THE AGES DIGITAL LIBRARY

REFERENCE

CYCLOPEDIA of BIBLICAL, THEOLOGICAL and ECCLESIASTICAL LITERATURE

Cleopas - Conformists

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

Cle’opas

(Κλεόπας, contr. for Κλεόπατρος, *of a renowned father*), one of the two disciples who were going to Emmaus on the day of the resurrection, when Jesus himself drew near and talked with them (<42418>Luke 24:18), A.D. 29.. Eusebius and Jerome (*Onomast. s.v.* Ἐμμαούς, *Emaus*) make him (Κλεώπας, *Cleophas*) a native of Emmaus. It is a question whether this Cleopas is to be considered as identical with the CLEOPHAS *SEE CLEOPHAS* (q.v.), or rather *Clopas* of <431925>John 19:25, or the ALPHESUS *SEE ALPHESUS* (q.v.) of <401003>Matthew 10:3, etc. Their identity was assumed by the later fathers and Church historians (Thiess, *Comment.* 2, 230 sq.). But Eusebius (*H. E.* 3. 11) writes the name of Alphseus, Joseph’s brother, Clopas, not Cleopas; and Chrysostom and Theodoret, on the Epistle to the Galatians, call James the Just the son of Clopas. Besides this, Clopas, or Alphaeus, is an Aramaic name, whereas Cleopas is apparently Greek. Again, as we find the wife and children of Clopas constantly with the family of Joseph at the time of our Lord’s ministry, it is probable that he himself was dead before that time. On the whole, then, it seems safer to doubt the identity of Cleopas with Clopas, notwithstanding the similarity of names. (See Rus, *Harmon. evang.* III, 2:1272 sq.; Wieseler, *Chronol. Synopse*, p. 431; Clemens, in the *Zeitschr. f. wiss. Theol.* 3. 356 sq.)

Cleopa’tra

Picture for Cloeapa’tra 1

Picture for Cleaopa’tra 2

(strictly *Cleop’atra*, Κλεοπάτρα, *of a renowned father*), a Greek female name occurring as early as Homer (*Il.* 9, 556), and borne especially by the Egyptian princesses after the times of Alexander (see Smith’s *Dict. of Class. Biog.* s.v.). The following, being members of the line of the Ptolomies, who frequently intermarried with the Seleucidae of Syria, are mentioned in the Apocrypha and Josephus, or alluded to in the Scriptures.

1. A daughter of Antiochus III (the Great), who was married to Ptolemy V (Epiphanes), B.C. 193 (see <271113>Daniel 11:13, 16), Coele-Syria being given as her dower (Josephus, *Ant.*12, 4, 1; Appian, *Syr.* 5; Livy, 37:3), though Antiochus afterwards repudiated this arrangement (Polyb. 28:17). *SEE ANTIOCHUS*, 2.

2. A daughter by the preceding match, who became "the wife of Ptolemy" (Esther 11:1) VI (Philometor), her own brother, on whose death (B.C. 146) she was violently persecuted by his successor (her own brother likewise, and for a time husband) Physcon, or Ptolemy VII, or Euergetes II (Justin. 38:8, 9; 39:1, 2; Livy, *Ep.* 59; Died. Sic. 2:602, ed. Wess.) She is mentioned by Josephus as having joined her first husband in the letter addressed to Onias (q.v.) in favor of reconstructing the Jewish temple at Leontopolis (*Ant.* 13, 3, 2), and as befriended in her distress by Onias (*Apion,* 2, 5). *SEE PTOLEMY PHILOMETOR*.

3. A daughter of the preceding by her first husband; married first (B.C. 150) to Alexander (q.v.) Balas, the Syrian usurper (1 Maccabees 10:58; Josephus, *Ant.* 13, 4, 1 and 5), and on his death (B.C. 146) to Demetrius (q.v.) Nicator (1 Maccabees 11:12; Josephus, *Ant.* 13, 4, 7). During the captivity of the latter in Parthia, B.C. 141 (1 Maccabees 14:1 sq.), she married his brother Antiochus (Josephus, *Ant.* 13, 7,1) VII (Sidetes), out of jealousy on account of Demetrius's connection with the Parthian princess Rhodogune, and also murdered Demetrius on his return (Appian, *Syr.* 68; Livy, *Ep.* 60), although Josephus (*Ant.* 13, 9, 3) and Justin (139, 1) represent her as only refusing to receive him. She also murdered Seleucus, her son by Nicator, who on his father's death assumed the government without her consent (Appian, *Syr.* 69). Her other son by Nicator, Antiochus VIII (Grypus), succeeded to the throne (B.C. 125) through her influence; but afterwards, finding him not disposed to yield her all the power she desired, she attempted to poison him, but was anticipated by him, and compelled to drink the poison herself (Justin, 39:2), B.C. 120. *SEE ANTIOCHUS*, 6 and 7.

4. A sister of the preceding, and the rival of her own mother (No. 2) in the affections of Ptolemy Physcon, by whose will she was left in supreme power, in connection with whichever of her own sons she might choose. She was compelled by her people to set up the eldest, Ptolemy VIII (Lathyrus); but she soon prevailed upon them to expel him, and make room for her younger and favorite son Alexander (Pausan. 8:7), and she even sent an army against Lathyrus to Cyprus, an effort in which the Jews became involved (Josephus, *Ant.* 13, 12, 2 sq.; 13, 1) through the intervention of Alexander Jannaeus (q.v.). Her son Alexander retired through fear of her cruelty, but was recalled by his mother, who attempted to assassinate him, but was herself put to death (B.C. 89) before she could effect her object (Justin, 39:4). *SEE PTOLEMY LATHYRUS*.

5. The second daughter of the name by the preceding marriage, and married to her own brother Lathyrus after her sister's divorce, from whom she is usually distinguished by the surname of *Selene* (Σελήνη, the *moon*). After his exile she married Antiochus XI (Epiphanes), and on his death Antiochus X (Eusebes). She was besieged by Tigranes in Syria or Mesopotamia, and either taken and killed by him (Strabo, 21, p. 749), or, according to Josephus (*Ait.* 13, 16 4; comp. *War,* 1, 5, 3), relieved by Lucullus's invasion of Armenia. *SEE ANTIOCHUS*, 9 and 10.

6. The last queen of Egypt, was the daughter of Ptolemy Auletes, born B.C. 69, and celebrated for her beauty and accomplishments, as also for her voluptuousness and ambition. She had various amorous and political intrigues, first with Julius Caesar (Dion Cass. 43:27; Sueton. *Cass.* 35), whom she even accompanied to Rome; and finally with Marc Antony (q.v.), who became so completely enamored of her as to commit suicide when falsely informed of her death, which she presently actually accomplished, it is said by causing herself to be bitten by an asp, on the capture of Alexandria by Octavianus, afterwards called Augustus, B.C. 30 (see Liddell's *Hist. of Rome,* chap. 70). Josephus often refers to her profligate conduct (see *Ant.* 14, 13, 1) as well as her artful cruelty (*Ant.* 15, 3, 5 and 8; *War,* 1, 19, 1), and narrates her unsuccessful attempt to draw even Herod into an amour (*Ant.* 15, 4).

7. One of Herod's wives, a native of Jerusalem, and mother of his sons Herod and Philip (Josephus, *Ant.* 17, 1, 3; *War,* 1, 28, 4).

8. The wife of Gessius Florus, procurator of Judea; she was a favorite with Nero's wife (Josephus, *Ant.* 20, 11, 1).

Cle'ophas

or rather CLOPAS (Κλωπᾶς), the husband of Marv (q.v.), the "sister" of Christ's mother (⁴³⁰²⁵John 19:25); probably a Graecized form of tie name elsewhere (⁴⁰¹⁰³Matthew 10:3; ⁴¹⁰¹⁸Mark 3:18; ⁴²⁰¹⁶Luke 6:16; ⁴⁴⁰¹³Acts 1:13; comp. ⁴¹⁵⁴⁰Mark 15:40) called ALPHIEUS *SEE ALPHIEUS* (q.v.), perhaps in imitation of the name *Cleopas* (q.v.). See the *Theol. Stud. u. Krit.* 1840, 3. 648.

Clerc, Le (Clericus), Jean,

a learned critic and theologian, was born at Geneva March 19, 1657. He studied theology at his native town, and in 1679 passed a brilliant

examination for admission into the ministry of Geneva, but had before this fallen out with strict Calvinism, chiefly under the influence of the Saumur theses (*Syntagma thesium theol. Salmurii.* 1655), and the writings of his grand-uncle Curcellaeus and of Episcopius. As early as 1679 he published a pseudonymous work on the difference between strict Calvinists and Remonstrants, in favor of the latter (Liberii *de sancto amore epistolce theologicae,* Saumur, 1679). In 1682 he openly joined the Remonstrants, and in 1684 the Rotterdam Synod gave to him the professorship of philosophy and ancient languages at the Arminian college of Amsterdam. Here he at once began to exhibit his marvelous literary activity. After publishing some exegetical treatises of his uncle David le Clerc, and his father Stephen le Clerc, and a dogmatical treatise on predestination, and the nature and limits of human knowledge (*Entretiens sur diverses matieres de thiologie,* Amsterdam, 1685), he attracted general attention by his literary controversy with the learned oratorian Richard Simon (*Origeni Adamantino Critobulus Hieropolitanus,* 1684, pseudonym.; *Sentimins sur l' hist. critique du V. T. composee par le P. R. Simon,.* Amsterd. 1685, *and Defence des Sentimens,* etc. Amsterd. 1685). In the same year he established with F. Cornand de la Croze a literary journal, under the title *Bibliotheque universelle et historique,* which, besides reviews and extracts from new books, contains many essays by Le Clerc (25 vols. 1686-1693). He also took an active part in the publication of the four editions of Moreri's *Dictionnaire* (4 vols. fol. 1691-1702). He defended Episcopius against the charge of Socinianism (*Lettre a M. Jurieu sur la maniere dont il a traite Episcopius,* 1690), and translated three works of Burnet into French, and part of the history of ancient philosophy by Th. Stanley into Latin. From 1692-1695 he wrote several compends of philosophy (*Opera philosophica,* 4 vols. 1698; later editions contain a 5th volume, with a life of the author). In 1693 he began the publication of his Latin translation of and commentary on the Old Testament (Genesis, 1693; the four last books of the Pentateuch, 1696; the other historical books, 1708; the remainder, 1731), in which he developed some latitudinarian views on Biblical miracles and scriptural interpretation. In 1696 he published his *Ars Critica* (2 vols. Amsterd.), one of his most important works, of which the *Epistole Critica et Ecclesiasticae* (1700, against Cave) are a continuation. He translated into Latin and added valuable notes to Hammond's New Testament (1698, 2 vols. fol.; 2d edit. Frankfort, 1714), and in the same year published a new edition of the *Patres Apostolici* by Cotelier, with notes and additions (Amsterd. 1698; 2d ed. 1724). A work against some

anti-Christian views in Bayle's *Dictionary* (*Parrhasiana,* Amsterd. 1699) involved him in a controversy with Bayle which lasted until the death of the latter. He prepared an appendix to the Amsterdam reprint of the Maurine edition of the works of St. Augustine (*Appendix Augustiniana,* Amsterd. 1703); published a French translation of the New Test. (Amsterd. 1703, 2 vols.), with notes, which again brought him into the suspicion of Socinianism, and published new editions, with notes, of Petavius, *De theologicis dogmatibus* (6 vols. fol. Amsterd. 1700), and *doctrina temporum* (Amsterd. 1703, 3 vols. fol.), of the complete works of Erasmus of Rotterdam (Lugd. Bat. 10 vols. fol. 1703-6), of Hugo Grotius, *De Veritate Religionis Christianae* (Amsterd. 1709), and of many others. He also continued his literary journal under the title *Bibliotheque chosie* (1703-13, 27 vols.). In 1 12, on the death of Limborch, he was appointed his successor as professor of Church History at the college of Amsterdam. His new office induced him to write a Church History of the first two centuries (*Hist. Eccles. duorum prim. saec.,* Amsterd. 1716). He also prepared several editions of Latin and Greek classics, a history of the Netherlands, and carried on a very extensive correspondence with scholars in various countries. In 1728 he suddenly lost, in consequence of a paralytic stroke, the use of language, and, to a large extent, his memory, and his condition became still worse after a new attack in 1732. He died January 8, 1736. Le Clerc was one of the most prolific writers of modern times, but more critical than productive. Though always in ecclesiastical communion with the Remonstrants, he undoubtedly leaned towards Socinianism. See Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* 2, 630 sq.; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 2, 756; Ersch u. Gruber, *Encyklop.* vol. 18, s.v.

Clerestory

SEE CLEAR-STORY.

Clergy

the general name given to those who are set apart by *ordination* (q.v.) for the performance of Christian worship and teaching, and who are therefore said to be in orders (q.v.).

1. *Origin and Meaning of the Word.* — The word is by some supposed to be derived from κλῆρος (*lot*), as if the minister were, in a special sense, κλῆρος τοῦ Θεοῦ, specially consecrated to God. Others (Augustine, *Expos. in Psalm* 67; Isidor, *De Off. Ecclesiastes* 2, c. 1) maintain that it

indicates that the lot by which Matthias was chosen apostle gave the first general name for the chiefs of the Church as a class. Jerome says they were called clergy, either because they were chosen by lot to be the Lord's, or because the Lord is their lot or heritage (<05D102>Deuteronomy 18:2). More recently both these derivations have been abandoned, and one proposed by Baur (*Ursprung des Episcopats,* p. 93 sq.; *D. Christenthum v. die christl. Kirche der drei ersten Jahrhund.* p. 245) and by Ritschl (*Entstek. der altcath. Kirche,* p. 245) has met with general favor. According to it, the word κλῆρος is in the N.T. (<440117>Acts 1:17, 25; <600503>1 Peter 5:3), as well as in the language of the ancient Church, commonly used in the signification of "rank," "degree." The "faithful" (*fideles*) and catechumens were called κλῆροι (ordines, ranks), just as well as bishops, presbyters, deacons. Gradually — the exact point of time cannot be fixed — the ecclesiastical officers were exclusively called "the rank," κλῆρος, a transition which was very natural when the difference between the officers of the Church and the bulk-of the people was emphasized. The earliest writer in which the name "clergy" (κλῆρος) in the restricted sense occurs is Clement of Alexandria. "It is clear from the N.T. that there were men separated to the work of the Christian ministry. Some of these appear to have been *extraordinary,* such as *apostles,* who had been selected by Christ himself without any intermediate authority; *evangelists,* such as Timothy and Titus; *prophets.* See <461408>1 Corinthians 14:3, 22-24. These probably continued only during the lifetime of the apostles and those on whom they laid hands. Others were *ordinary* ministers, denominated elders or presbyters, pastors; bishops, and teachers. See <600501>1 Peter 5:1-4; <441423>Acts 14:23; 15:6; <560105>Titus 1:5. These were divinely called and appointed to their work (<442028>Acts 20:28); they were solemnly set apart; they were entitled to be supported by the churches to whom they ministered; their duties were to feed the flock, to take care of and govern the Church of God, and to watch for souls (<520512>1 Thessalonians 5:12, 13; <581307>Hebrews 13:7, 17)" (Coleman, *Christian Antiquities,* ch. 3).

