recanted at Lausanne, 1537. See Schelhorn, *De Mino Celso et Claudio Allobroge* (Ulm, 1748, 8vo); Mosheim, *Ch. Hist.* 3, 223; Trechsel, *die protest. Antitrinitarier*, 1, 55.

## Claustrum

SEE CLOISTER.

## Clausfra

(Lat.), the enclosure of a monastic establishment, usually square, and surrounded by a wall. Ordinarily monks or nuns are not allowed to go beyond this space, or to receive a visit within it, without the especial permission of the head of the establishment.

## Claw

(**h**s**r****P**i, *parsah'*, *cleft*, i.e. cloven foot), prop. a *hoof* (as usually rendered) of a bifurcated animal (<sup>1006</sup>Exodus 10:26; <sup>3013</sup>Micah 4:13; <sup>3211</sup>Ezekiel 32:11), or of a solid-footed quadruped (e.g. a horse, <sup>2168</sup>Isaiah 5:28; <sup>2478</sup>Jeremiah 47:3); hence for the distinctive mark of a clean (q.v.) creature ("claw," <sup>5416</sup>Deuteronomy 14:16), or the sharp weapons of a beast of prey ("claw," <sup>3816</sup>Zechariah 11:16), or the talons of a predatory bird ("claw," <sup>2083</sup>Daniel 4:33). In one passage (<sup>1900</sup>Psalm 10:10) the powerful, clawed paw of a lion (q.v.) is poetically denoted by the term **μ****υ****μ****Υ****Χ** [ ] "strong ones,"

## Clay

is the rendering of several words, more or less accurately, in certain passages in the English Bible: **f****y****f****a****i**, prop. *mud* (<sup>1912</sup>Psalm 40:2), i.e. mire (as often rendered), hence potter's *clay*, as being trodden fine (<sup>2342</sup>Isaiah 41:25; <sup>3484</sup>Nahum 3:14); corresponding to the Gr. **π****η****λ****ό****ς** (<sup>4006</sup>John 9:6, 11, 14, 15; <sup>4121</sup>Romans 9:21; Wisd, 7:9; 15:7, 8; Ecclesiasticus 33:13; 38:30; Bel 7), as soiling or plastic; and **r****m****j** **ρ** *cho'mer*, reddish *loam* (<sup>8049</sup>Job 4:19; 13:12; 27:16; 33:67), e.g. potter's clay (<sup>2396</sup>Isaiah 29:16; 45:9; <sup>2480</sup>Jeremiah 18:4, 6), as used for sealing (<sup>1884</sup>Job 38:14), or for cement of building ("mortar," <sup>01108</sup>Genesis 11:3), so for making brick (<sup>0114</sup>Exodus 1:14; "mortar," <sup>2342</sup>Isaiah 41:25; <sup>3484</sup>Nahum 3:14); also common street "mire" (<sup>2306</sup>Isaiah 10:6; <sup>1809</sup>Job 30:19; "clay,"



<3810>Job 10:9). Other terms so rendered less correctly are: **fl m**, *me'let*, mortar for plastering (<2489>Jeremiah 43:9); and the Chald. **ās̄j }** *chasaph'*, *sherd*, of burnt clay-ware (<2023>Daniel 2:23). The word **b[ ; ab** ("clay," <1407>2 Chronicles 4:17), or **hb[ mj** *madbeh'* ("clay," <1074>1 Kings 7:47), denotes *darkness* or *density* of soil, i.e. perh. depth of earth; and the merely apparent compound **fyfb[ i** *abtit'* ("thick clay"), in <3116>Habakkuk 2:6, signifies rather a *pledging* of goods to an extortioner. **SEE MINERALOGY.**

"Clay is a sedimentary earth, tough and plastic, arising from the disintegration of felspar and similar minerals, and always containing silica and alumina combined in variable proportions. As the sediment of water remaining in pits or in streets, the word is used frequently in the O.T. (e.g. <2571>Isaiah 57:20; <2486>Jeremiah 38:6; <1982>Psalm 18:42), and in the N.T. (<4916>John 9:6), a mixture of sand or dust with spittle. It is also found in the sense of potter's clay (<2425>Isaiah 41:25), the elegant and useful forms assumed by the rude material under his hands supplying a significant emblem of the Divine power over the destinies of man (<2608>Isaiah 64:8; <2481>Jeremiah 18:1-6; <6192>Romans 9:21). The alluvial soils of Palestine would no doubt supply material for pottery, a manufacture which we know was, as it still is, carried on in the country (<2482>Jeremiah 18:2, 6); but our knowledge on the subject is so small as to afford little or no means of determining, and the clay of Palestine, like that of Egypt, is probably more loam than clay (Birch, *Hist. of Pottery*, 1, 55, 152). **SEE POTTERY.** Bituminous shale, convertible into clay, is said to exist largely at the source of the Jordan, and near the Dead Sea, also near Bethshan (Burckhardt, 2:593; Russegger, 3:278, 253, 254). The great seat of the pottery of the present day in Palestine is Gaza, where are made the vessels in dark blue clay so frequently met with. The Talmud (*Aboda Sara*, 2, 3) mentions a peculiar kind of luteous material called 'Hadrian's clay' (**ynyrrh srj**). The use of clay in brickmaking was also common. See BRICK. Another use of clay was in sealing (<1884>Job 38:14). The bricks of Assyria and Egypt are most commonly found stamped either with a die or with marks made by the fingers of the maker. Wine-jars in Egypt were sometimes sealed with clay; mummy-pits were sealed with the same substance, and remains of clay are still found adhering to the stone door-jambs. Our Lord's tomb may have been thus sealed (<4176>Matthew 27:66), as also the earthen vessel containing the evidences of Jeremiah's purchase (<2424>Jeremiah 32:14). So also in

Assyria, at Kouyunjik, pieces of fine clay have been found bearing impressions of seals with Assyrian, Egyptian, and Phoenician devices. The seal used for public documents was rolled on the moist clay, and the tablet was then placed in the fire and baked. The practice of sealing doors with clay to facilitate detection in case of malpractice is still common in the East (Wilkinson, *Anc. Egypt.* 1, 15, 48; 2, 364; Layard, *Nin. and Bab.* p. 153, 158, 608; *Herod.* 2, 38; Harmer, *Obs.* 4, 376)” (Smith, s.v.). Norden and Pococke observe that the inspectors of the granaries in Egypt, after closing the door, put their seal upon a handful of clay, with which they cover the lock. **SEE SEAL.** Clay was also used, no doubt, in primitive times for *mortar*, for the same term is employed for both (<sup><0118></sup>Genesis 11:3). Houses are built of clay mixed with sand in countries where stones are not to be found. **SEE MORTAR.** In <sup><1848></sup>Job 4:19, it is said of mankind that they dwell in huts of clay, either alluding to such dwellings, or to the “clay tenements” of the body (compare <sup><4781></sup>2 Corinthians 5:1). Our Savior anointed the eyes of the blind man with a salve made of clay and spittle (<sup><3306></sup>John 9:6), a simple preparation, which, it would be manifest to all, — could have in itself no curative virtue. The “clay ground” (literally *thickness of soil*) in which Solomon caused the large vessels of the Temple to be cast (<sup><1074></sup>1 Kings 7:46; <sup><1407></sup>2 Chronicles 4:17) was a compact loam, of a quality or rather extent, depth some 28 feet; **SEE JACHIN** not to be found elsewhere in Palestine, which is generally rocky or sandy. **SEE METALLURGY.**

### Clayton, Robert

born in Dublin in 1695, was a disciple of Dr. S. Clarke, became bishop of Killala, of Cork, and finally of Clogher, and published several works, none of which have gained lasting celebrity but his *Essay on Spirit* (1751), a treatise maintaining Arian views, of which, though not actually his composition, he bore the expense and assumed the responsibility. A powerful reply from Jones of Nayland did not hinder his proposing in the Irish House of Lords (2d Feb. 1756) the omission of the Nicene and Athanasian Creeds from the liturgy of the Church of Ireland; and at last, the third part of his *Vindication of the Histories of the Old and New Testament* gave occasion to legal proceedings, arrested only by his death on Feb. 26th, 1758. Among his other publications are *The Chronology of the Hebrew Bible Vindicated* (Lond. 1747, 4to); *A Dissertation on Prophecy* (Lond. 1749, 8vo). Kippis, *Biographia Britannica*, 3. 620.

## Clean

(*r/hf*; *tahor'*, καθαρός) and UNCLEAN (*amē*; *tame'*, ἀκάθαρτος).

These words are of frequent occurrence and obvious meaning in the sacred writings; but it is in their peculiar application, by the Mosaic law, to persons, animals, and things, that they are now to be considered. In order to partake of the privileges of the Jewish Church, and to engage acceptably in its outward worship, the individual must not only be circumcised, but he must be ceremonially pure or clean; that is, he must be free from uncleanness. How the various kinds of uncleanness were contracted, what time it continued, and what was the process of purification, we find particularly described in <sup><B110></sup>Leviticus 11-15; <sup><B490></sup>Numbers 19. *SEE PURIFICATION.*

The division of animals into clean and unclean existed before the Flood (<sup><B100></sup>Genesis 7:2), and was probably founded upon the practice of animal sacrifice. The regulations concerning clean and unclean animals are chiefly recorded in <sup><B110></sup>Leviticus, ch. 11, and <sup><B140></sup>Deuteronomy, ch. 14, where the following animals are pronounced unclean, and are consequently interdicted to be used as food:

- (1.) Quadrupeds which do not ruminate, or which have uncloven feet.
- (2.) Serpents and creeping insects; also certain insects which sometimes fly and sometimes advance upon their feet; but locusts, in all their four stages of existence, are accounted clean.
- (3.) Certain species of birds; but no particular characters are given for dividing them into classes, as "clean" or "unclean." Judging from those that are specified, as far as the obscure character of the Hebrew names will admit, it will be found that birds of prey generally are rejected, whether they prey on lesser fowls, or on animals, or on fish; while those which eat vegetables are admitted as lawful; so that the same principle is observed, in a certain degree, as in distinguishing quadrupeds.
- (4.) Fish without scales, and also those without fins.
- (5.) Animals of any kind which had either died of disease, or had been torn by wild beasts (<sup><B23></sup>Exodus 22:31). *SEE ANIMAL.*

The animal substances interdicted to the Hebrews were:

- (1.) Blood (<sup><8170></sup>Leviticus 17:10; 19:26; <sup><5126></sup>Deuteronomy 12:16, 23; 15:23).
- (2.) The fat covering of the intestines, termed the net or caul.
- (3.) The fat upon the intestines, called the mesentery, etc.
- (4.) The fat of the kidney.
- (5.) The fat tail or rump of certain sheep (<sup><12913></sup>Exodus 29:13, 22; <sup><8804></sup>Leviticus 3:4-9; 9:19). *SEE FOOD.*