2. *Distinction of Clergy and Laity.* — In the apostolical Church no abstract distinction of clergy and laity, as to privilege or sanctity, was known; all believers were called to the prophetic, priestly, and kingly offices in Christ (<600503>1 Peter 5:3). The Jewish antithesis of clergy and laity was at first unknown among Christians; and it was "only as men fell back from the evangelical to the Jewish point of view" that the idea of the general Christian priesthood of all believers gave place, more or less

completely, to that of the special priesthood or clergy (Neander, *Church History*, Torrey's ed., 1, 194 sq.; Schaff, *History of the Christian Church*, 1, ch. 5; Gieseler, *Church History*, 1, § 52). So Tertullian, even (*De Baptismo*, c. 17, before he became a Montanist): "The laity have also the right to administer the sacraments and to teach in the community. The Word of God and the sacraments were by the grace of God communicated to all, and may therefore be communicated by all Christians as instruments of the divine grace. But the question here relates not barely to what is permitted in general, but also to what is expedient under existing circumstances. We may here use the words of St. Paul, 'All things are lawful for men, but all things are not expedient.' If we look at the order necessary to be maintained in the Church, the laity are therefore to exercise their priestly right of administering the sacraments only when the time and circumstances require it." From the time of Cyprian († 258), the father of the hierarchical system, the distinction of clergy and laity became prominent, and very soon was universally admitted. Indeed, from the third century onward, the term *clerus* (κλῆρος, *ordo*) was almost exclusively applied to the ministry to distinguish it from the laity. As the Roman hierarchy was developed, the clergy came to be not merely a distinct order (which might consist with all the apostolical regulations and doctrines), but also to be recognized as the only priesthood, and the essential means of communication between man and God (Vinet. *Past. Theol.* Introd.).

3. *Classification.* — Simultaneously with the introduction into the Church of a distinction between clergy and laity, a division of the clergy into classes of different rank was gradually developed. The earliest and most important of those distinctions was that between bishop and presbyter, *SEE BISHOP*. To. these were added, in the course of time, deacon, subdeacon, archbishop, primate, patriarch, pope, and a number of officers preceding the subdiaconate. Each class was initiated into office by a special ordination, *SEE ORDERS*. In general, the various classes, according to the higher and lower dignity of the orders, were divided into the *higher* and *lower* clergy, the latter embracing the *ostiarii*, *lectores*, *exorcistae*, and *acolythi*, the former the subdeacons, deacons, priests, bishops. Up to the 13th century the subdeacons were counted among the lower clergy. The canon law very frequently applies the name *clerici* exclusively to the lower classes of the clergy, designating each higher class (subdeacons, deacons, priests, bishops),by its special name. *Higher* (or *high*) clergy is commonly

understood to, mean bishops or prelates (q.v.), and *lower* (or *low*) clergy the others.

In those churches which have monastic institutions, the clergy are also divided into *regular* and *secular* clergy, regular being members of orders - and congregations who bind themselves to common rules and secular those who have charge of parishes. In the Church of Russia the common name of the regular clergy is the *black* clergy, out of which the higher ecclesiastical dignitaries are chosen, while the secular clergy (priests, deacons, readers, and sacristans) are called *white* clergy.

4. *Exemptions and Privileges.* — "By laws made by Constantine, and confirmed by Valentinian IV, Gratian, and Theodosius the Great, the clergy were exempted,

(1.) From all civil and municipal offices, that they might give themselves to their religious duties.

(2.) From contributions to public works.

(3.) From a variety of taxes and imposts.

(4.) From military service, though this is not stated in so many words.

(5.) From appearance in civil courts. A bishop could not be forced to give public testimony; but it might be taken in private, though the bishop was not obliged to take formal oath, but only had the Gospels before him. Scourging and torture, which might be applied to other witnesses, could not be inflicted on the clergy. Nor could the civil courts take cognizance of purely ecclesiastical causes (Theodos. *Cod.*, lib. 16, tit. 2, leg. 23; Justinian, *Novel.* 83), though they could interfere in criminal matters, and in cases between a clergyman and a layman; for the layman was not bound to obey an ecclesiastical tribunal. Bishops were often arbiters in disputes, but only when both parties agreed to lay the matter before them, and then the episcopal sentence could be put in force by the civil power. In cases of life and death, clerical intervention was strictly prohibited."

The privileges which the clergy enjoyed under the ancient municipal laws of England were numerous; but being much abused by the popish clergy, they were greatly curtailed at the Reformation. "Those which now remain are personal, such as clergymen not being compelled to serve on juries, 6r to appear at the sheriffs, or consequently at the court-leet, or view of

frankpledge. Clergymen are exempt also from temporal offices, in regard to their continual attendance on their sacred functions. While attending divine service they are privileged from arrest in civil suit, stat. 50 Edward III, chap. 5, and I Richard II, ch. 15. It has been adjudged that this extends to the going to, continuing at, and returning from celebrating divine service. The ecclesiastical goods of a clergyman cannot be levied by the sheriff; but on his making his return to the writ *fieri facias*, that the party is a clergyman *beneficed*, having no lay-fee, then the subsequent process must be directed to the bishop of the diocese, who, by virtue thereof, sequesters the same. So in an action against a person in holy orders, wherein a *capias* lies to take his person, on the sheriffs making the same return, further process must issue to the bishop, to compel him to appear; it is otherwise, however, unless the clergyman is *beneficed.* In cases of felony, benefit of clergy is extended to them without being branded, and they are entitled to it more than once. Clergymen labor also under certain disabilities, such as not being capable of sitting as members in the House of Commons. This, however, though a received opinion, was not restricted by law till so late as the 41 George III, chap. 63, which was passed in consequence of John Horne Tooke, then in deacon's orders, being returned, and sitting in Parliament for Old Sarum. It was then enacted that no priest, nor deacon, nor minister of the Scotch Church, shall be capable of serving in Parliament; that their election shall be void, and themselves liable to a penalty of £500 a day in the event of their either sitting or voting. It would seem, therefore, as in the case of the bishop of Exeter against Shore, that no one can denude himself of holy orders. Various acts of Parliament have also, from the time of Henry VIII, been passed to prevent clergymen from engaging in trade, holding farms, keeping tan or brew houses, all of which are: stated, explained, and coinsolidated by the 57 George III, ch. 99" (Eadie, *Eccles.Dict.* s.v.). For a peculiar privilege, *SEE CLERGY, BENEFIT OF*.

In the 4th century it became a law that clergymen were to bring suits only in ecclesiastical courts (i.e. before bishops or synods). Justinian ordained that even laymen should bring suit against clergymen, monks, and nuns only before the bishop of the diocese, and against a bishop only before his metropolitan. Thus the privileged jurisdiction of the clergy came to be a general law, which was sanctioned and more fully defined by many imperial and canonical decrees, and which no individual member had a right to renounce. The privileged jurisdiction referred, however, to personal suits

only, not to real and feudal (see Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lexikon,* 4, 460, s.v. Gerichtsbarkeit, Geistliche).

A peculiar privilege of the clergy of the Roman Church is the one called *privilegium canonis.* It consists in a canonical provision that every one who inflicts upon a clergyman (including monks and nuns) a bodily injury (embracing spitting, kicking, etc.), incurs by the fact itself excommunication. It was first enacted by the Council of Rheims in 1131 (in the canon which begins *Siquis suadente diabolo clericum percusserit;* 'if any one, at the instigation of the devil, shall strike a clergyman"), and was made a general Church law in 1139 by Innocent II It provided that absolution from the excommunication thus incurred should only be given in the hour of death, or if the culprit shall personally go to Rome. The law still exists, but if the injury be a small one, the bishop may dispense from the Roman journey (see Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* 8, 782, s.v. Privilegium Canonis).

5. *Special Discipline, Duties, Disabilities.* — "In the early Church the clergy were placed under strict discipline. The crimes leading to punishment were simony, heresy, apostasy, neglect of duty, immorality, and violation of clerical etiquette. Punishments were various:

(1.) *Corporeal castigation,* which Augustine speaks of as not unfrequent, the delinquent being first deprived of his clerical rank, and then scourged as a layman. *Decanica,* or prisons, were attached to many churches.

(2.) *Degradation* — that is, the offender was put down to a lower rank or grade of office, and that to all appearance permanently.

(3.) *Suspension*-either *a beneficio,* from his income, or *ab officio,* from his office.

(4.) *Deprivation* - either forbidden from the Lord's Supper altogether, and treated as a stranger (*communio peregrina*), or allowed to communicate only with the laity (*communio laica*).

(5.) *Excomiznunication* — the final cutting off of the offender from clerical office, and the denial of all hope of restoration to it, even though he should be restored to the fellowship of the Church. We subjoin a few of the more characteristic of the ancient canons concerning the clergy, as showing the spirit of the age, and revealing some of its tendencies and usages: Thus, in the Apostolical Canons, ' 5. Let not a bishop, presbyter, or deacon turn

away his wife, under pretense of religion; if he do, let him be suspended from the communion (ἀφοριζέσθω), and deposed (καθαιρείσθω) if he persist.

6. Let not a bishop, presbyter, or deacon undertake any secular employ, upon pain of deposition.

17. He who, after his being baptized, has been involved in two marriages, or has kept a concubine, cannot be a bishop, or a presbyter, or a deacon, or at all belong to the sacerdotal catalogue.

18. He that marries a widow, or one that is divorced, or a harlot, or a servant, or an actress, cannot be a bishop, or a presbyter, or a deacon, or at all belong to the sacerdotal catalogue.

19. He that marries two sisters, or his niece, cannot be a clergyman.

20. Let the clergyman who gives security for any one be deposed.

51. If any bishop, presbyter, deacon. or any of the sacerdotal catalogue, do abstain from marriage, and flesh, and wine, not for mortification, but out of abhorrence, as having forgotten that all things are very good, and that God made man male and female, and blasphemously reproaching the workmanship of God, let him amend, or else be deposed, and cast out of the Church; and so also shall a layman.' In the Canons of Laodicea,

54. That they of the priesthood and clergy ought not to gaze on fines shows at weddings or other feasts; but before the masquerades enter, to rise up and retreat.

55. That they of the priesthood and clergy, or even laity, ought-not to club together for great eating and drinking bouts.' The duties of the various ranks of the clergy; were strictly defined, and firm laws laid down for their guidance. They were not allowed to leave their station without permission, but were to reside in their cure, deserters being condemned by a law of Justinian to forfeit their estates; but they could resign in certain circumstances, and a retiring or canonical pension was sometimes granted. They could not remove from one diocese to another without letters dimissory, nor could they possess pluralities, or hold office in two dioceses. It was forbidden them to engage in secular employments, or attend fairs and markets, nor could they become pleaders in courts of law. They were expected to lead a studious life, their principal book being the Scriptures,

while heathen and heretical treatises were only allowed them as occasion served. Bishops could not be ‘tutors and governors,’ but the inferior clergy might, under certain limitations. After the example of Paul, some of the lower clergy might support themselves, or fill up their leisure by some secular occupation. Severe laws were passed against what are called wandering clergy — *vacantivi,* who appear to have been often fugitives from discipline, without character or certificate. If a clergyman died without heirs, his estates fell to the Church, so the Council of Agde in 500 ruled. By a law of Theodosius and Valentinian III, the goods of any of the clergy dying intestate went in the same way” (Eadie, s.v.).

6. *Election of the Clergy.* — “Some assume that in the early Church the people had no other power than to give their testimonials to the persons elected, or to make exceptions, if they had any just and reasonable objections to urge; others say that the people were absolute and proper electors, and this from apostolical right, and that they enjoyed this for a succession of ages. That the people had a voice in the elections is evident from several circumstances. No bishop could be intruded upon a Church against the consent of the members: in case the majority of a Church consisted of heretics or schismatics, the practice differed. In many instances recorded in ecclesiastical history the voices of the people prevailed against the bishops themselves. In addition, we have the words used by the people in the decision, such as ἄξιος or ἀνάξιος, *dignus* or *indignus;* and instances in which persons were brought by force to the bishop to be ordained, or were elected to the office by acclamation. It was decided by the fourth Council of Carthage that as the bishop might not elect clerks without the advice of his clergy, so likewise he should secure the consent, cooperation, and testimony of the people. The popular elections, however, became scenes of great disorder and abuse. A remarkable passage from Chrysostom (*De Sacerd.*) has been frequently quoted, and applies more or less to such elections, not only in Constantinople, but also in Rome, Alexandria, Antioch, and other large cities. He says: ‘Go and witness the proceedings at our public festivals, in which, more especially, according to established rule, the elections of ecclesiastical officers take place. You will find there complaints raised against the minister as numerous and as various in their character as the multitude of those who are the subject of church-government. For all those in whom the right of election is vested split into factions. It is evident that there is no good understanding, either among themselves, or with the appointed president, or with the presbytery.

One supports one man, and one another. And the reason of this is, that they all neglect to look at that point which they ought to consider, namely, the intellectual and moral qualifications of the person to be elected. There are other points by which their choice is determined. One, for instance, says, “It is necessary to elect a person who is of a good family.” Another would choose a wealthy person, because he would not require to be supported out of the revenues of the Church. A third votes for a person who has come over from some opposite party. A fourth uses his influence in favor of a relative or friend. While another lends his influence to one who has won upon him by fair speeches and plausible pretensions.’ In order to set aside these abuses, some bishops claimed an exclusive right of appointing to spiritual offices. In this way they gave offense to the people. In the Latin and African churches an attempt was made to secure greater simplicity in elections by introducing *visiters.* This did not, however, long continue. Another plan was to vest the election in members of the lay aristocracy. But the determining who these should be was left to caprice or accident; and the result was that the right of election was taken out of the hands of the people, and vested partly in the hands of the ruling powers and partly with the clergy, who exercised their right either by the bishops, their suffragans and vicars, or by collegiate meetings, and this very often without paying any regard to the Church or diocese immediately concerned. Sometimes the extraordinary mode of a bishop’s designating his successor was adopted; or some one unconnected with the diocese, to whom a doubtful caste had been referred for decision, was allowed to nominate. Butin these cases the consent of the people was presupposed. Patronage has prevailed since the fifth century; but the complete development of this, system was a work of the eighth and ninth centuries” *SEE PATRONAGE*. — Coleman, *Christian Antiquities,* ch. 3; Farrar, *Ecclesiastes Dictionary,* s.v. Election; Bingham, *Orig. Ecclesiastes* bk. 4, chap. 2; Henry, *Ch. Antiq.* bk. 2, ch. 1; Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* 1, 630; Herzog, *Real-Encykcop.* s.v. Geistliche. *SEE ECCLESIASTICAL POLITY*.

Clergy, Benefit Of,

an ancient privilege whereby the persons of clergymen were exempted from criminal process before the secular judges in particular cases, and consecrated places were exempted from criminal arrests. See SANCTUARY. “‘This privilege was originally confined to those who had the *habitum et tonsuram clericalem,* but in time every one was accounted a clerk who

could read; so that after the dissemination of learning by the invention of printing, it was found that as many laymen as divines were admitted to this privilege, and therefore the stat. 4 Henry VII, ch. 13, distinguishes between lay scholars and clerks in holy orders, and directs that the former should not claim this privilege more than once, and, in order to their being afterwards known, they should be marked with a letter, according to their offense, on the brawn of the left thumb. After this burning, the laity, and before if the real clergy, were discharged from the sentence of the law in the king's court, and delivered over to the ordinary for canonical purgation. This purgation, having given rise to various abuses and prostitution of oaths, was abolished at the Reformation; and accordingly by the stat. 18 Elizabeth, ch. 7, it was enacted that every person having benefit of clergy should not be delivered over to the ordinary, but after burning in the hand should be delivered out of prison, unless the judge thought it expedient to detain him there for a limited period. It will be collected from the above statement that the parties entitled to this privilege are clerks in holy orders, without branding, or any of the punishments subsequently introduced in its place; lords of Parliament, peers, and peeresses for the first offense; commoners not in orders, whether male or female, for clergyable felonies, upon being burnt in the hand, whipped, fined, imprisoned, or transported. It is a privilege peculiar to the clergy that sentence of death cannot be passed upon them for any number of clergyable offenses committed by them (Blackstone, *Comm.* 4, 374)." — Eadie, *Eccles. Dict.* s.v.

Clerici Regulares Et Seculares.

SEE CANONS AND REGULARS.

Clericus

SEE CLERC, LE.

Clerk

(4195Acts 19:35). *SEE TOWN-CLERK*.

CLERK, originally and properly the name for one of the clergy (q.v.), and still the common appellation by which clergymen of the Church of England distinguish themselves in signing any legal instrument. It came afterwards, by an obvious transition, to signify a "learned man." Its most usual application in England is to that officer, now a layman, but once, in all

probability, an ordained functionary, who leads the responses of the congregation. Properly speaking, in the Church of England, the clerk is not an original functionary of the congregation in the eye of the Church, which, in her rubrics, speaks mostly, if not always, of “clerks” (ordained persons); and it is certain that several duties are by custom yielded to the clerk which properly belong to the clergyman, such as the giving out of the Psalms to be sung, and the publication of notices. (See Rubric after Nicene Creed.) The appointment of parish clerks properly belongs to the incumbent. They should be licensed by the ordinary, and take an oath to obey the minister, with whom properly rests the power of removing the clerk from his office, though if he be displaced without sufficient cause a “mandamus” may restore him. By the Church Temporalities’ Act for Ireland, the parish clerk is removable for any misconduct, by the minister with the consent of the bishop.

Clerks, Apostolical

SEE JESUITS.

Clerks, Minor

SEE FRANCISCANS.

Clerks Of St. Majolus

a religious order of the sixteenth century in Italy, founded by Jerome *A*Emilianus, and approved by Paul III in 1540 and by Paul IV in 1542. They gave themselves to the religious instruction of the young and the ignorant. *SEE SOMASCHIANS*.

Clerks Of St. Paul

SEE BARNABITES.

Clerks, Regular

SEE CANONS AND REGULARS.

Clerks, Theatine

SEE THEATINES.

Clermont

a city of Auvergne, France, where a council was held in 1095 and 1096, confirming the councils of Pope Urban. A crusade was also recommended, and King Philip excommunicated. The council was attended by 4 archbishops, 225 bishops, and an immense number of lower clergy and laity.

Clermont Manuscript

Picture for Clearmont Manuscript

(CODEX CLAROMONTINUS, known as Cod. D of the Pauline Epistles, No. 107 of the Imperial Library at Paris), an uncial MS., with the Greek and Latin on opposite pages, containing Paul's fourteen epistles, with a few hiatus, most of which have been supplied at various dates. The Epistle to the Colossians stands before that to the Philippians, and Hebrews after the Pastoral Epistles. The MS. is stichometrically arranged, with twenty-one lines on almost every page. The citations from the O.T. are written in red, except in Hebrews. It seems to belong to the sixth century. It probably came from a Latin scribe, with a Greek copy. The original writer made several alterations, then the whole of the Greek text was 'corrected (apparently in the seventh century) by the first reviser. Two others (in different handwriting) made a few changes, one of them only in the Greek text. But the fourth corrector went over the whole text, adding the breathings and accents, and erasing whatever displeased him. Besides these there are occasional alterations and *restorations* by later hands.

Beza says that he procured this MS. from Clermont, in the diocese of Beauvais (whence its name), a statement which Wetstein unnecessarily impugns. After Beza's death, it passed into the library of the brothers Jacques and Pierre du Puy, the former of whom being librarian to the king of France, and dying in 1656, it was purchased and deposited in the Royal Library at Paris. In the early part of the eighteenth century, 35 leaves were cut out of this MS. by John Aymon, an apostate priest, who sold one of them to Stosch in Holland, and the others fell into the hands of the bibliographical Earl of Oxford. Both these purchasers, on learning the theft, restored the leaves to their proper place.

Beza made some use of this document; Walton's *Polyglott* inserted 2245 readings sent by the Du Puys to Usher (Mill, *N.T.* proleg. § 1284);

Wetstein collated it twice (1715-16); Tregelles examined it in 1849; and Tischendorf published the text entire in 1852. It is one of the most valuable in sacred criticism. — Scrivener, *Introd. to N.T.* p. 130 sq. *SEE MANUSCRIPTS, BIBLICAL*.

Cletus

the name of one said to have been a bishop of Rome in the first century, but whether the same with Anacletus or not, and what his position in the order of succession, are points wholly unsettled. Migne, s.v. Anaclet.; Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* 2, 625; Herzog, *Real-Encyk.* 2, 157; Gieseler, *Ch. Hist.* per. 1, div. 1, ch. 3. § 34, n. 10. *SEE ANACLETUS*.

Clift

SEE CLEFT.

Climacus, John

SEE JOHN CLIMACUS.

Climate

SEE PALESTINE; *SEE WEATHER*.

Clinic Baptism

Baptism on a sick-bed was so called, from κλίνη, a bed, and was allowed in the case of one already a candidate for baptism whose life was endangered; but if he recovered, he was not held eligible to orders. The first instance of clinic baptism is found in a letter from the Roman bishop Cornelius (about 250) to Bishop Fabius at Antioch, in which it is stated that "when Novatian, who had only received the *baptismus clinicorum*, and without a subsequent imposition of hands by the bishop, had been ordained priest by a predecessor of Cornelius, the whole clergy and the people had protested on the ground that it was not permitted to ordain any one a clergyman who, like him (Novatian), had received baptism only upon the sick-bed; that, however, the bishop had asked to allow an exception in this case" (Eusebius *Hist. Eccl.* 1, 643). The same principle was expressed in 314 by the Synod of Neo Caesarea, and reasserted by a Paris synod in 829. Bishop Cornelius, in the letter above referred to, even hesitated to consider a clinic baptism as valid and efficient; "if," he says, "of such a one

(*clinicus*), it can be said at all that he has received baptism.” Similar doubts were expressed by others; but, on the other hand, Cyprian strongly insisted that a clinic baptism was just as valid and efficient as any other (*Epist.* 76). Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirch. — Lex.* 2, 636; Herzog, *Suppl.* 2, 595; Bergier, s.v. Cliniques; Bingham, *Orig. Eccl.* b. 11, ch. 2, § 5; Mosheim, *Commentaries*, cent. 3. § 15.

Clitus

(Κλεῖτος), a rash young man, who was compelled by Josephus, when commander in Galilee, to cut off one of his own hands, as a punishment for exciting a revolt in Tiberias (Joseph. *Life*, § 34; *War*, 2, 21, 10).

Cloak

(lyæ[m] *meil’*, <235917>Isaiah 59:17, elsewhere rendered in our version “robe,” or “mantle”) was an upper garment or robe (of cotton?), which extended below the knees, open at the top, so as to be drawn over the head, and having arm-holes. It was worn by the high-priest under the ephod (<022831>Exodus 28:31); also by kings and persons of distinction (<091527>1 Samuel 15:27; <180120>Job 1:20; 2:12), and by women (<101318>2 Samuel 13:18). *SEE APPAREL*.

So, in the New Testament, the word ἱματίον, rendered “cloak” in <400540>Matthew 5:40, is in its plural form taken for garments in general in other places (<401702>Matthew 17:2; 26:65; <440758>Acts 7:58; 9:39). The cloak, or *pallium* (<440939>Acts 9:39), was the outer garment (different from the “coat” or *tunic*, χιτών), and it seems to have been a large piece of woollen cloth nearly square, which was wrapped round the body, or fastened about the shoulders, and served also to wrap the wearer in at night. It might not be taken by a creditor (<022226>Exodus 22:26,27), though the tunic could (<400540>Matthew 5:40), which fact gives peculiar force to the injunction of our Lord. *SEE CLOTHING*.

The φελόνης, rendered “cloak” in <550413>2 Timothy 4:13, was the Roman *poenula*, a thick upper garment, used chiefly in traveling, instead of the toga, as a protection from the weather. It seems to have been a long cloak without sleeves, with only an opening for the head. Others suppose it to have been a traveling-bag or portmanteau for books, etc. Discussions *de palo Pauli* have been written by Brenner (Giess. 1734), Heinse (Viteb.

1697), Lakemacher (Helmst. 1722), Rusmeier (Gryph. 1731), Vechner (s. 1. 1678). *SEE DRESS*, etc.

Clod

vWG, *gush*, or vyG] *gish*, <18705>Job 7:5, a *lump* of earth; hp;rgm, *megraphah'*, <29017>Joel 1:17, a *spadeful* of earth; bg,r, *re'geb*, <18213>Job 21:33; 38:38, a *mass* of earth; ddic; *sadad'*, to "break clods," <23824>Isaiah 28:24; <28101>Hosea 10:11; to "harrow," <18910>Job 39:10, prop. to *level* the plowed field. *SEE AGRICULTURE*.

Cloister

(Lat. claustrum, *an enclosure*). This term is often applied to a *monastery* (q.v.). It was originally applied to the porch of the *atrium* or *paradise* (q.v.) of a church [see plan of ancient church under CHURCH EDIFICES], in which interments were made before it became usual to bury in the church itself. The term *cloister* is now more usually used in English to indicate the arcade surrounding the court enclosed by the buildings of a monastic establishment. This enclosed space was generally a garden, ornamented with a fountain and shrubbery, but it often served also as a burial-place for leading members of the brotherhood. The arcade (or cloister), in the first, or first and second stories of the buildings facing the court, served, especially during bad weather, for processions, and as a promenade for the monks while saying prayers, meditating, or studying, and for health, recreation, and conversation. In the Benedictine monasteries there was read in the cloisters each day a portion of the regulations of the order, and the entire body of the regulations before the assembled brotherhood four times a year. Stone seats were usually placed before the windows, and cells or stalls for study set into the wall of the building, off from the cloister. Relics and other objects of worship were sometimes placed in the cloister .or the court. The cloisters had often great architectural! beauty, and some of them are very important in their bearing on the history of architecture. Large monasteries often had several cloisters. The term *claustrum* .was in them applied also to the covered passage-way leading from one part of a monastic establishment to another. — Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen. Lex.* 6, 228;

Cloister-Garth,

the court or open space enclosed by a cloister (q.v.).

Cloke

SEE CLOAK.

Clonites

SEE METHODISTS, PRIMITIVE WESLEYAN, OF IRELAND.

Close Communion

SEE COMMUNION.

Closet

(חֻפָּה *chuppah'*, *a covering*, Joel 2:16), a bridal couch, with curtains, rendered by our translators "chamber" in Psalm 19:5. *SEE BED*. The Jews still employ the same word to designate the canopy under which' among them, the nuptial ceremony is performed. *SEE MARRIAGE*.

The word in the N.T. rendered "closet" is ταμεῖον, signifying properly a *store-house* (as in Luke 12:24); hence any place of privacy and retirement (Matthew 6:6; Luke 12:3). *SEE PRAYER*.

Clothing

(garment, לְבוּשׁ *lebush'*, ἔνδυμα). Immediately after the Fall, our first parents clothed themselves with the leaves of the fig-tree; afterwards with the skins of animals, Subsequently some method, we may suppose, was discovered for matting together the hair of animals and making a sort of felt-cloth. Later still the art of weaving was introduced, and a web was formed combining .the hair of animals with threads drawn from wool, cotton, or flax. The art of manufacturing cloths by spinning and weaving is of very great antiquity (Genesis 14:23; 41:42; Job 7:6). The Egyptians were celebrated for such manufactures The Hebrews, while dwelling among them, learned the art, and even excelled their teachers (1 Chronicles 4:21). *SEE WEAVING*. While wandering in the Arabian wilderness, they prepared the materials for covering the tabernacle, and wrought some of them with embroidery. Cotton (?) cloth was esteemed most valuable, next to that woolen and linen. That which was manufactured from the hair of animals was considered of least value. Silk is not mentioned at a very early period, unless it be so in Ezekiel 16:10, 13. This, however, is clear, that Alexander found silks in Persia, and it is

more than probable that the Median dress adopted by the Persians under Cyrus was silk. It was not introduced among the nations of Europe until a late period. (See these various materials in their alphabetical order.) Garments woven or dyed of various colors were much esteemed in the East. They were generally made by women, and were occasionally tastefully embroidered (<01270>Genesis 27:3; <02804>Exodus 28:4-8; 39:3; <07050>Judges 5:30; <20812>Proverbs 31:21-24). The Asiatic modes of dress are nearly the same from age to ace, and hence much light is thrown by modern observation on the subject of the clothing of the Hebrews. *SEE COSTUME*. The principal articles of dress, with men, were the "cloak," "robe," or "*mantle,*" constituting the ordinary outer garment; the "shirt," or *tunic,* forming the inner dress; the "*turban*" for the head; the "girdle" for confining the garments at the waist; and the "*sandals*" for the feet. To these were added, in the case of females, the "*veil*" for concealing the face, and, as a matter of ornament, the showy "head-dress," the ʿ necklaces," "bracelets," and "anklets," the jewelled rings for the ears and nose, with other occasional articles of effeminacy, as in Isaiah in. (See each of these words in its place.) *SEE ATTIRE*.