What was the design of these distinctions, and how they were abolished, may be learned with sufficient accuracy from a comparison of various passages of Scripture (<sup><8324></sup>Leviticus 20:24-26; <sup><4100></sup>Acts 10:9-16; 11:1-28; <sup><3889></sup>Hebrews 9:9-14). *SEE DECREE (of the Apostles)*. It has been observed that one object of these appointments may have been to make the Jews suspicious of Gentile customs and entertainments, and so induce them to abstain from all intercourse with them. We find in the New Testament that *eating* with Gentiles was regarded as a peculiar aggravation of the offense of associating with them (<sup><4191></sup>Matthew 9:11; <sup><4113></sup>Acts 11:3). It may be remarked, also, that the flesh of many of the animals interdicted was unwholesome, and others were objects of idolatrous worship among the heathen. The chief design of the regulation, however, appears to have been, to establish a system of regimen which should distinguish the chosen people from all other nations. See the treatises *De animalibus esu interdictis*, by Danz (Jen. 1687) and Munster (in *Menthenii Thes. diss.* 2, 477 sq.); also Neumann, *Ueb. d. Kastenl Noah* (Wittenb. 1741). *SEE UNCLEANNES.*

## Cleanse

*SEE PURIFICATION.*

## Clear-Story

### Picture for Clear-story

(or CLERE-STORY); the upper part of the central aisle of a church, raised above the roofs of the adjoining side aisles, with windows to light the nave below. In many cases the clear-story is evidently a subsequent addition to the original design, especially when the high-pitched roof, which included the body and aisles in its span, gave way to a flat roof covering the nave

only. The walls were then raised over the arches of the nave to receive the clear-story windows.

## Cleaveland, John

a Congregational minister, was born in Canterbury, Conn., April 11, 1722. He was expelled from Yale College for attending a Separatists' meeting, but his degree was afterwards given to him, and his name appears as a graduate of 1745. He was installed pastor over a newly-organized church in Chebacco, Feb. 25, 1747; acted as chaplain at Ticonderoga in 1758; served in the same capacity at Cambridge in 1782, and in New York in 1776. He died April 22, 1799.' His church at Chebacco was formed by a secession from Mr. Pickering's, who refused to allow Whitefield to preach in his pulpit. Mr. Pickering issued a pamphlet soon after Mr. Cleaveland's organization, to which he replied in *A plain Narrative by the new Church*. He also published *Chebacco Narrative rescued from the Charge of Falsehood and Partiality* (1748); an *Essay to defend some of the most important Principles in the Protestant Reformed System of Christianity, more especially Christ's Sacrifice and Atonement, against the injurious Aspersions cast on the same by Dr. Mayhew, in a Thanksgiving Sermon* (1763), which elicited from Mayhew a sharp rejoinder in *A Letter of Reproof to John Cleaveland; Justification of his Church from the Strictures of the Rev. S. Wigglesworth, of the Hamlet, and the Rev. Richard Jaques, of Gloucester* (1765); with several other controversial pamphlets and a few sermons. — Sprague, *Annals*, 1, 458; Alien, *Am. Biog. Dictionary*, s.v.

## Cleft

([**jq** **ḅ**] *beki'a*, a gap in a building, <sup><1061></sup>Amos 6:11; “breach,” <sup><2210></sup>Isaiah 22:9; [**sv**, *she'sa*, a split in the hoof of an animal, <sup><6146></sup>Deuteronomy 14:6; also **hrqn**] *nekarah'*, a fissure in a rock, <sup><2121></sup>Isaiah 2:21; **pywḡḡ**] *chagavim'*, refuges in the crags, <sup><2114></sup>Song of Solomon 2:14; <sup><24916></sup>Jeremiah 49:16; <sup><3008></sup>Obadiah 1:3), or CLIFT (**hrqn**] *nekariah'* crevice in a rock, <sup><12322></sup>Exodus 33:22; **āy**[ **ḅ**] *seiph'*, a rock fissure, <sup><2576></sup>Isaiah 57:5; “top” of the rock, <sup><171818></sup>Judges 15:8, 11; <sup><2121></sup>Isaiah 2:21). **SEE CAVE; SEE ROCK.**

## Cleland, Thomas D.D.,

an eminent Presbyterian divine, was born in Fairfax County, Va., May 22, 1778, and removed to Marion County, Ky., in 1789. Having developed extraordinary gifts as an exhorter in the great revival of 1801, he was urged by the Presbytery of Transylvania to become a preacher, and was licensed April 14, 1803. His first charge was Union Church, in Washington County. In 1813 he was settled over New Providence and Cane Run (now Harrodsburg) churches, where he labored during the rest of his life with remarkable success, being blessed with numerous revivals. He was one of the most popular and useful preachers in Kentucky. Sixteen young men studied divinity under him. He was appointed one of the synodical commission in the Cumberland Presbyterian difficulties. Dr. Cleland was withal a diligent student, and wielded his pen with signal ability against the Newlights and Campbellites. His principal printed works, besides *Occasional Sermons*, were, *A brief History of the Action of the Synod in the Case of the Cumberland Presbyterians* (1823, p. 29, 8vo): — *The Socini-Arian Detected* (1815, p. 101, 12mo): *Unitarianism Unmasked* (1825, p. 184, 12mo): — *Narrative of the Bodily Exercises*, in *Bibl. Repertory* for July, 1834: — *Letters on Campbellism*: — *A Hymn-book*, for prayer-meetings and revivals, extensively used in the West. Dr. Cleland died Jan. 31, 1858, in the eightieth year of his age — *Davidson's Hist. Presb. Ch. in Kentucky*, p. 354; *Memoirs, compiled from private Papers*, by Prof. Humphrey and Rev. Thos. H. Cleland.

## Clemanges

(*Clamengis* or *Clemangis*), NICOLAS DE, one of the ablest writers of the Roman Catholic Church during the Middle Ages. He was born about 1360 in the village of Clemanges, in the province of Champagne, and educated in the College of Navarre at Paris. As early as 1381 he gave public lectures as *Magister Artium*. In 1386 he began, in the same institution, to study theology under Pierre d'Ailly, who exercised a great influence upon him, and always remained his friend. In 1391 he became bachelor of theology, and began to give theological lectures. Being possessed of rare talents, and thoroughly familiar with the works of the ancient writers, he was soon regarded as the most eloquent member of the University of Paris, which in 1393 elected him rector. Henceforth Clemanges took the most active part in the efforts of the University in behalf of a thorough reformation, which constitute so important a part of mediaeval Church history. Most of the

letters addressed by the University to the popes and kings of this time emanated from his pen. In the same year in which he was elected rector (1393) he addressed, in the name of the University, an energetic memoir to Charles VI of France, in order to induce him to put an end to the schism in the Church. In 1394 he compiled a second memorial on the basis of the opinions of all the prominent members of the French clergy, which had been solicited by the Sorbonne. In accordance with these opinions, he proposed, in a letter to Clement VII, three measures for the reorganization of the Church: first, the abdication of both the popes; secondly, the election of arbiters; thirdly, the convocation of a general council. Another letter to the pope, much more severe in its language, was not sent off because Clement VII died (September, 1394). Charles VI, following the advice of the University, requested the cardinals of Avignon not to proceed to the election of a new pope until they had come to an understanding with the cardinals of Rome, and with Boniface IX; and Clemanges sent a letter of the same character to Avignon. But the cardinals of Avignon nevertheless hastened to elect Petrus de Luna, who assumed the name Benedict XIII. After being elected, Benedict secured recognition by Charles VI and the Paris University, but Clemanges was instructed to request him to do all that might be in his power to end the schism. To the same end he had to write to the king of Aragon. In his own name Clemanges sent to Benedict an eloquent epistle on the duties of the head of the Church, and recommended to him his friend Pierre d'Ailly as chief adviser. Benedict appreciated the learning of Clemanges, and prevailed upon him to accept the office of secret secretary of the pope. As the king of France and the Sorbonne, supported, in 1395, by the resolution of a national council, declared in favor of an abdication of both the popes, Clemanges, who was now a decided champion of the claims of Benedict, fell out with many of his former friends. In 1407 the French government withdrew its recognition of Benedict, whereupon the latter laid the ban upon king and country. Clemanges was charged with being the author of the bull of excommunication, but denied the charge, left his position at the papal court, and withdrew to Langres, where he had been appointed canon a short time before. His opponents persisted in calling him the author of the bull of excommunication; he was accused of high treason, and threatened with imprisonment. In order to escape this danger, he concealed himself in a Carthusian convent at Valprofonds, and subsequently in a convent of the same order at Fontaine-du-Bosc. In this retirement he devoted his attention to the Bible, which, as he states, had until then been neglected by him, and

which now became his favorite study. Besides a number of letters to his friends D'Ailly, Gerson, and others, he wrote at Fontaine-du-Bosc several works full of reformatory ideas as regarded both the prevailing corruptions of his Church and some of the doctrines. The most important of these are *De fructu eremi* (on the value of retired life); *De fructu rerum adversarum* (on the spiritual profit to be derived from adversity); *De novisfestivitatibus non instituendis* (complaining of the excessive number of holidays, which promote dissipation instead of edification, and cause the Bible to be forgotten over the stories of saints). In all these works Clemanges recommended the Bible as the purest and richest source of Christian knowledge and Christian life. The decay of the Church he attributed to the neglect of the Bible; the councils, in his opinion, could claim regard for their decisions only if the members were really believers, and if they were more concerned for the salvation of souls than for secular interests. His views on general councils were fully set forth in a little work, entitled *Disputatio de concilio generali*, which consists of three letters, addressed, in 1415 or 1416, to a professor at the Paris University (printed apparently at Vienna in 1482). He not only places the authority of general councils over the authority of the popes, but the authority of the Bible over the authority of the councils. He doubts whether at all the former oecumenical councils the Holy Spirit really presided, as the Holy Spirit would not assist men pursuing secular aims. He denies that a council composed of such men represents the Church, and asserts that God alone knows who are his people and where the Holy Ghost dwells, and that there may be times when the Church can only be found in one single woman (in *sola potest muliercula per gratian manere ecclesiam*). Other works, in which he expressed himself even more freely, have been lost, and perhaps suppressed. Chiefly against the immoral life of the higher clergy he wrote, about 1411, his treatise *De presulibus Simoniacis*. He also urgently recommended to the secular authorities of his country the teaching of the Bible as the only safe remedy against the continual civil wars and disturbances, and he counseled duke Philip of Burgundy to convoke the General Estates for the restoration of law and justice. He also wrote, while at Fontaine-du-Bosc, several poetical pieces, which are distinguished for the brilliance of their Latinity.

Of the latter years of his life but little is known. The canonry at Langres he exchanged for one at Bayeux. Other ecclesiastical dignities which were offered to him he refused, as his conscience did not allow him to accept



more benefices than one. In 1421 he defended at Chartres the liberties of the Gallican Church. In 1425 he again began to give theological lectures in the college at Navarre, and his connection with this school continued until his death. The year of his death is not known. Even his epitaph (which was destroyed in 1793) did not state it.

A work entitled *De ruina Ecclesiae, or De corrupta Ecclesice statu*, which, since Trithemius (*Catal. Script. Eccles.*), is usually classed among the writings of Clemanges, cannot be from him. Its language is more violent than Clemanges ever indulged in. It abounds in attacks upon Benedict XIII at a time when Clemanges was his secretary and eloquent champion. It was undoubtedly the work of some member of the Paris University. Equally certain is the spuriousness of the work *Apostoli* (i.e. *litterae dimissoriae*) *et responsio per nationem gallicanam dominis cardinalibus*, etc., which was written at Constance during the session of the council. Most of his works were published by Lydius (Leyden, 1613, 2 vols. 4to), but some of them still lie as unedited MSS. in libraries. See Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 2, 717 sq.; Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lexikon*, 2, 574 sq.; Neander, *Ch. Hist.* v. 53 sq.; Mosheim, *Ch. Hist.* 1, 422, and a monograph of Miintz, *Nicolas Clemanges, sa vie et ses Merits* (Strasb. 1846, 8vo); Gieseler, *Ch. Hist.* per. 3. div. 4, §, 113; Hase, *Christian History*, p. 325, 344; *Presbyterian Quarterly Review*, March, 1857.

### Clemens, Titus Flavius

surmamed ALEXANDRINUS, was a native of either Athens or Alexandria, and flourished in the reigns of Severus and Caracalla (the date of his birth being placed about A.D. 160, and that of his death from A.D. 215 to 220). He was in early life an ardent student of literature and philosophy, especially of the Stoic and Platonic schools, and was led by his studies to Christianity. To master its history and doctrines he visited different countries, and received instruction from various masters, of whom he himself speaks thus: "Those vigorous and animated discourses which I was privileged to hear, and of blessed and truly remarkable men. Of these, the one in Greece, an Ionic; the other in Magna Graecia; the first of them from Coele-Syria, the second from Egypt, and others in the East. The one was born in the land of Assyria, and the other a Hebrew in Palestine. When I came upon the last (he was the first in power), having tracked him out concealed in Egypt, I found rest. He, the true, the Sicilian bee, gathering the spoil of the flowers of the prophetic and apostolic meadow, engendered

in the souls of his hearers a deathless element of knowledge” (*Strom.* lib. 1, ch. 1, p. 355, vol. 1, of translation in “Anti-Nicene Christian Library”).

This last teacher was (according to Eusebius) Pantaenus, head of the catechetical school at Alexandria, by whose influence some suppose Clemens, as yet only a sincere inquirer, was led fully to embrace the Christian faith. He is called a presbyter by early Christian writers, having probably been appointed to that office by the Church at Alexandria, and about 190 became, according to some the assistant, according to others the successor to Pantaenus, when the latter set out on his missionary tour to the East. He continued in that office until the persecution under Severus, A.D. 202, compelled him to leave Alexandria. The writers of the articles in Smith’s *Dict. of Greek and Romans Biog. and Mythol.* and the *New Amer. Cyclopaedia* state that Clemens returned to Alexandria before A.D. 211, and then became the master of the school as successor of Pantaenus; but the weight of authority favors the earlier date, and his return to that place is doubtful. We know scarcely anything of the closing years of his life. He appears to have been about 210 or 211 in Jerusalem, for he is mentioned by Eusebius (lib. 7, ch. 2) as the bearer of a letter from Alexander, bishop of Jerusalem, then himself a prisoner for the Gospel’s sake, to the Church at Antioch. This Alexander and the more famous Origen are reckoned among his pupils.

Of the early Christian writers, Clemens was the most learned in the history, philosophy, and science of the nations of his day, and the influence of his studies is apparent in his writings, which display rather the speculative philosopher than the accurate theologian — more the fanciful interpreter than the careful expounder of the Scriptures on true exegetical principles. Many of his works have been lost, but those extant are the largest belonging to that early period, and very valuable for the light they throw on the social condition of the Roman Empire in his day, and for the information which they contain in regard to the systems of ancient philosophy, the heresies and schisms in the primitive Church, as well as for the numerous extracts from non-extant authors. His three chief writings form a series, and were written apparently with a common object, viz. to convert the heathen and educate them in the principles and practice of the Christian life. They are, 1. *λόγος προτρεπτικός πρὸς Ἑλλήνας*, *Cohortatio ad Hellenes* (Appeal to the Greeks), an apologetic work, in which the absurdity, obscenity, cruelty, impostures, and sordidness of heathen worship are clearly set forth in contrast with the simplicity and

purity of Christian faith and practice. 2. **Παιδαγωγός**, *Pvedagogue* (Instructor), a treatise on Christian education, in three books, addressed to those who had been converted from heathenism. In Book I we have set forth the function, the means, methods, and ends of the “Instructor,” who is Christ, leading the believers “through paths of virtue and truth” to salvation, not through fear as he did the Israelites, but by love, the guiding principle of the new and better covenant. Book II contains rules for the regulation of life, embracing minute details as to food, drink, behavior, etc., recommending temperance, purity, modesty, and frugality. Book III begins with an examination of the grounds of true beauty, showing it to be intellectual, and founded on reason and love; then, in considering the various modes in which men have sought to add to beauty, strongly reprobates luxurious dress and living, etc. Its satire of the follies and vices of the times is caustic and humorous. 3. **Στρωματεῖς** or **Στρώματα**, in eight books, of which the eighth is lost (the imperfect treatise on logic, standing at present as such, belonging to some other work). The word *strommateis*, meaning patch-work (*opus varie contextum*), is significant of the miscellaneous character of the work, which is discursive and unmethodical, and not unaptly likened by its author to “a thickly-planted mountain, where fruit and other trees are confusedly grouped together, so as to baffle the plunderer, while the careful husbandman would find and transplant in fitting order such as were desirable for fruit or ornament; so the mysteries of Christian faith, veiled herein from impertinent or ignorant curiosity, will discover their rich treasures to the honest and intelligent seeker of the truth” (*Strom.* lib. 7, p. 766, Potter’s ed.). The object of the work is “to furnish materials for the construction of a true gnosis,” or “Christian philosophy, on the basis of faith,” for those who had been trained for it by the preceding works. Book I, of which the beginning is lost, descants on the utility of philosophy, as preparing the heathen for the reception of the Gospel, and Christians for the defense of their, faith, maintaining that the good in heathen philosophy was derived from the Hebrews. Book II treats first of faith and repentance, combating the errors of the Basilidians and Valentinians. asserts the freedom of man’s will, and presents the views of different philosophers in regard to marriage, which Clemens defends on the grounds of the natural conformation of the sexes, the command of God (<sup>ἡ</sup>Genesis 1:28), and the mutual aid in sickness and age rendered by husband and wife, and parents and children. In Book III, continuing the same subject, he condemns the opinions of the Marcionites, Carpocratians, and other heretics who opposed marriage for different and

contradictory reasons, alleging in support of it the words of St Paul (<sup>500E</sup>1 Timothy 4:1-3), and the examples of the apostles Peter and Philip, who were married and had children. Book IV discourses of Christian perfection as exemplified in the Christian martyr, who is led to martyrdom not through fear of punishment or hope of reward hereafter, but from love to Christ, and who does not needlessly provoke his fate, but only accepts it cheerfully when called upon to be in that way a witness for the truth. The chief aim of Book V is to prove that the Greeks derived most of their wisdom from those called by them barbarians, and especially from Moses and the Hebrew prophets; but it also enters upon a long and interesting digression on the origin and use of symbols, and makes many valuable statements in regard to the Egyptian hieroglyphics, and the dress and ceremonial services of the Hebrew priests. This episode is one of the most curious relics of antiquity, and the book abounds in quotations from ancient authors. Books VI and VII portray the true Gnostic, the perfect Christian, who is presented as a “complete model of moral conduct,” not so much desirous of living as of living rightly, controlling his passions and regulating his desires in conformity with the laws of Christ.

A small work, *Τίς ὁ σωζόμενος πλούσιος*; (*What rich man may be saved?*) is also attributed to Clemens. This treatise is an examination of the words of Christ (<sup>41924</sup>Matthew 19:24; <sup>42825</sup>Luke 18:25), and aims to show that these words do not require the renunciation of worldly goods as a condition of salvation; that the disposition of the soul is the essential thing, and that riches may be the materials and instruments of good works for those who rightly use them.

The following works of Clemens are not extant (the fragments which have been collected are found in the edition of Potter, vol. ii, in Fabricius's *Hippolytus* at the end of vol. 2; and in Galland's *Biblioth. Patr.* and Migne's *Patrologia*): *Ὑποτυπώσεις*; *Περὶ τοῦ πάσχα*; *Περὶ Νηστείας*; *Περὶ καταλαλιᾶς*; *Προτρεπτικὸς εἰς Ὑπομονήν*; *Κανὼν Ἐκκλησιαστικὸς*; *εἰς τὸν Προφήτην Ἀμώς*; *Περὶ προνοίας*; *Οροι διαφόροι*. Clemens refers to some other treatises as either written or intended to be written by him, but we have no mention of them elsewhere.

The first edition of the three principal works of Clemens was made by Petrus Victorius (Florence, 1550, fol.; a Latin translation in 1551). It was followed by an edition by Fr. Sylburg (Heidelberg, 1592, fol.). A Greek-Latin edition was published by D. Heinsius (Leyden, 1616, fol.; reprinted

Paris, 1629, Paris, 1641, Cologne, 1688). The best edition of all the works of Clemens, genuine and doubtful, is that by the Anglican Bishop Potter (2 vols. fol. Oxford, 1715, with valuable notes and a commentary to Clemens by Gentianus Hervetus; reprinted at Venice, 1757, 2 vols. fol., and [without the notes and the commentary] by Oberholzer, at Wurzburg, 1778-79, 3 vols. 8vo). New editions are by Klotz (Leips. 1831-34, 4 vols. 8vo) and by Abbe Migne (in his *Patrologia*). An excellent translation in English of the *Appeal*, the *Paedagogue*, and the first book of the *Stromateis* (the remainder of the work to follow in a subsequent volume), is found in vol. 4 of the *Ante-Nicene Christian Library* (Edinb. 1867). — Schaff, *Ch. Hist.* 1, 205 et al.; Neander, *Ch. Hist.* 1, 691 sq., and *Hist. Dogmas*, 1, 63 et al.; Gieseler, *Ch. Hist.* per. 1, div. 2, chap. 3. § 62; Lardner, *Works*, vol. 2 (Lond. 1838, p 220-259; Clarke, *Sac. Literature* (N. Y. 1839), p. 109-118, Eusebius, *Histor. Ecclesiastes* lib. 5 et 6, *Journal of Sacred Lit.* Oct. 1852, p. 129; Reinkens, *De Clemente Presbytero Alexandrino, Homme, Scriptor, Philosopho, Theologo* (Vratislav. 1851, 8vo); Hoefer *Nouv. Biog.* Genesis s.v.; Freppel, *Clement d' Alexandrie* (Paris, 1866); Kaye, *Writings and Opinions of Clemens of Alexandria* (Lond. 1835, 8vo).