Change Of Clothing

SEE GARMENT.

Rending Of Clothes

To rend or tear the garments was from the earliest period an action expressive of the highest grief (<01729>Genesis 37:29). Jacob and David did it on various occasions; and so did Joshua, Hezekiah, and Ezra (<10131>2 Samuel 13:31; <06076>Joshua 7:6; <12901>2 Kings 19:1; <15903>Ezra 9:3). The high-priest was forbidden to rend his clothes (<03106>Leviticus 10:6; 21:10), prob. ably meaning his sacred garments: perhaps those referred to in <40265>Matthew 26:65, were such as were ordinarily worn, or merely judicial, and not pontificial garments. Sometimes it denoted anger, or indignation mingled with sorrow (<23622>Isaiah 36:22; 37:1; <44414>Acts 14:14). *SEE RENDING*.

Cloud

(properly ˆn;[; *anan* , as *covering* the sky, νεφέλη). The allusions to clouds in Scripture, as well as their use in symbolical language, must be understood with reference to the nature of the climate, where the sky scarcely exhibits the trace of a cloud from the beginning of May to the end

of September, during which period clouds so rarely appear, and rains so seldom fall, as to be considered phenomena-as was the case with the harvest-rain which Samuel invoked (<091217>1 Samuel 12:17,18), and with the little cloud, not larger than a man's hand, the appearance of which in the west was immediately noticed as something remarkable not only in itself, but as a sure harbinger of rain (<111844>1 Kings 18:44). As in such climates clouds refreshingly veil the oppressive glories of the sun, clouds often symbolize the Divine presence, as indicating the splendor, insupportable to man, of that glory which they wholly or partially conceal (<021610>Exodus 16:10; 33:9; <041125>Numbers 11:25; 21:5; <182214>Job 22:14; <191811>Psalm 18:11, 12; <231901>Isaiah 19:1). The shelter given, and refreshment of rain promised by clouds, give them their peculiar prominence in Oriental imagery, and the individual cloud in that ordinarily cloudless region becomes well defined, and is dwelt upon like the individual tree in the bare landscape (Stanley, *Syria and Palestine, p.* 140). Similarly, when a cloud appears, rain is ordinarily apprehended, and thus the "cloud without rain" becomes a proverb for the man of promise without performance (<201615>Proverbs 16:15; <231804>Isaiah 18:4; 25:5; <650112>Jude 1:12; comp. <202514>Proverbs 25:14). The cloud is, of course, a figure of transitoriness (<183015>Job 30:15; <280604>Hosea 6:4), and of whatever intercepts divine favor or human supplication (<250201>Lamentations 2:1; 3:44). Being the least substantial of visible forms, undefined in shape, and unrestrained in position, it is the one among material things which most easily suggests spiritual being. Hence it is, so to speak, the recognized machinery by which supernatural appearances are introduced (<231901>Isaiah 19:1; <260104>Ezekiel 1:4; <660107>Revelation 1:7, et passim), or the veil between things visible and invisible; but, more especially, a mysterious or supernatural cloud is the symbolical seat of the Divine presence itself-the phenomenon of deity vouchsafed by Jehovah to the prophet, the priest, the king, or the people (<198834>Psalm 68:34; 89:6; 104:3; <340103>Nahum 1:3). Sometimes thick darkness, sometimes intense luminousness, often, apparently, and especially by night, an actual fire is attributed to this glory-cloud (<050411>Deuteronomy 4:11; <024035>Exodus 40:35; 33:22, 23; <102212>2 Samuel 22:12, 13). Such a bright cloud, at any rate at times, visited and rested on the Mercy-seat (<022942>Exodus 29:42, 43; <111814>1 Kings 8:14; <141414>2 Chronicles 5:14; <263404>Ezekiel 43:4), and was named Shekinah (q.v.) by late writers (see Tholemann, *De nube supra area,* Lips. 1771-1752; Stiebritz, *De area federis,* Hal. 1753). Thus Jehovah appeared at Sinai in the midst of a cloud (<021909>Exodus 19:9; 34:5); and when Moses had built and consecrated the tabernacle, the cloud filled the court around

it, so that Moses could not enter (<2404034>Exodus 40:34, 35). The same happened at the dedication of the Temple by Solomon (<140502>2 Chronicles 5:13; <110810>1 Kings 8:10). So Christ, at his second advent, is described as descending upon clouds (<401705>Matthew 17:5; 24:30, etc.; <440109>Acts 1:9; <660107>Revelation 1:7; 14:14, 16). To come in the clouds, or with the clouds of heaven, was among the Jews a known symbol of Divine power and majesty; and Grotius observes that a similar notion obtained among the heathen, who represented their deities covered with a cloud. (See the treatises on the symbolical nimbus or halo by Nicolaio [Jen. 1699], Reiske [*Dissert.* 2, No. 4].) Hence "clouds and darkness" appear to be put as representing the mysterious nature of the Divine operations in the government of the world (<199702>Psalm 97:2). Clouds are also the symbol of armies and multitudes of people (<240413>Jeremiah 4:13; <236008>Isaiah 60:8; <581201>Hebrews 12:1); a figure referring to the effects of a large and compact body of men, moving upon the surface of an extensive plain, like a cloud in the clear sky. A day of clouds is taken for a season of calamity (<263003>Ezekiel 30:3; 34:12). Peter compares false teachers to clouds carried about with a tempest (<610217>2 Peter 2:17). Solomon compares the infirmities of old age, which arise successively one after another, to "clouds returning after rain" (<211202>Ecclesiastes 12:2). The favor of a king is compared to "a cloud of the latter rain," refreshing and fertilizing the earth (<201605>Proverbs 16:15). The sudden disappearance of threatening clouds from the sky is employed by Isaiah as a figure for the blotting out of transgressions (44:22).

Pillar Of Cloud

(ˆn;[h, dWM [i *column of the cloud,* <023309>Exodus 33:9, 10), otherwise called *Pillar of Fire* (vaeB;dWM [i, <021322>Exodus 13:22), was the active form of the symbolical glory-cloud, betokening God's presence to lead his chosen host, or to inquire and visit offenses, as the luminous cloud of the sanctuary exhibited the same under an aspect of repose. The cloud, which became a pillar when the host moved, seems to have rested at other times on the tabernacle, whence God is said to have "come down *in* the pillar" (<041205>Numbers 12:5; so <023309>Exodus 33:9, 10). *SEE PILLAR*. It preceded the host, apparently resting on the ark, which led the way (<021321>Exodus 13:21; 40:36, etc.; <041915>Numbers 9:15-23; 10:34). So by night the cloud on the tabernacle became fire, and the guiding pillar a pillar of fire. *SEE BEACON*. Modern Germans explain it of a natural appearance, or of the holy fire carried before the host from off the altar; but it is clearly spoken

of as miraculous, and gratefully remembered in after ages by pious Israelites (<19A539>Psalm 105:39; 78:14; Wisdom of Solomon 10:17) as a token of God's special care of their fathers. Isaiah has a remarkable allusion to it (<230405>Isaiah 4:5), as also Paul (<461004>1 Corinthians 10:4, 2; see Pfau, *De nube Israelitas baptizante*, Viteb. s. a.). A remarkable passage in Curtius (5:2, § 7), descriptive of Alexander's army on the march, mentions a beacon hoisted on a pole from head-quarters as the signal for marching ("a fire was observed by night, a smoke in the day-time"). This was probably an adoption of an Eastern custom. See also an account of an appearance of fire by night in the expedition of Timoleon to Italy (Diod. Sic. 16:66). Similarly the Persians used, as a conspicuous signal, an image of the sun enclosed in crystal (Curtius, 3. 3, § 9). —Caravans are still known to use such beacons of fire and smoke, the cloudlessness and often stillness of the sky giving the smoke great density of volume and boldness of outline. *SEE EXODE*.

Clough, Benjamin

a Wesleyan Methodist missionary, was born at Bradford, England, 1791, and united with the Wesleyan Church in 1808. In a few years he was licensed as a local preacher, and in 1813 was sent with Dr. Coke, as one of his helpers, in his mission to India. In Ceylon he was soon regarded as one of the most successful students and teachers. He compiled two dictionaries — English and Singhalese, and Singhalese and English — which were published at the expense of the colonial government, and have been of incalculable value to his successors in the mission. He was one of the translators of the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments into the Singhalese language; and he assisted in preparing for the press a translation of the New Testament into the Pali, the sacred language of the Buddhists. As a preacher to the natives he was most zealous and successful. "During the first year of his labors, he won the confidence and convinced the judgment of many distinguished men among the heathen, and assisted to form that system of evangelization which has blessed many thousands of persons in the island of Ceylon." In 1838, failing health compelled him to return to England. He died in London, April 31, 1853. — *Wesleyan Minutes*, 1853, p. 13.

Clout

is given in Joshua 9:5 as the rendering of the Heb. verb לָטָלַא (*tala* elsewhere rendered "spotted"), which properly means to *patch,* and denotes that the sandals of the Gibeonites were mended, as if old and worn by a long journey. The "cast clouts" (שַׁחֲבוֹת *sechabah',* literally a *tearing* in pieces) put under Jeremiah's arms to prevent the cords by which he was drawn out of the dungeon from cutting into the flesh (Jeremiah 38:11, 12) were old torn clothes or *rags.*

Clovis

(old Ger. *Chlodwig,* i.e. "famous warrior;" modern Ger. *Ludwig,* Fr. *Louis*), the first Christian king of the Franks, was born A.D. 465, and by the death of his father, Childeric, became king of the Salian Franks, whose capital was Tournay. After having overthrown the Gallo-Romans under Syagrius, near Soissons, he took possession of the whole country between the Somme and the Loire, and established himself in Soissons. In 493 he married Clotilda, daughter of a Burgundian prince. His wife was a Christian, and earnestly desired the conversion of her husband, who, like most of the Franks, was still a heathen. In a great battle with the Alemanni at Tolbiac [Zulpich], near Cologne, Clovis was hard pressed, and, as a last resource, invoked the God of Clotilda, offering to become a Christian on condition of obtaining the victory. The Alemanni were routed, and on Christmas day of the same year Clovis and several thousands of his army were christened by Remigius, bishop of Rheims. The reception of Clovis into the Church by a bishop in connection with Rome tended greatly to secure the, supremacy of orthodoxy over Arianism, to which, at that time, most of the Western Christian princes belonged. Pope Anastasius, who fully appreciated the importance of this gain, saluted Clovis as the "most Christian king." In 507, love of conquest concurring with zeal for the orthodox faith, Clovis marched to the south-west of Gaul against the heretic Visigoth, Alaric II, whom he defeated and slew at Vougle, near Poitiers, taking possession of the whole country as far as Bordeaux and Toulouse; but he was checked at Arles, in 507, by Theodoric, king of the Ostrogoths. Clovis now took up his residence in Paris, where he died in 511. Clovis, in several instances, used the Arianism of other Christian princes as a pretext for war and conquest, and he stained his name by cruelly murdering a number of his relations whom he looked upon as dangerous rivals; but the writers of the Romish Church assert that he was

chaste, and just toward his subjects. — See Chambers, *Encycl.* s.v.; Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* 2, 490.

Cloyne

an ancient episcopal town in the southeast of Cork county, fifteen miles east by south of Cork. The bishopric was founded in the 6th century by St. Colman, the abbey in 707, and the cathedral in the 13th century. Near the cathedral is a round tower 92 feet high. About 1430 the episcopate was united to that of Cork, separated in 1678, and reunited in 1835. *SEE CORK*. Berkeley, the celebrated philosopher, was born here, and was bishop of Cloyne in 1678. Brinkley, the astronomer, who died in 1835, was also bishop of Cloyne. Population 1126. Cloyne is also the seat of a Roman Catholic bishop, who belongs to the ecclesiastical province of Cashel. — Chambers, *Encyclopaedia*.

Club

(only once in the plur., and that in the Apocrypha, 2 Maccabees 4:41, ξύλων πάχη, *thicknesses of sticks*, i.e. stout pieces of wood).

Clugny

Congregation of, a congregation of Reformed Benedictine monks, established in 909 at Clugny (now Cluni, a town of France, Department of Saone and Loire, eleven miles north-west of Macon) by Duke William of Aquitania and Berno, abbot of the Benedictine monasteries of Gigny and Baume. William gave to the new convents all the lands, forests, vineyards, mills, slaves, etc., of the domain of Clugny. The convent was to be always open for the poor, needy, and travelers, and to pay a small annual tribute to Rome; it was to be exempt from ducal and episcopal jurisdiction, being subject to the pope and the abbot only. William himself went to Rome to obtain the papal sanction. The convent began with twelve monks, under Berno as its first abbot. Under his successor Odo (q.v.), one of the most influential men of his, time, numerous French convents subordinated themselves to Clugny, thus forming the “Congregation of Clugny,” which soon extended from Benevento to the Atlantic Ocean, and embraced the most important convents of Gaul and Italy. Under the administration of his successors Aymard, Maieul (Majolus), and St. Odilo, the congregation steadily extended, many bishops and princes placing their convents under Clugny. A large synod of French bishops at Anse, during the time of Odilo,

declared the exemption of Clugny invalid; but under Odilo's successor, St. Hugo (died 1109), the old privilege was recovered. The reputation of Clugny at this time greatly increased in consequence of three monks of the congregation ascending, within a brief space of time, to the papal chair — Gregory VII, Urban II, and Pascal II. Hugo, in 1089, began the construction of the basilica of Clugny, which at that time was the largest in the world, and subsequently only a little surpassed by St. Peter's Church at Rome. Under Hugo the congregation numbered about 10,000 monks. His successor, Pontius de Melgueil, received the right of exercising the functions of a cardinal, and assumed the title of Archiabbas. His ambition having involved him in great difficulties, he resigned, and undertook a pilgrimage to Jerusalem; but a few years after he returned, took forcible possession of Clugny, of which at that time Peter Maurice, of Montboissier, generally called Peter the Venerable, was abbot, and squandered the treasures of the Church. He was arrested and imprisoned at Rome, where he died excommunicated. Under Peter the Venerable, Clugny reached the most brilliant point in its history, more than 2000 convents belonging to the congregation. Soon after it began to de, dine, especially in consequence of the rise of the mendicant orders and of the immense riches of the congregation. Several abbots endeavored to restore a strict discipline, and abbot Ivo of Vergy, in 126,9, established the College of Clugny in Paris, in order to inspire the monks with greater interest in literary pursuits; but all these efforts led to no permanent improvement. Gradually the abbey fell under the rule of the French kings, and in the 16th century it became a "commend" (q.v.) of the cardinals and prelates of the family of Guise, and was on that account several times devastated during the civil wars in France. Clugny lost many of its convents in consequence of the Reformation, and because foreign governments objected to the continuance of a connection of convents in their countries with a French abbey. In 1627, Cardinal Richelieu made himself abbot of Clugny, and united it with the Congregation of the Maurines. This led to violent dissensions among the monks of Clugny, and the union had after a time to be repealed. The corruption after this time steadily increased, and Clugny, as a monastic institution, was only a wreck, when the French Constituent Assembly, on February 13, 1790, suppressed all the convents. The last abbot of Clugny, Cardinal Dominique de la Rochefoucauld, died in 1800. The property of the convent was confiscated, and the church sold for 100,000 francs to the town, which broke it down. Only a few ruins are left. See Lorain, *l'Abbaye de Clugny* (Dijon, 1839); Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-*

Lex. 2, 641; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 2, 759; Hase, *Church Hist.* p. 226; Neander, *Church Hist.* 3. 417; 4:249, 263. *SEE BENEDICTINES*.