## Clement

(Κλήμης for Lat. *clemens*, *merciful*), a person (apparently a Christian of Philippi) mentioned by Paul (<sup>500B</sup>Philippians 4:3) as one whose name was in the book of life (q.v.), A.D. 57. This Clement was, by the ancient Church, identified with the bishop of Rome of the same name (Eusebius *Hist. Eccles.* 3. 4; *Constitut. Apost.* 7, 46, Origen, vol. 1, p. 262, ed. Lommatzsch; and Jerome, *Scriptor. Eccl.* p. 176, a); and that opinion has naturally been followed by Roman Catholic expositors. It cannot now be proved incorrect; and, in fact, it is not improbable in itself. There are essays on his life, identity, and character as a teacher, by Feuerlein (Altorf, 1728), Freudenberger (Lips. 1755), Frommann (Cobl. 1768), Roudinini (Romans 1606). *SEE CLEMENT OF ROME.*

## Clement Of Rome

(CLEMENS ROMANUS). One of the early presbyters of the Church in Rome; probably a presiding presbyter, *primus inter pares*, afterwards called bishop. Irenaeus, in his *adv. Haer.* (3:3, 3), written between 182-188 A.D., makes him the third in order after the apostles Peter and Paul, Linus being

the first, and Cletus or Anacletus the second. The *Clementines* give a different order, which was followed by Tertullian. But Eusebius, who appears to have taken great pains to be accurate, and had access to authorities no longer extant, preferred the order of Irenaeus. He also adds the dates. Clement, he says (*Hist.* 3. 34), died in the third year of Trajan, "having for nine years superintended the preaching of the Divine Word." As Trajan became emperor on the death of Nerva, Jan. 23, 98 A.D., the so-called episcopate of Clement will have for its termini 91 or 92 - 100 or 101 A.D. Irenaeus speaks of him as "having seen and conversed with the blessed apostles" who "founded the Church in Rome," i.e. Peter and Paul. Origen (*Comment. in Joan.* 6, 36) identifies him with the Clement of ~~ROMS~~ Philippians 4:3. This may have been only a conjecture, or it may have been a tradition. It was, at any rate, the opinion of Eusebius and the early writers, and is in itself not at all improbable. Thirty years would certainly be time enough for a prominent Philippian to become a prominent Roman. Modern attempts to make out his origin from the epistle which bears his name have failed. Judging from the epistle, he may have been either a Jew, as Tillemont argues, or a Roman, as Lipsius argues, and the one about as probably as the other. Rufinus, who died 410 A.D., was the first to call him a martyr. The language of Eusebius implies that he died a natural death, which is altogether likely to have been the case if his dates have been correctly given. *The Martyrdom of St. Clement*, in the first volume of the *Patres Apostolici* of Cotelerius, is a puerile fabrication of no great antiquity. Its story is that Clement was first banished by Trajan to Chersonesus, and afterwards drowned in the Black Sea. On reaching his place of exile, he found two thousand Christians condemned to work in a marble quarry. As the water they used had to be fetched six miles, Clement caused a spring to break forth close to the quarry. This led to the conversion of a great multitude in the province, and the building in one year of seventy-five churches. And this, in its turn, led to Clement's martyrdom. An anchor was fastened to his neck, and he was cast into the sea. The people, bewailing him, prayed God to discover to them his remains. In answer to their prayer, the sea receded, and the people, going in on dry ground, found the body of the holy martyr buried with the anchor in a marble tomb, but were not permitted to remove it. Every year, on the anniversary of the martyrdom, the sea repeats this miracle of receding for seven days. Another fable confounds Clement the presbyter with T. *Flavius Clemens*, the consul, and cousin to the emperor Domitian, by whom he was put to death on a charge of "atheism," one of the charges then current

against Christians. Such fables, in the absence of authentic memorials, are not to be wondered at. The wonder is that the authentic memorials are so meager; that of the real Clement—a man so conspicuous, able, and influential there is so little known.

Of the writings falsely ascribed to Clement of Rome notice is taken in another article. *SEE CLEMENTINES*. The only genuine document is his *Epistle to the Corinthians*, commonly called the *First*, but improperly, since the so-called *Second Epistle* is not his, and is not an epistle, but only the fragment of a homily, later, perhaps, by nearly a hundred years. The only known manuscript of this epistle is the one appended to the Alexandrian Codex of the Scriptures sent by Cyril Lucar to Charles I in 1628, and now the property of the British Museum. Throughout the manuscript are many *lacunae*, generally, however, of only single words or syllables. The only considerable gap, occasioned apparently by the loss of a leaf, is near the end of the epistle, between chapters 57 and 58. Here may have belonged certain ancient citations from Clement which cannot now be verified. Some expressions, like *λαϊκός* in the 40th chapter, have a suspicious look; but of the substantial integrity of the epistle there is no good reason for serious doubt. That it came from the pen of Clement, though his name is not in the epistle, is now generally conceded. It appears to have been in the hands of Polycarp of Smyrna when writing to the Philippians as early, perhaps, as 115, certainly not much later than 150 A.D. It is referred to as the work of Clement by Dionysius of Corinth in a letter to Soter of Rome, which must have been written between 170-176 A.D. Irenaeus, in the section already cited (*adv. Haer.* 3. 3, 3), speaks of it as a very able epistle, sent to the Church in Corinth by the Church in Rome under the episcopate of Clement. Origen, who died 254 A.D., speaks of it as written by Clement. So also Clement of Alexandria [† 220], who frequently and freely quotes from it, — and even calls the author of it “the *apostle* Clement.” Eusebius, whose *History* was written about 325 A.D., ascribes it to Clement, and speaks of it as having been “publicly read in very many churches both in former times and in our own” (*Hist.* 3. 16). Jerome († 420), in his *De Viris Illustribus*, § 15, reports it as still “publicly read in some places.” But no one of these writers anywhere speaks of it as an inspired book. Though highly prized, neither this, nor the *Epistle of Barnabas*, nor the *Shepherd of Hermas*, was ever included in any ancient list of authoritative books. (See Westcott, *Canon of the New Testament*, Appendix B.)



This epistle, as we now have it, consists of fifty-nine short chapters — some of them very short — whose total bulk is about one third greater than that of the sixteen chapters of St. Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians. Presbyters of the Church in Corinth had been unjustly deposed from office; a bitter dissension had broken out, and this epistle was written by Clement in the name of the Church in Rome, in order, if possible, to end the strife. It was sent by the hands of three messengers, Claudius Ephebus, Valerius Biton, and Fortunatus, who, it was hoped (chap. 59), might bring back the good news of peace and harmony restored. In form it resembles the Canonical Epistles, beginning with a salutation and concluding with a benediction. In the first three chapters, the Corinthians are first praised for their former virtues, and then sharply rebuked for the scandals which had occurred. The next nineteen chapters are devoted to historical illustrations, drawn from the Old and New Testaments, of the evils flowing from jealousy and envy; followed by exhortations to repentance, humility, and meekness. In the next fourteen chapters, the exhortations are continued in view of the promised coming of Christ and their own resurrection; salvation by grace through faith is taught; and good works, in their proper relation to faith, are strongly insisted upon. Twenty-one chapters are then devoted to the special purpose of the epistle, discussing the general subject of ecclesiastical organization and order, and urging the Corinthians to put an end to their grievous sedition. The last two chapters contain a prayer for helping grace, with a benediction.

As to the *date* of this epistle, Hefele, who agrees with Cave, Dodwell, Fleury, and others in assigning the episcopate of Clement to the years 68-77 A.D., refers it to the time of Nero. But the mention made in the first chapter of "sudden and successive trials" which had befallen the Roman Church seems to require a later date. The Tübingen school put it into the second century. But recent critical authority preponderates decidedly in favor of 95-98 A.D. Falling thus within the apostolic age, and yet of considerably later date than the great bulk of the New Testament, special interest attaches to this epistle. It may be considered:

**1.** In comparison with the canonical books. It is evidently modeled after the canonical epistles, and yet is decidedly inferior to them. In regard to language, three words used by Clement are found only in the First-Epistle of Peter; eleven only in the epistles of Peter and Paul; and twelve only in the epistles of Paul. (See Westcott, p. 30.) The book of which it most reminds us is the Epistle to the Hebrews. Hence an ancient tradition,



reported by Eusebius (*Hist.* 6, 25) on the authority of Origen, that Clement was the author also of that epistle. But besides the many points of dissimilarity which discredit this particular tradition, there is a marked inferiority pervading the epistle of Clement as compared not only with the Epistle to the Hebrews, but with all the rest of the New Testament, which reacts powerfully as an argument for the inspiration of the canonical books. The Old Testament quotations are more extended; fanciful interpretations are given, as of the scarlet cord let down by Rahab typifying the blood of Christ; fables are introduced, as of the phoenix in treating of the resurrection; attempts are made at fine writing, as in the twentieth chapter, devoted to a description of the order and harmony of nature; with a tendency throughout to expatiation; which stands in strong contrast with the soberness, simplicity, terseness, and vigor of the apostolic epistles. A line has thus been deeply drawn between the inspired and uninspired documents of the early Church.

**2.** With respect to the canon itself. Of the Old Testament but little needs to be said. In the way either of express citation or of marked resemblance, nearly every book is recognized. Two at least of the apocryphal books are quoted. Clement made use of the Septuagint, and quotes more accurately than some of the fathers, indicating that he either referred to a manuscript or had a better memory than common. The text employed by him, Hilgenfeld says, accords neither with the Alexandrian nor the Vatican Codex, but, where these are at variance, steers between them, agreeing sometimes with the one, sometimes with the other. In quoting from the New Testament, Clement never calls it "Scripture" or "Scriptures," as he does the Old Testament; but individual writers are either quoted or referred to, and in a way which implies his belief that they had an authority above his own. Apologizing for the attitude he assumes, he exhorts the Corinthians, as though that must end all controversy, to "take in their hands the epistle of the blessed apostle Paul." Besides the Gospels of Matthew and Luke, the books indicated are Romans, 1 Corinthians, Ephesians, Hebrews, and James; perhaps also 1 Timothy and Titus. In short, the usage is precisely what we should expect while the canon was not yet formed, but only silently forming.

**3.** With respect to the polity of the early Church. The object aimed at in the epistle called for certain definite statements on this point. And these are in complete accord with the representations of the inspired books. In Clement, as in the Acts and Epistles of the New Testament, several

features are palpable. No distinction is made between bishops and presbyters. For the local Church only two orders are recognized: presbyter-bishops and deacons. And they were appointed at first by the apostles, afterwards by these rulers themselves, though not to the exclusion of the brotherhood. The *initiative* was not with the congregation, but with its elders, “the whole Church *consenting*.” Such is the representation in the forty-fourth chapter; and it accords with what is related of Paul and Barnabas, who, instead of merely *ordaining*, as our version appears to teach, “had *appointed* them elders in every church” (~~44:23~~ Acts 14:23). The New Testament representations are thus not only corroborated, but also elucidated.

**4.** In relation to doctrine. The orthodoxy of Clement, as of the earlier fathers in general, has been repeatedly called in question, but without good reason. Doctrinal discussion, in the style of the Epistle to the Romans, is certainly not attempted. But the leading features of the Gospel economy come clearly out. The divinity of Christ is taught quite as distinctly as in the Epistles to the Colossians and Hebrews. And so likewise are the atonement and justification by faith. If good works are strongly emphasized, so also are they strongly emphasized not only by James in his epistle, but by Paul himself. And as there is no contradiction between Paul and James, there is none between Paul and Clement.

The *Literature* of the subject is abundant. Of the text there have been three recensions. The epistle was first published by Junius, at Oxford, in 1633; again, more accurately, by Wotton, at Cambridge, in 1718; and, lastly, by Jacobson, at Oxford, in four successive editions, 1838, 1840, 1847. and 1866. Jacobson’s text is now the standard, and is as nearly perfect as critical acumen and diligence could make it. Of earlier editions, embracing all the apostolical fathers, the best are those of Cotelerius, Paris, 1672, as improved by Clericus (Antwerp, 1698), and again improved (Amsterdam, 1724), and of Ittivius, with a valuable dissertation (Leipsic, 1699). Of later editions, the best are those of Jacobson, already named; of Hefele (Tubingen, 1839, 1842, 1847, 1855); and of Dressel (Leipsic, 1856, 1863). Of treatises, the most valuable are those of Lechler, *Das apostolische und das nachapostolische Zeitalter* (Haarlem, 1851; Stuttgart, 1857); Hilgenfeld, *Apostolische Vater* (Halle, 1853); Lipsius, *De Clementis Romani Epistola ad Corinthios Priore Disquisitio* (Leipsic, 1855); and Donaldson, *Critical History of Christian Literature and Doctrine from the Death of the Apostles to the Nicene Council* (vol. 1, London, 1864). Of

English translations, the earliest was by Burton (London, 1647); the next was that of Archbishop Wake (London, 1693, frequently republished; admirably though inaccurately done); the next was anonymous (Aberdeen, 1768); then Chevallier (London, 1833, 1851, on the basis of Wake); and, lastly, Roberts and Donaldson (Edinburgh, 1867, vol. 1 of the “Ante-Nicene Library”). This last has not the scriptural tone of Wake, but is greatly superior to it in accuracy of rendering.

## Clement I

*SEE CLEMENT OF ROME*

## Clement II

Pope (*Suidger*, bishop of Bamberg), was placed in the papal see Dec. 25, 1046, after the Synod of Sutri, by the Emperor Henry III, in the room of Gregory VI, who abdicated. He crowned this emperor, and held in Jan. 1047, a synod at Rome for the suppression of simony. He died, as some think, by poison, Oct. 9, 1047. He was the first of the German popes, and retained the diocese of Bamberg even during his pontificate. He put the city of Benevento under the interdict because it had refused to receive the Emperor Henry. — Neander, *Ch. Hist.* 3. 378; Gieseler, *Ch. Hist.* per. 3. div. 2, § 22; Hoefler, *Teutsche Papste*, 1 *Abtieu.* 233-288; Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* 2, 590.

## Clement III

Anti-Pope (*Guibert*, archbishop of Ravenna), was chosen pope at the Synod of Brixen in 1080, by the party of the Emperor Henry IV, with the view of supplanting Gregory VII. After being repeatedly placed in the Roman see by violence, and expelled from it by the same means, he submitted to Paschal II in 1099, and died in the following year. — Neander, *Ch. Hist.* 4, 118 sq.; Gieseler, *Ch. Hist.* per. 3. div. 3. chap. 1, § 47, 48.

## Clement III

Pope (*Paolo*, cardinal bishop of Rome), was a native of Rome. He was chosen pope at Pisa on the 19th of Dec. 1187, in the place of Gregory VIII, who had died in the same city two days before. The chief concern of the new pope was the speedy organization of a third crusade, as the news of the conquest of Jerusalem by Saladin (Oct. 3d, 1187) had just been

received. He wrote at once to all the Christian princes, and succeeded in calling forth an unprecedented enthusiasm. The aged emperor Frederick Barbarossa (67 years old), who had had a violent conflict with the predecessor of Clement on account of the possessions of the Countess Matilda, made peace with the pope and took the cross. Peace was also restored between Venice and the king of Hungary, and between the king of France and the king of England, and all these states, joined by Leopold of Austria and others, were induced to take part in the crusade. The pope had the grief of learning the death of Frederick in the River Kalicadnus, and the dissensions between the princes besieging Acco, but he did not live to see the unfortunate end of the crusade.

Clement again secured for the popes the secular rule over the city of Rome, which during forty-nine years had been left by the popes. Tired of their civil wars, the Romans conceded to Clement the right of sovereign. A conflict with the king of Scotland, who had appointed of his own accord a bishop for St. Andrew's, terminated favorably to the pope. The king yielded when the pope threatened with the interdict. In reward for this concession, the pope (by a bull of March 13, 1189) exempted all Scotland from the jurisdiction of the archbishop of York, made it an immediate dependency of the papal see, and provided that henceforth no one should be a papal legate in Scotland who was not either a Scotchman or an officer of the Church in Rome. On the death of King William II of Sicily (Nov. 1, 1189), a dangerous conflict arose between the son of Frederick Barbarossa, Henry (subsequently emperor Henry VI), whose wife was the nearest relation to the late king, and the pope, who claimed feudal rights over Sicily, and hastened to invest with its government Tancred, an illegitimate son of duke Roger of Sicily. Henry, after the death of his father, was marching upon Rome, when Clement died, on March 25, 1191. The personal life of this pope is said to have been blameless. Seven letters and many decrees issued by Clement are given by Mansi (22, 543-574). — Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 2, 730; Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lexicon*, 2, 591; Neander, *Ch. Hist.* 4, 417; Gieseler, *Ch. Hist.* per. 3. div. 3. chap. 1, § 53.

## Clement IV

Pope (*Gui Fulcodi*, according to others, *Guido Foulquois le Gros*), was a native of France, first a soldier, then a lawyer, married, and on his wife's death entered the Church, and became in succession bishop of Puy,

archbishop of Narbonne, and (1261) cardinal bishop of Sabina. He was chosen pope at the beginning of 1265, while he was absent from Italy as papal legate, and solemnly crowned on the 22d of February, at Viterbo, where he took up his residence on account of the disturbances prevailing in Rome. During the whole time of his pontificate he was occupied with the contest concerning the government of Sicily. His predecessor, Urban IV, has invited Charles of Anjou to take possession of Sicily, which was then ruled by Manfred, an illegitimate son of Emperor Frederick II. When Charles appeared in Rome (May 21, 1265), five cardinals, in the name of the pope, concluded between him and the papal see a treaty which gave to Charles the whole of the Apulian Empire, while Charles, on the other hand, pledged himself to pay a certain tribute, and to abolish the ecclesiastical decrees of Frederick II. The arrogance of Charles, his want of money, and the outrages committed by French soldiers, disposed the pope favorably toward Manfred, but the latter died before the reconciliation had taken place. The cruelty of Charles against the family and the adherents of Manfred, and his violation of the treaty, filled the pope with indignation. Nevertheless, when young Conradin, the grandson of Frederick II, appeared in Italy, the traditional hostilities of the popes toward the Hohenstaufens induced the pope to excommunicate him. Conradin was received with enthusiasm by the Ghibelline opponents of the pope, and, in particular, by the people of Rome, and the pope naturally rejoiced at his defeat and capture. It cannot, however, be proved that he knew of, and much less that he approved of his execution. Clement survived exactly one month after the last scion of the Hohenstaufens Conradin was beheaded, dying at Viterbo Nov. 29, 1268. He was an able ruler, and resolutely hostile to nepotism. Many of his letters have been published by Martene and Durand in their *Thesaurus Novus Anecdotorum* (Paris, 1717, 5 vols. fol.), and by D'Achery in his *Spicilegium*. He wrote several works, among which was a life of St. Hedwig, duchess of Poland, who was canonized by him in 1267. On works falsely attributed to Clement, see Cave, *Hist. Lit. ad annum* 1265. A special work on the life and writings of Clement was published in 1623 at Lyons by the Jesuit Claudius Clemens. See Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 2, 732; Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lexicon*, 2, 594; Neander, *Church Hist.* 4, 289, 424; Gieseler, *Church Hist.* per. 3. div. 3. chap. 1, § 57.

## Clement V

Pope (*Bertrand d'Agoust*), was born at Uzeste about 1264. He was appointed bishop of Comminges by Boniface VIII in 1295, and was one of the few French bishops who obeyed the summons of the pope to visit Rome, notwithstanding the prohibition of Philip the Fair. In 1299 he was appointed archbishop of Bordeaux. During the conclave following the death of Boniface VIII in 1305 he was gained over by Philip the Fair, and when a compromise had been adopted between the party of Boniface and the French party, in virtue of which the French cardinals had to choose the pope among three candidates proposed by the party of Boniface, he was elected, being still regarded as a friend of Boniface. At a secret interview which he had had with Philip before the election he had promised to reconcile the king with the Church, to leave to him during five years the tithe for military wants, to condemn the memory of Boniface, and to create a number of new French cardinals. — All these conditions were promptly fulfilled except the one relating to Boniface, which the pope tried to escape. He instituted a committee to investigate the charges brought against Boniface, but ultimately (1311) declared him free from the stain of heresy. On the other hand, he yielded to the demand of Philip for the abolition of the order of the Templars. He summoned the grand master of the order, under false pretexts, to his court; issued in 1308 a bull against the order, in which he brought against it the most unfounded and absurd charges; and finally, at the General Council of Vienne (in 1312), pronounced its abolition. The pope raised no objection to the appropriation of most of the possessions of the order by Philip, and to the burning of the grand master and of many leading members. Clement was the first pope who fixed his residence at Avignon, thus; beginning what has been styled the Babylonian Captivity of the popes. He published a large number of constitutions based upon the decrees of the Council of Vienna, which still form, under the name of "Clementines" (q.v.), the seventh book of the Decretals. He died April 20, 1314. The contemporaneous writers accuse him of licentiousness, nepotism, simony, and avarice. *SEE WETZER U. WELTE, Kirchen-Lex.* 2, 594 sq.; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 2, 732; Neander, *Ch. Hist.* 4, 70, 341; Gieseler, *Ch. Hist.* per 3. div. 3. ch. 1, § 59, and div. 4, ch. 1, § 95; Landon, *Manual of Councils*, s.v. Vienne.