Cluster

SEE BITTER; *SEE ESHCOL*; *SEE GRAPE*.

Clysma

(Κλῦσμα), the name given by Eusebius (*Onomast.* s.v. Βεελσεφών) to the head of the Heroopolitan or western gulf of the Red Sea, through which the Israelites passed on dry land; according to Philostorgius (*Hist. Eccl.* 3, 5), from a town of that name (comp. Epiphanius, *adv. Haer.* 2, p. 618), apparently corresponding nearly to the modern site of Suez (Reland, *Palaest.* p. 471), a little to the north of which are some mounds still known by the Arabs as *Tell Kolzum* (Wilson, *Lands of Bible*, 1, 137). *SEE EXODE*.

Cni’dus

Picture for Cni’dus 1

Picture for Cni’dus 2

(Κνίδος, of unknown etymol.; by the Romans often called *Gnidus*) is mentioned in 1 Maccabees 15:23, as one of the Greek cities which contained Jewish residents in the second century before the Christian era, and in <44270>Acts 27:7, as a harbor which was passed by Paul after leaving Myra, and before running under the lee of Crete. It was a city of great consequence, situated at the extreme southwest of the peninsula (Mela, 1:16, 2) of Doris (Ptolemy, 10:2,10), in Asia Minor, *SEE CARIA*, on a promontory which projects between the islands of Cos and Rhodes (Pliny, 5:29; see <44210>Acts 21:1); in fact, an island, so joined by an artificial causeway to the main land as to form two harbors, one on the north, the other on the south (see Smith’s *Dict. of Class. Geogr.* s.v.). All the remains of Cnidus show that it must have been a city of great magnificence (see Mannert, VI, 3, 234 sq.). Its inhabitants were originally Lacedaemonian colonists (Herod. 1:174). It was celebrated for the worship of Venus, whose famous statue, executed by Praxiteles, stood in one of her three temples there (Strabo, 14, p. 965; Pliny *Hist. Nat.* 36, 15; Hom. *Odyss.* 1, 30), and was the birthplace of Etesias and other noted ancients (Pausanias, 1:1, 3). It is now a mere heap of ruins, and the modern name of

the promontory is Cape *Krio* (Clarke's *Travels,* 3. 261). The place has been fully illustrated by Beaufort (*Karamania,* p. 81), Hamilton (*Researches,* 2, 39), and Texiar (*Asie Mineure*)*;* see also Leake (*Northern Greece,* 2, 177; *Asia Minor,* p. 226), with the Drawings in the *Ionian Antiquities,* published by the Dilettanti Society, and the English *Admiralty Charts,* Nos. 1533, 1604.

Coadjutor

in the churches of Rome and England, an assistant, appointed by competent authority, to any bishop, dignitary of a cathedral, or incumbent who is disabled by age or infirmity from the personal discharge of his duties. Such coadjutor may be either permanent or temporary, and in the former case may be appointed either with or without the right of succession. In the 3d century Bishop Narcissus, of Jerusalem, received as coadjutor Alexander of Cappadocia, and in the 4th century St. Augustine was appointed coadjutor of Valerius of Hippo. The first instance of the bishops of Rome having claimed any influence upon the appointment of coadjutors is found in a letter from Pope Zacharias to St. Boniface, in which permission is given to the latter to consecrate a coadjutor. The provincial councils, however, continued to claim this right, until in 1298 Boniface VIII reserved it as a *causa major* for the papal chair. The laws of the Church of Rome strictly forbade the appointment of coadjutors with the right of succession. The Council of Trent forbade it absolutely, with regard to lower benefices, but in the case of bishops and superiors of monasteries provided that, from important reasons, the popes might make an exception. The popes, however, disregarded this law, as well as so many others given by the councils, and appointed coadjutors for lower offices no less than for episcopal sees. See Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* 2, 646; Herzog, *Real-Encyklopadie,* 2, 739; Eden, *Theol. Dict.,* s.v.

Coal

(Sept. and N.T. ἄνθραξ) is a translation usually of one or the other of two Heb. words, viz., לַחַשׁ (*gachleeth,* literally a *kindling, ruina*), which signifies an ignited or *live coal,* and is of frequent occurrence (<1047>2 Samuel 14:7; 22:9; <1842>Job 40:21; <1908>Psalm 18:8; 120:4; <2349>Isaiah 44:19; 47:14; <2641>Ezekiel 24:11), often with the emphatic addition of "burning" or of "fire" (<0362>Leviticus 16:12; <1023>2 Samuel 22:13; <1912>Psalm 18:12, 13; 140:10; <2063>Proverbs 6:28; 25:22; 26:21; <2601>Ezekiel 2:13; 10:2), and מִדְלָה,

(*pecham’*, literally *black, carbo*), which properly signifies a coal quenched and not reignited, or *charcoal* (<202621>Proverbs 26:21, where the distinction between this and the former term is clearly made, “as *coals* [*pecham*] are to burning *coals* [*gacheleth*]*”*), and hence an ignited coal (<234412>Isaiah 44:12; 54:16). *SEE FUEL*. Two other Heb. terms (erroneously) rendered “coal” are , hPx]r ,(*ritspah’*, “live coal,” <230606>Isaiah 6:6, literally a *pavement,* as elsewhere rendered), which appears to nave been a *hot stone* used for baking upon; ãv,r ,(*re’sheph*), properly *flames* (to which jealousy is compared, <220806>Song of Solomon 8:6), and hence pestilential *fever* (<350305>Habakkuk 3:5; “burning heat, “<052224>Deuteronomy 22:24; elsewhere a “*spark,”* <180507>Job 5:7; *thunderbolt,”* <197848>Psalm 78:48); and ãx,r ,(*re’tseph,* spoken of a cake “baken on the coals”), which appears to be cognate to both the preceding words and to combine their meaning, and may thus designate (as explained by the Rabbias a *coal,* Sept. ἐγκρυφία, Vulg. *subcinericus*) a loaf baked *among the embers*. *SEE BREAD*. In <250408>Lamentations 4:8, “their visage is blacker than a *coal,”* the word is r/jv,(*shechor’*), which simply means *blackness,* as in the margin. In the New Testament, the “fire of coals” (ἀνθρακία, <431818>John 18:18) evidently means a mass of live charcoal, used in a chafing-dish for warming in the East, and so explained by Suidas and parallel instances in the Apocrypha (Ecclesiasticus 8:10; 11:32). The substance indicated in all the foregoing passages is doubtless *charcoal,* although anthracite or bituminous coal has been found in Palestine in modern times (see Browning’s *Report;* also Elliot, 2:257). *SEE MINERAL*.

“In <102209>2 Samuel 22:9, 13, ‘coals of fire’ are put metaphorically for the lightnings proceeding from God (<191808>Psalm 18:8, 12, 13; 140:10). In <202522>Proverbs 25:22, we have the proverbial expression ‘Thou shalt heap coals of fire upon his head,’ which has been adopted by Paul in <451220>Romans 12:20, and by which is metaphorically expressed the burning shame and confusion which men must feel when their evil is requited by good. (See the essays on this text by Heinrich [Lug-d. B. 1716], Wahner [Gott. 1740].), In like manner, the Arabs speak of *coals of the heart, fire of the liver,* to denote burning care, anxiety, remorse, and shame (Gesen. *Thesaur. Heb.* p. 280). In <19C004>Psalm 120:4, ‘coals’ — burning brands of wood (not ‘juniper,’ but broom), to which the false tongue is compared (<590306>James 3:6). In <101407>2 Samuel 14:7, the quenching of the live coal is used to indicate the threatened destruction of the single remaining branch of the

family of the widow of Tekoah suborned by Joab; just as Lucian (*Timothy* § 3) uses the word ζώπυρον in the same connection." *SEE FIRE*.

Coast

an inaccurate rendering in the A. V. of various terms (usually lWbG; lb,j, etc., Gr. ὅριον) signifying *border* (q.v.), boundary, or extremity, except in the expression "sea-coast" (ãj, *choph*, <262516>Ezekiel 25:16; παράλιος, <420617>Luke 6:17; παραθαλάσσιος, <401913>Matthew 9:13). *SEE SEA*.

Coat

(tn,tK; *ketho'neth*, or tn,TKu *kutto'neth*, probably meaning *covering;* hence Greek χιτών) is the word employed by our translators for the ancient *tunic* (q.v.), which was in modern phrase a *shirt* worn next to the skin (<031604>Leviticus 16:4), by females as well as males (<220503>Song of Solomon 5:3; <101318>2 Samuel 13:18), and especially by the priests and Levites (<022804>Exodus 28:4; 29:5; <160770>Nehemiah 7:70, 72). The same term is used of the "coats of skins" prepared by the Almighty for the first human pair (<010321>Genesis 3:21), which were probably nothing more than aprons, or a short skirt bound at the waist. The tunic was commonly (at least with males) without sleeves, and usually reached to the knees. It was generally made of linen, but for the winter was frequently made of wool; and the rich no doubt wore tunics *of byssus* ("fine linen," i.e. [?] *cotton*, then very rare). It was sometimes woven entire without a seam, like the modern hose (<431923>John 19:23). It was also occasionally of a gay pattern; such was "Joseph's coat of many colors" (Genesis 38), that is, of different colored threads in stripes or plaided. Sometimes two tunics seem to have been worn at once, either for ornament or luxury, for the term is frequently used in the plural of an individual (<401010>Matthew 10:10; Mark, 6:9; <420311>Luke 3:11). In that case the outer one probably supplied the place of the "cloak" or pallium. *SEE CLOTHING*; *SEE DRESS*, etc. The "fisher's coat" (ἐπενδύτης) mentioned in <432107>John 21:7, was evidently an outer garment or cloak, and Peter is said to be "naked" before throwing it about him, as having on only the tunic, or perhaps no more than a strip of cloth about the loins, like the modern Arabs. The little "coat" made by Hannah for the young Samuel (<090219>1 Samuel 2:19) was the ly[ame (*meil'*), or outer dress, elsewhere rendered "robe," "mantle," or "cloak" [q.v.]. The "coats" of the three Hebrew children in the furnace (<270321>Daniel 3:21, 27) are called in the

original Chaldee ˆylæB]r]s (*sarbalin’*, Sept. σαράβαρα), thought by some to be the Persian name for long and wide *trowsers*, whence Greek σαράβαλλα, Lat. *sarabala*, etc., but by others, with greater probability, to be kindred with the Arabic name for a long shirt or *cloak*, which is corroborated by the Talmudic interpretation of *mantles*, i.e. the *pallium* or outer dress. (See Smith’s *Dict. of Class. Antiq. s.v.* Tunica, etc.) *SEE ATTIRE*.

Coat Of Mail

(ˆ/yr]væ, *shiryon’*, *glittering*) occurs in the description of Goliath’s armor (<091705>1 Samuel 17:5), and also of Saul’s (ver. 38). *SEE ARMOR*. The plural forms are found in <160416>Nehemiah 4:16; <142614>2 Chronicles 26:14; where they are translated “habergeons” (q.v.). The kindred terms, hy;r]væ (*shiryah’*, “habergeon,” <184126>Job 41:26), ˆy;r]vi (*shiryan’*, “harness,” <112234>1 Kings 22:34; <141833>2 Chronicles 18:33; “breast-plate,” <235917>Isaiah 59:17), and ˆ/yr]sæ (*siryon’*, “brigandines,” <244604>Jeremiah 46:4; 51:3), were probably less complete kinds of the same, i.e. *corslets*. *SEE MAIL*.

Cobb, Sylvanus, D.D.

a Universalist minister and writer, was born at Norway, Maine, July, 1788. His first education was under orthodox influences, but early in life he became a Universalist. He preached his first sermon at the age of twenty-one, but was not ordained until 1821. He was settled as minister in succession at Waterville, Maine, at Malden, Waltham, and (since 1849) at East Boston. While at Waltham he established the *Christian Freeman*, which in 1862 was united with the *Trumpet*. In 1864 he retired from editorial life, after a service of about thirty years. In the same year he received from Tufts College the honorary degree of doctor of divinity. He died October 31, 1866. Dr. Cobb was a voluminous writer. Many of his earlier controversial sermons were published and widely circulated in Maine and elsewhere. His *Discussions* with Dr. Adams and Mr. Hudson, involving the subjects of everlasting punishment and the annihilation of the wicked, were also put into book form, after appearing in the columns of the *Freeman*. His *Compend of Divinity* is recognized as a standard in the denomination. He also wrote a *Commentary on the New Testament*. — *Universalist Register* for 1867, p. 81 sq.

Cobbet, Thomas

a Congregational minister, was born at Newbury, Berkshire, Eng., in 1608, and served in the ministry of the Church of England for a short time. Ejected for nonconformity, he came to New England, arriving June 26, 1637. He served for twenty years as collegiate pastor in Lynn, and removed to Ipswich, where he died Nov. 5, 1685. — He published *A Vindication of the Covenant of the Children of Church Members* (1643): — A *Defence of Infant Baptism* (1645): — *The civil Magistrate's Power in Matters of Religion modestly debated,* etc. (1653): — *A practical Discourse on Prayer* (1654): — A *Treatise on the Honor due from Children to their Parents* (1656). — Sprague, *Annals,* 1, 102

Cobbs Nicholas Hanmer, D.D.,

a bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States, was born February 5, 1795. He was the first bishop of the diocese of Alabama, being consecrated October 20, 1844. He died January 11, 1861.