## Clement VI

Pope (*Pierre Roger*), was a native of Limousin, in France. After having been a Benedictine monk in Chaise-Dieu, professor at Paris, bishop of Arras, archbishop of Sens and Rouen, and (1388) cardinal, he was elected pope on the 7th of May, 1342. He had a protracted quarrel with Edward III, king of England, on the subject of ecclesiastical benefices, over which Clement claimed an absolute right. He issued a frightful leull of excommunication against Louis IV of Germany (see Raynald, *ad annum* 1346), when the latter and the German Diet refused to promise that the king should do nothing without the consent of the pole, and induced five of the German electors to elect Charles, the son of the king of Bohemia, as German emperor. By a contract of June 9, 1348, he purchased from Joanna, queen of Naples, the city of Avignon and some adjoining territory for 80,000 gold florins, which, however, were never paid. Previously the I queen, who personally appeared before him, had been acquitted of the charge of having murdered her husband. An urgent invitation from the Romans (among whose ambassadors was Petrarch) to return to Rome was sent to the pope, but he continued at Avignon. By a bull of April 10, 1349, he reduced the interval between the years of jubilee, *SEE JUBILEE*, from 100 to 50 years, and celebrated the jubilee in 1350 with extraordinary pomp. In the bull of Clement the angels are commanded to introduce into Paradise without delay any one who should die during his stay at Rome. His efforts to bring about a union of the Greek Church with the Roman were fruitless, although the emperor Johannes Cantacuzenus declared in favor of the union. More successful were similar efforts with regard to the Armenians, who, at a council held in 1342, condemned those heresies with which they were charged. In 1345 Clement brought about a new crusade against the Turks, in which the king of Cyprus, the grand master of Rhodes, and the republics Venice of and Genoa took part, which, however, led to no result. He showed a great severity against the Flagellants. *SEE FLAGELLANTS*. Most of the new cardinals created by this pope were Frenchmen, and among them were a considerable number of his own relatives, who scandalized the Church by their licentious lives. Clement died in 1352. Petrarch praises the generosity and eloquence of this pope; but he gave, on the other hand, great offense by his extravagance and by his private life. Of his writings there are still extant several sermons, a treatise on the poverty of Christ and the apostles, a volume of letters, etc. See Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* 2, 596-600; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 2,

733, 734; Hoefer, *Biog. Generale*, 10, 765; Neander, *Church Hist.* 10, 41, 43, 412; Gieseler, *Ch. Hist.* per. 3. div. 4, ch. 1, § 97, 100.

## Clement VII

Anti-pope at Avignon (*Robert of Geneva*), with whom the great papal schism commenced, took this title on his election in 1378. He resided at Avignon, was acknowledged at once in Naples and France, and at a later period by Scotland, Savoy, and Lorraine, as well as by Castile, Aragon, and Navarre. He died without reputation in 1394. — Neander, *Church Hist.* v. 475, 565, 164, 232; Gieseler, *Ch. Hist.* per. 3. div. 6, ch. 1, § 101; Hase, p. 275. *SEE AVIGNON; SEE URBAN VI.*

## Clement VII

Pope (*Giulio*, illegitimate son of Giuliano de Medicis), became pope in 1523; one of the weak and wavering men whose selfish policy in critical times makes their prominence in history a prominence of disgrace. He entered the Maltese order, and became grand prior of Capra. When his cousin Leo X ascended the papal throne he was at once appointed archbishop and cardinal. Subsequently he acted as cardinal legate of Tuscany. He was elected pope on the 19th of Nov. 1523. On May 2; 1524, he issued a bull for the reformation of abuses prevailing in Italy. In the same year he sent a legate, Campeggio, to the Diet of Nuremberg, in order to bring about a suppression of the Reformation in Germany. The pope and his legate greatly offended the German princes by their arrogance, but succeeded, nevertheless, in effecting an alliance against the Protestants between Austria, Bavaria, and twelve princes of South Germany. Notwithstanding the zeal of the emperor for the defense of the Church of Rome, the pope was prevailed upon by the king of France to join the alliance of France, England, Venetia, and other Italian states against Charles. After the siege and capture of Rome by the imperial army, the pope was compelled to capitulate (Jan. 5, 1527); but, being unable to fulfill the conditions of the capitulation, he escaped, disguised as a merchant, on Dec. 9, 1527, and fled to Orvieto. Soon after he concluded a peace with Charles (1529), and crowned him emperor at Bologna (1530); while, on the other hand, Charles restored the papal possessions, and made Alessandro of Medicis (a reputed son of the pope) sovereign of Florence. The demand of Charles and the German princes for the convocation of an oecumenical council, which was to reform abuses in the Church and restore



its unity, he did not fulfill, making his consent contingent upon conditions which he knew to be unacceptable to Charles. In the suit of Henry VIII of England for divorce from his wife, Catharine of Aragon, the pope, after long hesitation, decided against the king, and thereby precipitated the separation of the Anglican Church from the Church of Rome. He sanctioned the new monastic orders of the Capuchins, Theatines, Somaskians, and Recollects, enlarged the library of the Vatican, and was in general a patron of literature. He died Sept. 25, 1534. The *Bullarium Romanum* (ed. Lugd. 1692, 1:636-694) contains 41 constitutions and decrees of this pope. The life of Clement has been written by Onufrio Panvini and Jacob Ziegler (in Schelhorn, *Amoen. hist. eccl.* tom. 2). See Wetzler u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* 2, 600-602; Herzog, *Real-Encykl.* 2, 734-736; Hoefler, *Biog. Gienrale*, 10, 766; Ranke, *Hist. Papacy*, bk. 1, ch. 3; Hase, *Ch. History*, p. 376, 390, 421, 450.

### Clement VIII

Anti-pope (*AEgidius Munoz*), took this title in 1421 on being elected by three cardinals at Peniscola, after the death of Benedict XIII. He resigned to Martin V in 1429, and thus terminated the great Western schism. — Migne, *Dict. Biog.* s.v. Mugnoz; Gieseler, *Ch. Hist.* per. 3. div. 5, ch. 1, § 130.

### Clement VIII

Pope (*Ippolito Aldobrandini*), was born in 1536, at Fano; became first a lawyer, subsequently consistorial advocate, auditor of the Rota, **SEE ROTA**, datarius (q.v.), and, in 1585, cardinal, and legate in Poland. He was elected pope Jan. 30, 1592. He was a cautious and politic ruler. He mediated the peace of Vervins between France and Spain. In the civil war of France he sided, like his predecessors, with the league against Henry IV. Even after the latter had joined the Church of Rome the pope hesitated to recognize him, and it was not until nearly the whole of France had recognized him that the pope consented to a solemn absolution of Henry (Dec. 17, 1597). Henry supported the annexation of Ferrara to the papal states, and reintroduced the Jesuits into France, while, on the other hand, the pope abstained from openly opposing Henry's edict of toleration. During his pontificate the king of Poland prevailed upon the metropolitan of Kiev and seven of the Ruthenian bishops to unite with the Church of Rome, and ambassadors arrived at Rome from the Coptic patriarch of

Alexandria to negotiate a union of the Copts with the Church of Rome. He issued new editions of the Vulgate, the Roman Breviary, Missal, and of the Index. In order to settle the dogmatical controversy between Jesuits and Dominicans on divine grace, he instituted in 1597 the *Congregatio de auxiliis divinae gratiae*. A dispute with the republic of Venice was amicably settled. He died on March 5, 1605. Baronius and Bellarmine were among the cardinals appointed by him. One hundred and twenty-three constitutions and decrees of this pope are contained in *Bullar. Rom. Magnum*, tom. 3. 1-170. His life was written by Cicarella. — Ranke, *Hist. Pap.* b. 6; Hase, *Ch. Hist.* p. 456, 466 sq.; Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* 2, 603-640; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 2, 1136.

### Clement IX

Pope (*Giulio Rospigliosi*), was born in 1600 at Pistoja. He was in succession auditor of the Rota, secretary of Sixtus IV, and cardinal, and was elected pope in 1667. He mediated a peace between Louis XIV and Spain, at Aix-la-Chapelle, in 1668. He was upright in his intentions, but easy in disposition. He left his name to the *Clementine Peace*, a brief pause in the struggle between the Jansenists and Jesuits. He is said to have died of grief at the taking of Candia by the Turks, 1669. — Ranke, *Hist. Pap.* b. 8; Hase, *Ch. Hist.* p. 512, 518; Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lexikon*, 2, 605.

### Clement X

Pope (*Emilio Altieri*), was born at Rome on the 13th of July, 1590, and held the papal chair from 1670 to 1676. Eighty years old at his accession, he was completely governed by his relations, one of whom, Cardinal Paluzzi, was called by the Romans pope *de facto*. He was always eager to mediate peace between the Roman Catholic states, and supported the Poles with money against the Turks. In his reign commenced the dispute with Louis XIV of France concerning the rights claimed by the French kings, during the vacancies of episcopal sees, to dispose of the ecclesiastical benefices, and to receive the revenue. — Ranke, *Hist. Pap.* b. 8; Hase, *Ch. History*, p. 512; Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lexikon*, 2, 608.

### Clement XI

Pope (*Giovanni Francesco, count of Albani*), was born at Pesaro July 22, 1649. He was secretary of the secret briefs under Innocent XI, Alexander VIII, and Innocent XII, and, as such, wrote, among others, the celebrated

bull of Alexander VIII (1691) against the Gallican liberties adopted by a national convention of the French bishops in 1682. He became cardinal deacon in 1690, and cardinal priest in 1700. He was raised to the popedom in 1700 on account of his energy and ability, and displayed abundance of the former quality, but with singular want of success. He opposed the elevation of Prussia to a kingdom, and thus made himself ridiculous in Germany. In the war of the Spanish succession he voluntarily acknowledged Philip V, the grandson of Louis XIV of France, but was compelled by the imperial forces threatening Rome to recognize Charles III, the brother of Joseph I of Austria, as king of Spain. He lost Parma and Placentia, and was totally disregarded at the peace of Utrecht (1713). By this peace Sicily was given to Duke Victor Amadeus of Savoy, who denied the papal claim to Sicily, and when the pope had recourse to ban and interdict, expelled nearly all the priests from Sicily, and transported them to the papal states. The pope did not repeal ban and interdict until 1719, when Sicily fell to the power of the emperor of Austria. In the long controversy between the Dominicans and Jesuits concerning the observance of the pagan customs of China by converts, in which Innocent X had decided in favor of the Dominicans, and Alexander VII in favor of the Jesuits, Clement again declared against the Jesuits, who apparently submitted, but continued the controversy. In the Jansenistic controversy this pope took very decisive action by the bull *Vineam Domini* (July 16, 1705), which demanded a strict adherence to the decrees of Innocent X and Alexander VIII against the book of Jansenius. Of still greater importance was the celebrated bull *Unigenitus* (Sept. 8, 1713) against Quesnel's (q.v.) work on the New Testament, which produced an extraordinary commotion in the Gallican Church. The *Bullar. Romans Contin. P. 11* (1727), contains 123 bulls, constitutions, letters, and briefs of Clement; and *Contin. P. VI* (1739), 183 constitutions. The life of Clement XI was written by Polidoro (Urbino, 1727), Lafiteau (Pad. 1752, 2 vols.), Reboulet (Avignon, 1752, 2 vols.), and by the Protestant Buder, *Leben u. Thaten des klugen Papstes Clementis XI* (3 vols. Frankf. 1720). He died 1721. His works (Homilies) were published (2 vols. fol.) in Rome, 1729. — Ranke, *Hist. Pap.* b. 8; Hase, *Ch. Hist.* p. 513, 518; Wetzler u. Welte, *KirchenLex.* 2, 609, 612; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 2, 737.