Cobham

Lord (Sir *John Oldcastle*), a Lollard martyr of the fifteenth century. Of his early life little is known. He was born in the reign of Edward III; married the niece of Henry, lord Cobham, and obtained his title. He entered the military life, and gained great distinction. According to Bayle, "in all adventurous acts of worldly manhood he was ever fortunate, doughty, noble, and valiant." By his military talents he acquired the esteem both of Henry IV and Henry V. In conjunction with Sir Richard Story, Sir Thomas Latimer, and others, he drew up a number of articles, which, in the form of a remonstrance against the corruptions of the clergy, they presented to the House of Commons. He put himself to great expense in collecting, transcribing, and dispersing the works of Wycliffe. He also furnished Lollard itinerant preachers with shelter at his mansion at Cowling Castle, in Kent. These proceedings made him very obnoxious to the clergy. During the first year of the reign of Henry V, the principal subject of debate was the growth of heresy. Thomas Arundel (q. ,v.), archbishop of Canterbury, requested the king to send commissioners to Oxford to inquire into the growth of heresy. The commissioners reported to the archbishop, who informed the Convocation that the increase of heresy was especially owing to lord Cobham, who encouraged scholars from Oxford and other places to propagate heretical opinions throughout the country. The archbishop,

accompanied by a large body of the clergy, waited upon Henry, and, having laid before him the offense of lord Cobham, begged, in all *humility* and *charity*, that his majesty *would suffer them, for Christ's sake, to put him to death.* To this humane request the king replied that he thought such violence more destructive of truth than of error; that he himself would reason with lord Cobham; and, if that should prove ineffectual, he would leave him to the censure of the Church. Henry endeavored to persuade lord Cobham to retract, but he returned the following answer: "I ever was a dutiful subject to your majesty, and I hope ever shall be. Next to God, I profess obedience to my king. But as for the spiritual dominion of the pope, I never could see on what foundation it is claimed, nor can I pay him any obedience. As sure as God's word is true, to me it is fully evident that he is the great Antichrist foretold in holy writ." This answer so displeased the king that he gave the archbishop leave to proceed against lord Cobham "according to the devilish decrees which they call the laws of the holy Church" (Bayle). On the 11th of September, the day fixed for his appearance, the primate and his associates sat in consistory; when, lord Cobham not appearing, the archbishop excommunicated him. Cobham now drew up a confession of faith, which he presented to the king. Being again cited to appear before the archbishop, and refusing compliance, he was committed to the Tower by the king's order. "Upon the 25th of September, 1413, he was brought again by the lieutenant of the Tower before the archbishop, the bishops of London, Winchester, and Bangor sitting upon the bench with him. The archbishop desired Sir John to move for the absolution of the Church in the customary form. He replied he would beg absolution of none but God Almighty. After this, the archbishop desired him to make an express declaration concerning the sacrament of the altar. To which he gave this answer: that as Christ, when upon earth, consisted of the divine and human nature, his divinity being concealed under his humanity, so in the sacrament of the altar there is both a real body and real bread; that the bread is the object of our sight, but that the body of Christ, contained or shrouded under it, is imperceptible to our senses. When he was pressed closer to the point of transubstantiation, he declared expressly against it, adding withal that the common belief in this article was a contradiction to the holy Scriptures; that the decision was modern, and that the Church did not vary thus from the old standard till she was poisoned by being endowed. And as to penance and confession, he affirmed that if any person happened to be under the misfortune of any great crime, and was not in a condition to disentangle himself, he

conceived it would be advisable to make use of the direction of some holy and discreet priest. But then he did not think there was any necessity of confessing to the parish curate, or any other of that character; for that in this case there was needed no more than contrition to cancel the fault and restore the penitent. Touching the worshipping the cross, he maintained that only the body of Christ, which hung upon the cross, ought to be adored. And being further interrogated what regard was to be paid to the resemblance of that cross, to this he replied directly that all the reverence he could pay was only to clean it and keep it handsomely. Being interrogated further about the power of the keys, and what his opinion was of the character and authority of the pope, of the archbishops, and bishops, he made no scruple to declare that the pope was downright Antichrist, and the head of that party; that the bishops were the members, and the friars the hinder parts of this antiChristian society; that we ought to obey neither pope nor prelates any further than their virtue and probity could command; and that unless they imitated our Savior and St. Peter in the sanctity of their lives, the pretense of their commission was not to be regarded; that he who was most unblemished in his conduct, most remarkable for his sanctity, was St. Peter's successor, and that all other titles to Church authority signified nothing" (Hook, *Eccl. Biog.*, 1, 31,7). Having remained six months in the Tower, he escaped into Wales. In 1414 the king set a price of a thousand marks upon the head of Cobham; and for four years he continued in exile in Wales; but at length his enemies engaged the lord Powis in their interest, who, by means of his tenants, secured and delivered him up. He received sentence of death both as a heretic and a traitor. On the day appointed for his execution (Christmas, 1417) he was brought out of the Tower with his arms bound behind him, but with a cheerful countenance. Arrived at the place of execution, he devoutly fell upon his knees, and implored of God the forgiveness of his enemies. He was hung up alive by the middle, with iron chains, on the gallows which had been prepared, under which, a fire being made, he was burned to death. — Jones, *Christian Biography*, s.v.; Middleton, *Memoirs of the Reformers* (3 vols. Lend. 1829), 1:98 sq.; *England and France under the House of Lancaster* (London, 152) p. 60-87: *Eclectic Review*, 4th series, 16:249; Milner, *Church History* (Lond. 1829, 4 vols.), 3. 307-329.

Cocceius, John

one of the most distinguished theologians and Biblical interpreters of the 17th century, was born in Bremen July 30 (or August 9, N. S.), 1603. The

family name was *Cock* (according to others *Koch*), but he and his brother Gerhard having been in their youth called *Cocceii*, ever afterwards retained that appellation. The family was an ancient and honorable one in Bremen, many members of it having filled high offices in Church and State. He was brought up with great moral and religious strictness, for he relates in a short autobiography, which he left unfinished, that having been chastised at school for some boyish falsehood, he ever from that time despised lying, and had such a reputation for truthfulness as never to be compelled to take an oath; and that, having once been struck on the mouth by his father with a spoon for the irreverent use of God's name at the table, he never again took: it in vain. He was put to the best schools in his native city, and became, while still a boy, so great a proficient in Greek as to read with delight its historians and poets. He learned from his brother the rudiments of Hebrew, and afterwards obtained the Lexicons of Munster and Pagninus, and studied them with great industry of his own accord for the investigation of the themes of the language. To the Hebrew he added Chaldee and Arabic, and gave his attention also to Rabbinical literature. Although most strongly drawn to philological studies, because, as he says, he was persuaded that the Scriptures could not be rightly understood without a knowledge of the original languages, he did not neglect other branches of learning, but studied physics and metaphysics with Gerhard Neufville, and theology with Martinius and Crocius. While still a student he wrote a Greek oration on the religion of the Turks, reading the Koran for that purpose. At the age of 22 he went to Hamnburgh, at the suggestion of Martiniup, to prosecute his Rabbinical studies with the Jews of that city. On his return he went to Franeker, in Friesland, preferring the Belgic schools to those of Germany, which, he says, were in bad repute (*quod de his non bonus rumor esset*). There he formed the acquaintance of an eminent Rabbinical scholar, Sixtinus Amama, and with him studied the Talmud. At his request he published a treatise *De Synedrio,* which was highly commended by such scholars as Heinsius, Rivetus, Grotius, Selden, and Salmasius. While at Franeker he also became intimately acquainted with Maccovius and the celebrated Puritan divine William Ames. On his return to Bremen he was made, at the age of 27, professor of sacred philosophy, and began to lecture on the books of the Old Testament. In the following year he published a 'Commentary on Ecclesiastes' In 1636 he removed to Franeker, to be professor of Hebrew in the newly-revived academy in that city; and in 1643 he was also appointed to the theological chair. He remained at Franeker until 1650, giving himself with great

diligence to the study and public exposition of the Scriptures. Amongst the fruits of these labors were a. Commentary on Job, Lectures on the Minor Prophets, and on the Epistles to the Hebrews and the Colossians, an *Exercitatio de Principio Epistoloe ad Ephesios,* and a theological treatise, *De Foedere et Testamento Dei,* to which he added a brief *Analysis Temporum Novi Testamenti.* After fourteen years of laborious and successful teaching at Franeker, he was invited to Leyden, to succeed the celebrated Frederick Spanhelm as professor of theology; and at his inauguration in October, 1650, he delivered an oration *De causis Incredulitatis Judceorum.* He soon began to lecture on Isaiah; but the death of one of his colleagues (Triglandius) made a new division of labors necessary, and he afterwards devoted himself to the exposition of the New Testament. In 1652 his Commentary on the Minor Prophets was printed by thie famous Elzevir and in 1654 he published his *Consideratio Principi Evangelii S. Johannis,* an elaborate examination of the first 18 verses of that Gospel, with especial reference to the misinterpretations of Socinus, Schlichtingius, and others of that school. The writings of the Socinians having been disseminated through Holland and other provinces, the Synods of North and South Holland presented to the States a petition that they might be restrained of this liberty, and an edict was accordingly issued in 1653 forbidding the printing and publishing of Socinian books, and the preaching of their doctrines. This was done in accordance with the opinion of the theological faculty of Leyden, which the States had asked for; and when an Apology against the edict was written by *Eqies Polonus* (believed to be the Socinian Jonas Schlichtingius), the task of answering it was committed to Cocceius, who fulfilled the duty so ably as to receive the thanks of the Synods of Dort and of North Holland. In 1656 he was drawn into a controversy with his colleague Hoornbeek on the divine authority of the Sabbath, which became so warm that the States interposed and put an end to it. Cocceius, recoiling from the rigid Judaizing view, went to the opposite extreme, and maintained that the Sabbath was a Jewish institution, not binding upon the Christian Church, although he was in favor, on grounds of expediency, of observing the Lord’s day by public services of worship and preaching. The following year he began to write his Hebrew Lexicon, at the request of her highness the princess Maria Eleonora of Brandenburg; but, owing to his many other labors and cares, he did not finish it till a little before his death in 1669. He never intermitted his work as an interpreter of the Scriptures, but sent forth one commentary after another till he had almost gone through with the sacred books. The most

elaborate of these are on the Psalms, Job, the Song of Solomon, and the prophetical books of the Old Testament, and on the Epistles of the New Testament, particularly those of Paul, and on the Apocalypse; but there are many valuable notes on the Pentateuch. He was also much occupied with the controversies of his time, and wrote with great learning and ability against Jews, Socinians, and Papists. He defended the integrity of the Jewish Scriptures against Isaac Vossius, who maintained that they had been corrupted, and that the translation of the Seventy had divine authority. In addition to his treatise *De Faedere,* he wrote a much larger work with the title *Summa Theologiae ex Scripturis repetita,* the form of which was more in harmony with the systematic theology of his time. But while thus laboriously occupied, and in the full maturity of his powers, he was suddenly seized with a fever, and, after a sickness of nineteen days, died on the 4th of November, 1669, at the age of 66.

As an interpreter of Scripture, Cocceius had many of the highest qualifications. He was a man of great learning, the worthy compeer of the mighty scholars of which Holland could boast in the 17th century. In the range and thoroughness of his acquirements he was not inferior to such men as Grotius, Heinsius, Buxtorf, and Vossius. But it was in his *principles of interpretation* that his unrivaled gift was chiefly seen. He held that the Scriptures are the source of all sound doctrine; that they have not been exhausted by previous interpreters; that they are to be regarded as one organic whole, the Old Testament containing every where the hidden, and the New the unfolded Gospel; that they are to be interpreted according to the analogy of the faith or the scope of the one great revelation; that their meaning is to be determined by a careful examination of each passage as to the force of its words and phrases, and its relations to the context, or that which is derived *ex tota coanpage sermonis;* that the interpreter is not to force his own opinions into the Scriptures, but to submit his mind to their teachings; and that Christ is the great subject of divine revelation, as well in the Old Testament as in the New. It was his holding up of the Scriptures as the living fountain of theology which drew on him the bitter opposition of the scholastic theologians of his day, who would not go beyond what the Reformers had attained to, and used the Bible only as a storehouse of proof texts for doctrines which they had learned from the symbolic writings of the Reformation. Against that dry and hard scholasticism Cocceius set himself with uncompromising boldness; and he did as much as any man of his time to reinstate the Scriptures in their true

place of authority, and to make interpretation to be the drawing of fresh streams from the inexhaustible well-spring of divine truth.

He has been accused of *being fanciful* as an interpreter, but, in the sense in which it is commonly understood, no charge could be more groundless. His fundamental principle was that "of those things which Christ and the apostles spake, the foundation, cause, and prescribed formula existed in the writings of Moses and the prophets, and, in truth, that Christ and the apostles accomplished that preaching concerning the kingdom of God which had been promised to Israel," and therefore that "what is to be believed concerning Christ and his righteousness, what in the New Testament is explained more succinctly and clearly, that ought to be demonstrated from the Old Testament, since both the apostles appealed to its testimony, and the Savior himself charged the Jews to search it as testifying concerning himself." He would bring men to "the examination of all Scripture, to the perpetual analogy of promise, prophecy, and Gospel, and so of all the revelations of God's Testament."

In the application of this principle he often erred by going beyond the bounds of clear and definite knowledge, by forcing events into the mould of prophecy, and also by too great subtlety in tracing out analogies; but his errors were those of a man of penetrating insight and robust judgment, and not of weak and childish fancies. No one has seen more clearly or more sharply defined the true province and methods of the interpreter, "adding nothing to, and taking away nothing from the words of God; leaving those things which are said in a general way to be interpreted generally; giving force to the propriety and emphasis of phrases, and the analogy of sacred speech."

No one now will doubt that the one great object of divine revelation, both in the Old and New Testaments, is to unfold "the mystery of godliness, God manifest in the flesh." In all his interpretations of Scripture he was struggling towards this end; and, notwithstanding his many failures, which were inevitable at the time and under the circumstances in which he lived, his writings are full not only of grand and far-reaching principles, but of striking examples of prophetic insight in the application of them. He gave a great impulse and a right direction to Biblical studies in Holland. Amongst his pupils the famous Vitringa is to be numbered.

As a theologian, Cocceius, while conscientiously adhering to the doctrines of the Reformed (Calvinistic) Church, gave to them a more scriptural and

less scholastic form, in consequence of his free and profound study of the Bible. His favorite method of setting forth theology was the *historical,* as the unfolding of the successive stages of the covenant entered into before all worlds by the Father and the Son. After the Fall, by which the covenant of works, under which Adam in his state of innocence had been placed, was abrogated, the way was opened for the establishing of the covenant of grace, which was the manifestation of that which had existed in the eternal councils of the Godhead, of which the second Person was the mediator and surety. Of these there are three dispensations-that of the Promise during the time of the patriarchs, that of the Law given from Sinai, and that of the Gospel; although the two former are also classed as one, as preceding the advent of the Redeemer. The fall of man was self caused, and not necessitated by any act of God (*Bona enim operatur in nobis Deus non mala*), but all his posterity were involved with Adam in the guilt and curse of his sin. This required a Mediator who could not be of the number needing redemption, and yet must be a partaker of their nature; a problem that was solved by the Son of God being made man. He, standing as the sponsor of the eternal covenant, gave unto the Father the obedience that was due from men, and also endured the penalty of death, the curse for sin, thereby making a true expiation and atonement.

Cocceius limits the death of Christ in its full force to the elect, but he asserts that Christ was “a victim of so great preciousness and sufficiency that the whole world, and all men without exception coming to him, can find sure and perfect salvation in him.”

In respect to most doctrines he does not depart from the Reformed Church; but there is a spiritual life and power in his handling of them which takes them out of the sphere of a cold and lifeless orthodoxy. He was a man mighty in the Spirit, and far in advance of most men of his time in his apprehension of the work of God in Christ. Where he fails in clear sight, we still feel that noble instincts are working in him. His errors, as in regard to the Lord’s day, were partly the fruit of his desire to vindicate for the Church her Christian liberty of walking always in the Spirit. He saw clearly the bondage under which the Law brought men, and he looked upon the Sabbath given from Sinai as a yoke to which those whom Christ has made free should not be in subjection. In this, as in many things, he held but half the truth, not discerning the freedom of divine ordinances; but he is not to be ranked with the lawless spirits who would break down all restraints upon the licentiousness of the flesh. He was among the the first in modern

times to teach the doctrine of a spiritual dispensation of glory, in distinction from a visible kingdom of Christ, and so far did he carry it as to find nothing of the resurrection in the last chapters of the Apocalypse. But he firmly held the faith of the Church as to the final resurrection of the body and the awards of the judgment.

The views of Cocceius were adopted and further developed by a number of prominent theologians of the Reformed Church of Holland and other countries. His followers were commonly designated by the name Coccejans. The foremost among the writers of this school in the province of systematic theology are Momma, Witsius, Burmann, and Van Til (see these articles); in exegetical literature, the greatest and most celebrated member of the school was Vitringa (q.v.), while the pious hymnologist Jodokus von Todenstein and Dr. F. A. Lampe exercised a considerable influence upon the practical life of the Church of their times. His *Opera Theologica,* including his *Summa doct. de foedere et testamento* (Leyd. 1648), his *Lex. Hebr. et Chald. V. T.,* and other writings, were published at Amsterdam (1676-78, 8 vols. fol.; 2d ed. 10 vols. fol., 2 vols. *Opera* ἀνέκδοτα, 1701). His *Life* by his son, J. H., is given in vol. 8. See Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 2, 765; Wetzer u.Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* 2, 646; Mosheim, *Church Hist.* cent. 17, pt. 2, ch. 2; Gass, *Prot. Theologie,* 2, 253; Hagenbach, *Hist. of Doctrines,* vol. 2; Dornea , *Geschichte der Protestant. Theologie,* p. 452 sq.; Fairbairn, *Typology;* Fairbairn, *Hermeneutical Manual.*

Cochin-China

SEE ANAM.

Cochlaeus, Johannes

(proper name *Dobneck*), was born in 1479 at Wendelstein, near Nurnberg; became rector in Nirnberg, 1511; in 1527, dean at Frankfort; finally, canon of Breslau, in which office he died, 1552. He was one of the most violent opponents of the Reformation. He attended the Diet of Worms (1522), where he became a sort of volunteer aid to Alexander, the papal nuncio. He is charged with having sought to induce Luther to give up his safe-conduct, in order to put him in the power of the legate; but Cochlaeus afterwards denied that this was his purpose. He was also present at the Diets of Ratisbon, 1526, and of Augsburg, 1530. At the latter, with Eck, Faber, and Wimpina, he undertook to refute the Augsburg Confession. His

"refutation" was read before the Diet August 3. On the death of Eck (1543), Cochlaeus took his place as the leading champion of the and-Reformers. He wrote a tirade against Melancthon, entitled *Philippicae,* addressed to the emperor. In 1546 he was active at the colloquy of Ratisbon, against Bucer and Major. His numerous pamphlets are full of violence and personalities. Among them are *Bockspiel Martini Luthers* (Mainz, 1531); *Lutherus Septiceps* (Mainz, 1529); *Historia Hussitarum* (Mainz, 1549; *De actis and scriptis Lutheri* (1549, fol.); *Speculum circa Missam; De emendanda Ecclesia,* 1539, 8vo. — Dupin, *Eccles. Hist.* cent. 16, p. 456; Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* 2, 647; Pierer, *Universal-Lexikon,* 4, 270; Ranke, *History of the Reformation,* 3. 306; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale,* 10, 955.

Cock

Picture for Cock

(ἀλέκτωρ, literally *wakeful*). It is somewhat singular that this bird (and poultry in general) should not be distinctly noticed in the Hebrew Scriptures, especially as rearing gallinaceous fowls was an object of considerable economical importance in Egypt, and their flesh one of the principal resources for the table in every part of Southern and Western Asia. It is true, the date when the practice of obtaining them by artificial heat commenced in Egypt is sufficiently disputable, and birds of the genus Gallus, properly so called, are not indigenous in Western Asia, but belong in their original condition to lower India, Indo-China, and the great islands of Austral-Asia. Several species, apparently distinct, are still found wild in the forests and jungles of India, and two at least, *Gallus Sonneratii* and *G. Stanleyi,* are abundant in the woods of the Western Ghauts, to which our familiar fowl bear so close a resemblance that naturalists consider the former to be their original. Domestic poultry have existed in Hindoostan from the remotest antiquity; probably much earlier than the twelfth century B.C.; for in the *Institutes of Menu,* which Sir William Jones assigns to that age, we read of "the breed of the towncock," and of the practice of cock-fighting (5:12; 9:222). When the cock found its way to Western Asia and Europe we have no record. Fowl of plumage so gorgeous, of size so noble, of flesh so sapid, of habits so domestic, of increase so prolific, would doubtless early be carried along the various tracks of Oriental commerce. There is no trace of it, so far as we are aware, on the monuments of Pharaonic Egypt, but we find the cock figured in those of Assyria. In a

hunting and shooting scene depicted at Khorsabad (Botta, pl. 108-114), the scene is laid in a forest whose characteristics seem to indicate a mountain region, such as Media or Armenia. Much game is represented, including many kinds of birds, one of which seems to be the pheasant. But the most interesting, is a large bird, which appears from its form, gait, and arching tail to be our common cock; it is walking on the ground amidst the trees. So far as this is evidence, it would go to prove that the fowl, in a wild state, existed at that period in Western Asia, though now unknown on this side the Indus. The cock and hen are distinctly represented in the Xanthian sculptures, of an era probably contemporaneous with the Khorsabad palace of Nineveh. They appear also on Etruscan paintings, having probably a much higher antiquity (Mrs. Gray's *Etruria*, p. 28, 45). The early Greeks and Romans figure them on their coins and gems, and speak of them as perfectly familiar objects, with no allusion to their introduction. They had even found their way into Britain at some unknown period long anterior to the Roman invasion; for Caesar tells us with surprise that the Britons did not think it right to eat the goose or the hen, though they bred both for the pleasure of keeping them (*Bell. Gall.* lib. 5). This is a very interesting allusion, since we are compelled to refer their introduction into that island to the agency of the Phoenicians, who traded to Cornwall for tin centuries before Rome was built. Under these circumstances, their absence from Egypt, where in modern times they have been artificially bred to so immense an extent, becomes a remarkable and unaccountable fact. They were, indeed, it may be surmised, unknown in Egypt when the Mosaic law was promulgated, and, though imported soon after, there always remained in an undetermined condition, neither clean nor unclean, but liable to be declared either by decisions swayed by prejudice, or by fanciful analogies; perhaps chiefly the latter; because poultry are devourers of unclean animals, scorpions, scolopendra, small lizards, and young serpents of every kind. But, although the rearing of common fowls was not encouraged by the Hebrew population, it is evidently drawing inferences beyond their proper bounds when it is asserted, *SEE COCK-CROWING*, that they were unknown in Jerusalem, where civil wars and Greek and Roman dominion had greatly affected the national manners. *SEE FOWL*.

In the denials of Peter, described in the four Gospels, where the cock-crowing (see below) is mentioned by our Lord, the words are plain and direct; not, we think, admitting of cavil, or of being taken to signify

anything but the real voice of the bird, the ἀλεκτοροφωνία, as it is expressed in <411335>Mark 13:35, in its literal acceptation, and not as denoting the sound of a trumpet, so called because it proclaimed a watch in the night; for to what else than a real hen and her brood does our Savior allude in <421334>Luke 13:34, where the text is proof that the image of poultry Was familiar to the disciples, and consequently that they were not rare in Judaea? To the present time in the East, and on the Continent of Europe, this bird is still often kept, as amongst the Celtes (Caesar, *Bell. Gall.* 4, 12), not so much for food as for the purpose of announcing the approach and dawn of day. *SEE HEN*.

Cock-Crowing

(ἀλεκτοροφωνία). “The cock usually crows several times about midnight, and again about break of day. The latter time, because he then crows loudest, and his ‘shrill clarion’ is most useful by summoning man to his labors, obtained the appellation of *the* cock-crowing emphatically, and by way ‘of ‘eminence, though sometimes the distinctions of the *first* and *second* cock-crowing are met with in Jewish and heathen writers (Bochart, 3. 119). These times, and these names for them, were, no doubt, some of the most ancient divisions of the night adopted in the East, where ‘the bird of dawning’ is most probably indigenous. The latter ‘cock-crow’ was retained even when artificial divisions of time were invented. “In our Lord’s time the Jews had evidently adopted the Greek and Roman division of the night into four periods or watches, each consisting of three hours, the first beginning at six in the evening (<421238>Luke 12:38; <401425>Matthew 14:25; <410648>Mark 6:48)” (Kitto, s.v.). This watch (the third of these divisions, comprehending the space between the two cock-crowings) seems to have been about three in the morning, and was known to the Hebrews as rbG,hi taer]q] (*keriath’ hag-ge’ber*), and was termed by the Romans *galliciniuem;* and it has been supposed that Jerusalem being a military station of the Romans, the custom of that nation concerning the placing and relieving of the guard was in force there. These watches, or guards, were declared by the sound of a trumpet; and whenever one guard relieved another, it was always done by the military signal. The whole four-watches were closed by the blowing of a shrill horn. Drakenborch says, the last trumpet, which blew at three in the morning, was sounded three times, to imitate the crowing of a cock. *SEE WATCH*.

“It has been considered a contradiction that <402634>Matthew 26:34 records our Lord to have said to Peter, ‘Before the cock crow, thou shalt deny me thrice,’ whereas <411430>Mark 14:30 says, ‘before the cock crow twice.’ But Matthew, giving only the *general sense* of the admonition (as also <422234>Luke 22:34; <431338>John 13:38), evidently alludes to that only which was *customarily* called *the* cock-crowing; but Mark, who wrote under Peter’s inspection, more accurately recording *the very words,* mentions the two cock-crowings (Wetstein on <411430>Mark 14:30; Scheuchzer, *Phys. Sacr.* on <411335>Mark 13:35; Whitby’s *Note* on <402634>Matthew 26:34). Another objection to this part of the Evangelical history has been founded upon an assertion of the Mishna (*Baba Kaml,* 7, 7), ‘They do not breed cocks at Jerusalem because of the holy things,’ i.e., as it is interpreted, cocks turn up the dung-hills, and set free the reptiles by which the sacrifices might be polluted which were eaten as food; and that, consequently, Peter could not *hear* one crow. But this is sufficiently answered above. Even the traditions themselves on this subject are not uniform; witness the story (in *Erubin,* p. 26, 1) of a cock which killed a child, and was stoned by order of the council. Other instances are given by Reland, which show that the cock might crow, though *not in the city,* and yet be heard by Peter in the stillness of the night, especially as the palace of Caiaphas (according to the modern tradition) stood on an elevated situation, at the distance of scarcely 400 yards from the city walls.” In the modern East the barndoor fowl is a common appendage to every household, and the cock-crowing is a universal signal of morning in Palestine (Thompson, *Land and Book,* 2, 552).

Cock

the, as a Christian symbol.

(1.) On tombs the cock is a symbol of the resurrection — the *prasco diei,* or herald of the light, after the night of death.

(2.) The cock is also a symbol of vigilance. — —Martigny, *Dict. des Antiquitis Chretiennes,* s.v. Coq.

Cockatrice

properly a fabulous serpent supposed to be hatched from a cock’s egg, is the rather fanciful translation in our version of [pix, (*tsepha, hissing,* <231429>Isaiah 14:29) and ynæ[p]xæ (*tsIphoni’,* <231108>Isaiah 11:8; 59:5; <240817>Jeremiah

8:17). The latter word also occurs in Proverbs 23:32, where it is translated “adder.” Aquila and the Vulg. understand the *basilisk*, a fabulous serpent of antiquity, identified by many moderns with the *basilicus regulus*, a small and exceedingly venomous viper of Africa. By others, however, the *cerastes*, or “horned viper” (*coluber cerastes* of Linn., *coluber cornutus* of Hasselquist), has been more definitely fixed upon as the animal intended, a very poisonous serpent of Egypt and Palestine, about a foot long, brown on the back and sides, with a white belly, about as thick as the finger, and having two knob-like projections upon the head (comp. Pliny, 11:45), which were anciently compared to horns (*A*Elian, *Anim.* 1, 57; Pliny, 8:35; comp. Herod. 2:74). It buries itself in the sand, from which it is scarcely distinguishable in color, with the horns projecting out like feelers, whence it suddenly darts forth and seizes its prey (Diod. Sic. 3. 50). — (See Bochart, *Hieroz.* 3. 205 sq.; Hasselquist, *Trav.* p. 365 sq.; Belon, in Paulus’s *Samml.* 1, 206; 2:258; Bruce, *Trav.* 7, pl. 40; Wilkinson, 2d ser. 2:245 sq.; Prosp. Alp. *Rer. Egypt.* 4, 4, p. 210, pl. 5, 6.) Others, again, refer this last to the “adder,” i.e. viper (q.v.), of Genesis 49:17. *SEE SERPENT*.