## Clement XII

Pope (*Lorenzo Corsini*), was born at Florence in 1652. He was appointed cardinal May 17, 1706, cardinal bishop of Frascati in 1725, and became

pope July 12, 1730, when 78 years old. Immediately upon his accession to the papal chair, he instituted a trial against Coscia, the favorite of his predecessor, Benedict XIII, for extortion. Coscia was sentenced to eight years' imprisonment, and a fine of 40,000 ducats. In 1732 he issued a papal "constitution" for a better regulation of the conclave; by a brief of 1736 he suppressed the sect of the Cocchiari, and in 1738 he condemned the Freemasons. He took a special interest in the union of the Greek Church with the Roman, and in 1734 founded the "Corsinian" ecclesiastical seminary for young Greeks at Bissignano, in Calabria; but the endeavors of the Jesuits to gain over the patriarch of Constantinople were fruitless. Equally inefficient were special efforts made for winning over the Protestants of Saxony and Silesia. His relations to the Roman Catholic states were, in general, not friendly. Parma, which he claimed after the death of the last Farnese (1731), was occupied by Austria. Spain, against the consent of the pope, made enlistments in the papal states, and placed garrisons in several towns. Portugal claimed the cardinal's hat for a favorite of the king (Bicchi), and the pope, in 1731, yielded. Charles Emanuel of Sardinia was threatened with the ban for occupying several places in Piedmont which the pope claimed as fief. The little republic of San Marino, which Cardinal Alberoni, in 1739, had rashly annexed to the papal states, soon recovered its independence. He supported the emperor of Austria with money in his war against the Turks. He promoted the study of Oriental languages, especially the Syriac, and sent Asseynani on his second journey to the East, to collect Oriental manuscripts for the library of the Vatican. His private life was austere, and he was rigid in the enforcement of ecclesiastical discipline. He died Feb. 6, 1740. The *Bullarium Romans Cont. P. VIII* (Luxemb. 1740), contains 277 constitutions of this pope. — Hase, *Ch. History*, p. 514; Ranke, *Hist. Pap.* b. 8; Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* 2, 611; Hoefler, *Biogr. Generale*, 10, 769.

### Clement XIII

Pope (*Carlo della Torre di Rezzonico*), was born at Venice March 7, 1693; became governor of Fano in 1721, auditor of the Rota in 1729, cardinal-deacon in 1737, bishop of Padua in 1743, cardinal-priest in 1747. He ascended the papal chair July 6, 1758. He owed his elevation to the Jesuits, whom he supported with an earnestness and perseverance that fully displayed the feebleness of the popedom. By autograph letters to the kings of France, Portugal, and Spain, he endeavored to avert the destruction of the order in those three states. But in vain. The Portuguese government

suppressed all the convents in 1759 and 1760, imprisoning a number of members under the charge of being accomplices of a plot against the life of the king, and transporting most of them into the papal states “as a present to St. Peter.” In 1764 the Jesuits were exiled from France. In reply, Clement issued the bull “*Apostolicum pascendi*,” in which he again confirmed the order; but the French Parliament forbade the publication of the bull. In April, 1767, the Spanish government embarked all the members of the order in Spain in order to transport them to the papal states. On the 30th of January, 1768, the pope issued a brief, in which he annulled, as head of the Church and as feudal sovereign of Parma, a number of reformatory measures which the duke of Parma had issued in 1765 and 1766, pronouncing the severest censures of the Church against all who had aided in the drawing up, publication, and execution of these decrees, and releasing the subjects of the duke from the duty of obeying them. This bull produced the greatest indignation at all the Bourbon courts. Parma expelled the Jesuits (in 1768), France occupied Avignon and Venaissin, and Naples took possession of Benevento and Pontecorvo. In addition to these troubles, a conflict arose with the republic of Venice, which had issued some laws restricting the privileges of the clergy, and in particular that of accumulating property. The republic of Genoa offered a reward of 6000 scudi for the capture of a papal delegate to the island of Corsica, which had risen in insurrection against the Genoese. In January, 1768, the pope protested against the resolution of the Polish Diet, which, although recognizing the Church of Rome as the state Church, made some concessions to the dissidents. Besides these conflicts with the state governments, Clement had a hard struggle against an Episcopal movement in the Church of Rome, which demanded a restriction of the papal prerogatives and an enlargement of the powers of the metropolitans, and the chief representative of which was the German bishop Febronius (q.v.). The *Congregation of the Index* forbade the possession and circulation of the book under penalty of the galleys; but this rigorous measure, as well as letters to the bishops of Germany to use the utmost efforts for the suppression of the dangerous book, remained useless. Some of the bulls issued by Clement (as *Animarum Saluti* and *Aliud ad Apostolatus*), in vindication of the claims of the papacy, offended even the most zealous partisans of the pope. Even the cardinals became dissatisfied, and a change of policy was seriously contemplated when the pope died on February 3, 1769. Clement restricted the right of asylum, forbade the clergy from engaging in mercantile pursuits, and conferred upon Maria Theresa the title

of apostolic majesty. — Ranke, *Hist. Pap.* bk. 8; Hase, *Church Hist.* p. 524 sq.; Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lexikon*, 2, 613-618; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 2, 738-740.

## Clement XIV

Pope (*Giovanni Vincente Antonio Ganganelli*), was born at San Arcangelo, near Rimini, October 31, 1705. After receiving an education in the institutions of the Jesuits at Rimini and the Piarists at Urbino, he entered, on May 17, 1723, the order of the Minorites, exchanging his baptismal Christian name for that of Lorenzo. He soon distinguished himself both as a pulpit orator and as a theologian, and taught theology in several of the institutions of his order. When, on May 20, 1741, Pope Benedict XIV presided at the general chapter of the Minorites, which was to elect a new general of the order, Ganganelli, in the name of the chapter, addressed the pope in a speech which gained to him the full confidence of Benedict. He was in 1745 appointed assistant, and in 1746 consultor at the Sant' Uffizio (the Congregation of the Inquisition), and in this office won general respect by his moderation, amiable character, and scholarship. On September 24, 1759, he was appointed cardinal-priest by Clement XIII upon the recommendation of the general of the Jesuits. The pope intrusted to him several important missions; but when it was found that he disapproved the uncompromising opposition of the pope to the Bourbon courts, he fell into disfavor, and was deprived of all influence. The conclave, after the death of Clement XIII, lasted over three months. The ambassadors of the Bourbon courts, aided by the youthful Archduke Joseph of Austria (subsequently Joseph II), made the utmost exertions to secure the election of a liberal pope. Ganganelli finally was agreed upon by a compromise of the two parties. The one regarded him as sufficiently flexible and liberal, while the Jesuits' party held that, though opposed to the late pope's policy, he was not hostile to the order of the Jesuits. Thus he was elected by both parties on May 19, 1769. As he was not yet a bishop, he received the episcopal consecration on the 28th of May, and was crowned pope on the 4th of June. He opened his pontificate by making reforms in the administration of the papal states, showed himself a patron of science and art, and endeavored to gain the confidence of the Roman people. But his chief care was to restore the good relations between the papal and the Bourbon courts. He opened a personal correspondence with the Bourbon princes, and carefully avoided everything that could give offense. He abandoned the papal claims to the duchy of Parma; offered

himself to the court of Madrid as godfather for the new-born son of the princess of Austria; conciliated the king of Portugal and his prime minister Pombal (who threatened a complete separation of Portugal from the Church of Rome) by appointing Pombal's brother a cardinal, and confirming the episcopal nominations which had been made by the king. This conciliatory policy secured the restoration to the papal government of Avignon, Venaissin, Benevento, and Pontecorvo. But the chief demand of the Bourbon courts, the suppression of the order of the Jesuits, he tried to escape as long as possible. He had held himself aloof from the Jesuits from the first day of his pontificate, and had forbidden the admission of the General of the order to the Vatican. He appointed a committee of jurists to examine the subject; acquainted himself personally with all that had been written for or against the order; and took great care to prepare public opinion gradually for its suppression. In a letter to the king of Spain he publicly admitted the necessity of suppressing the order, as the members had deserved this fate by their intrigues. The bishops of the papal states were authorized to examine the houses of the Jesuits, and to secularize those members who desired it. On June 25, 1773, the seals were put on the archives of the novitiate of the order at Rome, and the cardinal of Aragon was directed to possess himself of all their possessions within his legation. A similar order was given to the bishop of Montalto. Finally, on July 21, 1773, the famous brief "*Dominus ac Redemptor Noster*," by which the whole order was suppressed, was signed. It was published on the 16th of August. On the whole, the decree was carried out with great regard to the individual members, but the general, father Ricci, was arrested. The brief states, as a reason for the suppression, that the Church no longer derived from the order the advantages which were expected from it at the time of its foundation; it refers to the suppression of other monastic orders by former popes; claims for the pope the right of suppressing an order without previous trial, and explains his long hesitation to take this step from his earnest desire of thoroughly considering the matter. The measure naturally produced an extraordinary excitement; the Jesuits everywhere submitted, but some violent books against the acts of the pope were published by the members or friends of the order, and prophecies from a Dominican nun, Anna Theresa Poll, and from a certain Bernardina Renzi, announcing the imminent death of the pope, were widely circulated. Some months after the suppression of the order the health of the pope began to fail, and he died September 22, 1774. An opinion that he had been poisoned found many believers, and is still defended by a number of writers, but a majority of the

best historians have declared it not sufficiently supported. Special works on Clement are, Caraccioli, *Ve de Clement XIV* (1775; German translation, Frankfurt, 1776); *Leben des P. Clemens XIV* (Berlin, 1774-75, 3 vols.); Cretineau-Joly, *Clement XIV et les Jesuites* (Paris, 1847, on the side of the Jesuits); Ganganelli, *Papst Clemens XIV; seine Briefe und seine Zeit* (Berlin, 1847); Theiner, *Histoire du Pontificat de Clement XIV* (Paris, 1853, 3 vols.; German edit. Leipzig). Father Theiner, who was a prefect-coadjutor of the archives of the Vatican, consultor of the Congregation of the Index and other congregations, a member of the special Congregation on the Immaculate Conception, etc., at Rome, made use of many unprinted documents in the archives of the Vatican. He tried to exalt Clement as one of the greatest popes, and, in order to achieve this, came out very severely against the Jesuits of that time. His work led to a lively controversy. The French historian of the order, Cretineau-Joly, undertook the defense of the Jesuits, but his book was put on the Index. The general of the order, P. Roothan, fearing that the controversy might turn out badly for the order, declined all responsibility for Cretineau-Joly's work, but at the same time induced P. de Ravignan, the celebrated Jesuit preacher at Paris, to take up the defense of the order. Ravignan accordingly wrote and published *Clement XIII et Clement XIV* (Paris, 1854, 2 vols., p. 574 and 502), in which he tries to justify both the Jesuits and the pope who suppressed them. See Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 2, 740-742; Wetzer u. Welte, 2:618-622; Hoefer, *Biog. Generale*, 10, 770-776; Ranke, *Hist. Pap.* bk. 8; Hase, *Church Hist.* § 525; Hook, *Ecclesiastes Dict.* s.v. Ganganelli.

## Clementines I

(Κλημέντια, Κλημέντινα, or pseudo-Clementines), are the several writings, partly orthodox, partly heretical, falsely ascribed to Clement, one of the apostolic fathers, and bishop of Rome from A.D. 92-102, for the purpose of giving them greater weight and currency. These works are:

**1.** A SECOND EPISTLE TO THE CORINTHIANS, extant only in fragments. These fragments are found, together with Clement's genuine or first Epistle to the Corinthians [*SEE CLEMENT OF ROME*], at the close of the Alexandrian Codex of the Bible (called Cod. A), dating from the fifth century, and preserved in the British Museum. The earliest mention of such an epistle we meet in Eusebius, who says (*Hist. Eccl.* 3. 38), "We must know that there is also a second Epistle of Clement; but we do not regard



it as being equally notable with the former, since we know of none of the ancients that have made use of it.”

The catalogue of writings contained in the Alexandrian MS. ascribes it to Clement; but this, in the absence of other evidence, external and internal, is not of great weight, since Codex A cannot be traced beyond the fifth century. A closer examination of the fragments shows that they are not an epistle, but a homily, containing general exhortations to active Christianity, and to fidelity in persecution, with polemical references to the Gnostic denial of the resurrection. The document differs so much in style and doctrinal importance from the genuine epistle of Clement that it has been generally assigned by critics to a later date. It is orthodox in sentiment. The very beginning contains a distinct confession of the divinity of Christ, who is called “God, and the Judge of the living and the dead.” Otherwise it is of no special account.

**2.** Two encyclical LETTERS TO VIRGINS, first discovered by Wetstein in 1752, in a Syriac translation, and appended to his edition of the Greek Testament. They commend celibacy, and contain exhortations and rules of discipline for monks and nuns.

**3.** Five DECRETAL LETTERS, which pseudo-Isidore has placed at the head of his collection of decretals of Roman popes. Two of them are addressed to James, bishop of Jerusalem, and are older than the pseudo-Isidore of the eighth or ninth century; the three others were fabricated by him.

**4.** The APOSTOLICAL CONSTITUTIONS and CANONS, including the LITURGY of St. Clement, which is a part of the eighth book of the Constitutions. This is a collection of ecclesiastical laws and usages which grew up gradually during the first four centuries, and is valuable chiefly as a rich source of information concerning ancient Church government, worship, and practice. The work professes to be a bequest of all the apostles handed down through the Roman bishop Clement, or dictated to him. It begins with the words, “The apostles and elders to all who among the nations have believed in the Lord Jesus Christ. Grace be to you and peace,” etc. It contains, in eight books, a collection of moral exhortations, ecclesiastical laws, and liturgical formularies. The object of the compiler was to establish the episcopal hierarchy, and to furnish the clergy with a convenient guide in worship and discipline. The first six books were written at the end of the third century, the remaining two at the beginning of the fourth; at all events, before the Council of Nicaea (325). The APOSTOLICAL CANONS are

appended to the eighth book of the Constitutions, and pretend to be likewise of apostolical origin. They consist of 85, or, in other copies, 50 brief rules for the conduct of the clergy and laity, borrowed in part from the Pastoral Epistles, partly from decrees of early councils, and partly from oral tradition. They are also found separately in Greek, Syriac, Ethiopic, and Arabic manuscripts. They were collected by some unknown hand about the middle of the fourth century. The Greek Church in 692 adopted the whole collection of 85 canons; the Latin retained only 50, which Dionysius Exiguus translated into Latin about A.D. 500.

The Apostolical Constitutions and Canons are found in the larger editions of the works of the apostolic fathers, by Cotelier and Clericus (1672, 1698, 1700, 1724), in the first volume of Mansi's, and also of Harduin's *Collection of Councils*, and have been separately edited by Guil. Ueltzen, *Constitutiones apostolicae* (Rostochii. 1853), and by P. A. de Lagarde, *Constitutiones apostolorum* (Lips. 1862). Among the many treatises on the Apost. Const. we mention Krabbe, *Ueber den Ursprung und Inhalt der apost. Constitutionen* (1829); S. von Drey, *Neue Untersuchungen*, etc. (1832); Chase, *Constitutions of the holy Apostles, including the Canons* (1148); comp. Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte*, 1, 767 sq.; Schaff, *Church History*, 1, 440 sq.; Bunsen, *Hippol.* 1, 319 sq.

**5.** The pseudo-Clementine HOMILIES, to which the title *Clementines* (τὰ Κλημέντια, *Clementina*) is more particularly applied, and the RECOGNITIONS (*Ἀναγνωρισμοί*, *Recognitiones Clenentis Rom.*), which resemble the former in form and contents. To these must be added THE EPITOME DE GESTIS PETRI, which is a summary of the Homilies. The HOMILIES are twenty in number, but the last has only recently been discovered. They figure very prominently in the history of the ancient heresies. They are a most curious philosophico-religious romance. Clement, an educated Roman, and kinsman of the emperor Domitian, dissatisfied with heathenism and thirsting after truth, travels to Judaea, meets the apostle Peter, and is converted by him to the Christian faith. He accompanies him on his missionary journeys, and takes down in writing the substance of the sermons and disputations with Simon Magus. Simon Peter is thus the proper hero of the romance, and appears as the champion of pure, primitive Christianity, in contrast with Simon Magus, the great deceiver and arch-heretic. The apostle Paul is not mentioned, but is perhaps attacked under the name of Simon. The doctrinal system which is skillfully interwoven with this narrative stands by itself as a peculiar and

confused mixture of Ebionistic and Gnostic ideas and fancies. It is a speculative form of Ebionism, rather than (as Baur treats it) a school of Gnosticism. It is essentially Judaizing in spirit and aim, though influenced by heathen philosophy. It is bitterly hostile to the theology of Paul, and forms in this respect the opposite extreme to the Gnosticism of Marcion and his school. It presents Christianity as the restoration simply of the primitive religion of Adam, Enoch, Noah, Abraham, and Moses, which was corrupted by daemons, until Christ purged it of all false additions. The apostle Peter defended it against the new corruptions of Simon Magus. James, the brother of Christ, is made the general vicar of Christ, the pope to whom even Peter is amenable, and Jerusalem is the center of Christendom. The *Epitome* is only a poor abridgment of the Homilies. The *Recognitions* of Clement, in 10 books, are an orthodox recension of the Homilies, and were probably written in Rome. They exist only in a Latin translation.

The *Homilies* and *Recognitions* are incorporated in the large editions of the apostolic fathers by Cotelier and Clericus. The former were separately edited I y Schwegler; 1847 (incomplete); better by Alb. Dressel, who first discovered the 20th homily in the Vatican library (Gott. 1853); and by P. de Lagarde (Leipsig, 1865). On the system of the pseudo-Clementine Homilies, compare the works of Neander and Baur on Gnosticism, the learned monograph of Schliemann (*Die Clementinen nebst den verwandten Schriften*, Hamb. 1844), Hilgenfeld (*Die Clementinischen Recognitionen und Homilien*, Jena, 1848, and also his work on the apostolic fathers, 1853, p. 289-306), Uhlhorn (*Die Homilien und Recognitionen des Clemens Rom.*, Gottingen, 1854, and an article by the same in Herzog's *Encykl.* 2, 744), Schaff (*Church History*, 1, 215 sq.), and an article of Steitz in the *Studien und Kritiken* for 1867, No. III, p. 545 sq. Dr. Steitz derives the German story of Faust from the pseudo-Clementine fiction of Simon Magus. There are some points of resemblance, but not sufficient to establish such a connection. A translation of the *Recognitions* (by the Rev. T. Smith) is given, with an introduction on the literature, in the *Ante-Nicene Library*, vol. 3 (Edinburgh, 1867).

## Clementines II

A part of the canon law prepared by pope Clement V (1305-1314), and consisting of the decrees issued by the Council of Vienna (1311-1312), as well as his own constitutions. This collection was to follow the five books

of decretals collected by Gregory IX in 1234, and the *liber sextus* prepared in 1298 by Boniface VIII, under the name of *Liber septimus*; it is, however, more commonly known under the name of Clementines. Like the two previous collections, it is divided into five books — *Judex, Judicium, Clerus, Connubia, Crimen*; and even the series of titles and the headings fully correspond with those of the collection of Gregory IX. Clement made his collection known to the consistory of cardinals in 1313, and in the following year sent it to the University of Orleans. His successor, John XXII, sent it also to the universities of Paris and Bologna. The first *glossa* (commentary) to it was written about 1326 by Joannes Andreae, and it soon obtained the authority of a *glossa ordinaria*. It was revised by cardinal Zabarella († 1417). The first editions of the Clementines were published at Mainz in 1460, 1467, and 1471. See Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* 2, 628; Hase, *Ch. Hist.* § 286. **SEE CANON LAW.**

### Clementines III

A sect whose members reject most of the forms and ceremonies of the Romish Church, but adhere to its distinguishing doctrines, such as the sacrifice of the mass, the necessity of confession, etc. Their name is said to be derived from that of a priest, their first leader. The sect has never been numerous; but a few members, it is thought, may still (1867) be found in the Pyrenaean provinces of France.

### Cleobians

a branch of the Simonians (q v.), in the first century, extinguished almost at its rise.