Cocker

an old English term, used but once in the A. V. of the Apocrypha (Ecclesiasticus 30:9, τίθνησον, *tend* as a nurse), in the sense of *fondle*, or treat gently.

Cockle

(hvaB; *boshah’*, an *offensive* plant, q. d. stink-weed; Sept. βάτος, i.e. bramble) occurs only in Job 31:40: “Let thistles grow instead of wheat, and *cockle* instead of barley.” It is probably a mere general term signifying *weed*, perhaps like the *darnel* (ζιζάνια, “tares”) of Matthew 13:30. Celsius (*Hierobot.* 2, 199) would identify it with the *aconite*, but Gesenius questions this (*Jesaia*, 1, 230; 2:364), as the word must not be confounded with the plur. form (µyvæB] *beiishim’*), “wild grapes” (q.v.), in Isaiah 5:2, 4. *SEE BOTANY*.

Codex Alexandrinus, etc.

SEE ALEXANDRIAN MANUSCRIPT, etc.

Codex Canonum Ecclesiae Universae

is the name of a work published at Paris in 1610 by Christ. Justeau (Justellus), which undertook to give the canons of the first councils in a shape as conformable as possible to the collection of canons which the Council of Chalcedon (451) was supposed to have made. This *codex canonum,* etc., was reprinted in the *Bibl. jur. can. vet.* (tom. 1, p. 29), published by Justellus and Voallus. The supposition which led to the compilation of this work, that the Council of Chalcedon had made or ordered to be made such a collection of canons, is erroneous. It is true that the resolutions of the ancient Church councils were early collected and circulated among the bishops, and that at the Council of Chalcedon many of the bishops had with them collections containing the canons of the five synods of Nice, Ancyra, Neo-Caesarea, Gangra, and Antiochia, from which many passages were read. But it appeared that in the arrangement of the canons the collections widely differed, and it is not known that the council took any action with regard to the matter. Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* 2, 649.

Codex Justinianeus

a code composed by order of the Emperor Justinian, and intended to embrace all that was still available of former collections of imperial manuscripts and edicts, as well as of edicts then recent. The previous collections were,

1. The *Codex Gregorianus,* compiled by Gregorianus, who lived about the middle of the fourth century. It contained the “Constitutions” (the collective name for the “*Rescripta,*” or replies to particular inquiries and requests, and the ‘“*Edicta,*” or orders on general questions) of the emperors up to the time of Constantine;

2. The *Codex Hermogenianus,* compiled by Hermogenes, likewise about the middle of the fourth century, and containing the “Constitutions” of Diocletian and Maximinian;

3. The *Codex Theodosianus,* compiled in the first half of the fifth century by order of the Emperor Theodosius II, by a committee of sixteen jurists, and containing the Constitutions of the emperors from Constantine to Theodosius. It was promulgated by Theodosius in 438 in the Eastern empire, and in the same year by Valentinian in the Western. It was divided

into sixteen books, of which the first five and the former part of the sixth are lost. All these three codes are found in the *Corpus Juris Antejustinianei*, published by Hanel. In Feb. 528 the Emperor Justinianus ordered the preparation of a new code, which was to embrace all that was still of practical value of the three previous collections, and, in addition, all the constitutions issued since the publication of the Theodosian Code. This new collection was published in April, 529. After the publication of the Pandects (a compilation of the writings of former Roman jurists) and the *Institutiones* (an introduction to the study of the Roman law), another revision was made in 534 by Tribonianus. This new revision (*Codae repetito prcelectionis*) still forms an important portion of the *Corpus Juris Civilis*, while the first revision (*Codex vetus*) is lost. In its last revision, the *Codex Justinianeus* consists of twelve books, each book containing a number of titles in chronological order. Up to the time of Constantine nearly all the constitutions are *rescripta* (rescripts); after that we meet with numerous *edicta* (edicts). The code of Justinian is of great importance for Church history and Church law, as a great many edicts of the Christian emperors concerned religious questions. In quoting the code of Justinian, first the number of the constitution is given, next the special code (Greg., Herm., Th., Just.) from which it is taken; and finally the title; thus, c. 45. *C. Just.* 1, 3, *de episc. et cler.*, which means constitution 45 of the Justinianean code (that is, the entirely new portion of it), book 1, title 3, which treats *de episcopis et clericis.* Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lexikon*, 2, 650.

Codman John, D.D.,

a Congregational minister, was born in Boston Aug. 3,1782; graduated at Harvard 1802, and studied law until the death of his father, when he commenced theology, and completed his studies at Edinburgh. After preaching a year in Great Britain, he came back to America, and was ordained pastor in Dorchester, December 7, 1808. In 1834 he went to England as delegate to the Congregational Union of England and Wales. He died Dec. 23,1847. He was made D.D. by the college of New Jersey, 1822, and by Harvard, 1840. Dr. Codman published a *Visit to England* (1835); *Sermons* (1834, 8vo); and a number of occasional discourses. — Sprague, *Annals*, 2, 492.

Coelestine

(Pope). *SEE CELESTINE*.

Coelestins

SEE CELESTINS.

Coelestius

a native of Ireland (or of Bretagne?) of noble birth. According to Marius Mercator (*Commonitorium*, 2), he was a law student at Rome when Pelagius arrived there. Embracing the views of Pelagius, he accompanied him in 408 (or 409) to Sicily, and in 411 to Africa. By his character and talents he succeeded, even better than Pelagius, in diffusing the views which they held in common. He was accused of heresy before the bishop of Carthage, A.D. 412, and condemned. He appealed to Rome; and on his way stopped at Sicily, and there spread his opinions very successfully. Thence it is supposed that he went to Ephesus, where he was ordained presbyter. In 417 Pope Zozimus, at Rome, was so far satisfied by the explanations of Coelestius that he recommended the African bishops to restore him. In 418 he was condemned by a synod at Rome, and went to the East for safety; but about 429 he was banished from Constantinople by order of the emperor. The Council of Ephesus condemned him A.D. 431. His later years are involved in obscurity. "He wrote a *Confessio Fidei Zozimo Papae oblata*, and various epistles and appeals, the substance of most of which can be gathered from the excerpts given by Augustine and Jerome; but none of his writings have come down to us entire. Coelestius was a man of pure morality, and more zealous and active (perhaps more honest) than Pelagius as a controvertist. Jerome says of him (in an epistle to Ctesiphon, A.D. 415), 'Although a scholar of Pelagius, he is yet leader and master of the whole host.'" — Cave, *Hist. Lit.* Anno 407, 1:246; Murdoch's Mosheim, *Church History*, N. Y., 3 vols., 1, 370; Wiggers, *Augustinism and Pelagianism*, Emerson's transl., p. 40 sq.; Schaff, *History of the Christian Church*, 3. § 147. *SEE PELAGIUS*.

Coele-Syria

(ἡ κοίλη Συρία; Vulg. *Celesyria*), "the *hollow* Syria," was (strictly speaking) the name given by the Greeks, in the times of the Seleucidae, to the remarkable valley or hollow (κοιλία) which intervenes between

Libanus and Anti-Libanus, stretching from lat. 33° 20’ to 34° 40’, a distance of nearly a hundred miles. As applied to this region the word is strikingly descriptive (see Dionysius, *Perieg*. 899-900). Thus a modern traveler observes: “We finally looked down on the vast green and red valley — green from its yet unripe corn, red from its vineyards not yet verdant — which divides the range of Lebanon and Anti-Lebanon; the former reaching its highest point in the snowy crest to the north, behind which lie the Cedars; the latter in the still more snowy crest of Hermonthe culmination of the range being thus in the one at the northern, in the other at the southern extremity of the valley which they bound. The view of this great valley is chiefly remarkable as being *exactly to the eye what it is on maps* — the ‘hollow’ between the two mountain ranges of Syria. A screen through which the Leontes (Litany) breaks out closes the south end of the plain. There is a similar screen at the north end, but too remote to be visible” (Stanley’s Palestine, p. 399). The plain gradually rises towards its center, near which, but a little on the southern declivity, stand the ruins of Baalbek or Heliopolis. In the immediate neighborhood of Baalbek rise the two streams of the Orontes (Nahr-el-Asy) and the Litany, which, flowing in opposite directions to the north-west and the south-east, give freshness and fertility to the tract enclosed between the mountain ranges. *Amyce*, the name of the plain through which the Orontes flowed (τὸ Ἀμύκης πεδίον, Polyb. v. 59), is derived by Bochart from the Syriac aqym[, Amica, which means *deep*, and is nearly synonymous with the Greek *Caele* (*Geogr. Sac*. I, 1, 1).

The term Coele-Syria was also used in a much wider sense. In the first place it was extended so as to include the inhabited tract to the east of the Anti-Libanus range, between it and the desert, in which stood the great city of Damascus; and then it was further carried on upon that side of Jordan, through Trachonitis and Peraea, to Idumaea and the borders of Egypt (Strab. 16, § 21; Polyb. v. 80, § 3; Josephus, *Ant.* 1:11, 5). Ptolemy (v. 15) and Josephus *(Ant.* 13:13, 2) even place Scythopolis in Coele-Syria, though it was upon the west side of Jordan; but they seem to limit its extent southwards to about lat. 31° 30’, or the country of the Ammonites (Ptol. v. 15; Josephus, *Ant.* 1:11, 5). Ptolemy distinctly includes in it the Damascus country. In the time of David, Caele-Syria was probably included in “Syria of Damascus,” which was conquered by that monarch (<100806>2 Samuel 8:6), but recovered from Solomon by Rezon, the son of Eliadah (<111124>1 Kings 11:24). The possession of it was an object of many struggles between the

Seleucidae and the kings of Egypt (Polyb. 1:3; 2:71; 3:1; v. 40; 16:39; 27:17).

There can be little doubt that a part at least of Coele-Syria was included in that "Valley of Lebanon" (ˆwnob;L]hi t [iq]Bæ) mentioned by Joshua (<061117>Joshua 11:17; 12:7), the extent of which has been too much restricted by recent geographers. The name "Valley of Lebanon" could scarcely be applied with propriety *exclusively* to that section of the great valley which lies at the base of Hermon, at a considerable distance from the range of Lebanon. Doubtless Baal-Gad was situated "under Mount Hermon;" but we have reason to believe that the "Valley of Lebanon" includes the whole of that valley which separates the ridge of Hermon from that of Lebanon. It seems that at a subsequent period this valley was called by Amos, apparently in contempt, "the valley of idols" (ˆwa;t [iq]Bæ, chap. 1:5). *SEE AVEN*. The name was most appropriate. The whole sides of the valley are thickly studded with old heathen temples. Mr. Porter visited no less than fourteen of them, and he heard of several others. Some of them were of-great size and splendor, such as those of Baalbek, Mejdel, Niha, and Hibbariyeh. This appears, in fact, to have been the chosen house of idolatry (Porter's Damascus, 1:12; 2:320; *Hand-book of S. and P*. p. 568, 570; Robinson, *Later Bib. Res*. p. 438, 492, 520). The modern name of the valley confirms the above view. It is called *el-Bukaa*, which is strictly the same as the Hebrews *Bikah* (h [;q]Bæ).

In the apocryphal books there is frequent mention of Coele-Syria in a somewhat vague sense, nearly as an equivalent for Syria (1 Esdras 2:17, 24, 27; 4:48; 6:29; 7:1; 8:67; 1 Maccabees 10:69; 2 Maccabees 3, 5, 8; 4:4; 8:8; 10:11). In all these cases the word is given in the A. V. as "Celo-Syria," i.e. Coele-Syria. In Esdras 6:3, it is called simply "Syria." Under the emperor Diocletian, Phoenice and Coele-Syria formed one province, called Phoenicia Libanica. Under the present Turkish government the western part of Coele-Syria is in the pashalic of Saide, and the eastern in the pashalic of Damascus. *SEE SYRIA*.

Coelicolae

("worshippers of heaven"), the name of an African sect in the 4th century, who appear to have blended together some parts of Judaism and Paganism with Christianity. An edict of Honorius (A. D. 408) forbids their assemblages and demands their disbandment. As they are counted in this

edict among the heretics, and as they were not subject to the jurisdiction of the Jewish patriarch, but had their own chiefs, called majores, and as they had a kind of baptism, they are by some regarded as a Christian sect. By others they are regarded as an offshoot of the Essenes. See Schmid, *Historia Caelicolarum* (Helmst 1704). — Gieseler, *Church History*, 1, § 73; Bingham, *Orig. Eccl.* 16:6, 2.

Coelln

SEE COLLN.

Coemeteria

SEE CEMETERIES.

Coena Domini

the Lord's Supper. *SEE LORDS SUPPER*.

Coena Domini Bull Of.

SEE BULL; and *SEE IN COENA DOMINI*.

Coenobites,

monks who formed a community living in a fixed habitation (coenobium) under a chief (abbot or father). Their name is derived from κοινός, *common*, and βίος, *life*; and they are opposed to hermits, who live in solitude. Pachomius is admitted to be the institutor of the *coenobite Life*, as being the first that gave a rule to any community. — Bingham, *Orig. Eccl.* 7:2; Coleman, Ancient Christianity, ch. 7, § 5. *SEE MONACHISM*.

Coffee

(drunk in the East). *SEE CUP*.

Coffer

(zG;r]ai, argaz'; Sept. θέμα, Vulg. capsella), the receptacle (apparently a customary appendage to a cart, from the use of the article in every occurrence) which the Philistines placed beside the ark when they sent it home, and in which they deposited the golden mice and emerods that formed their trespass-offering (<090608>1 Samuel 6:8, 11, 15). The root seems to signify to be *shaken* about; and Gesenius and Lee agree in regarding it

as the same, or nearly the same thing, as the Arabian *rijaza*, which Jauhari describes as "a kind of wallet, into which stones are put: it is hung to one of the two sides of the *haudaj* [a litter borne by a camel or mule] when it inclines towards the other." Dr. Lee, however, thinks that the Hebrew word denotes the wallet itself; whereas Gesenius is of opinion that it means a coffer or small box, to which, from its analogous use, the same name was applied. See ARK.

Coffin

Picture for Coffin 1

(ˆwra; *aron'*, a box for *gathering* articles; Sept. σορός) is used with reference to the burial of Joseph (Genesis 1, 26): "They embalmed him, and he was put in a *coffin* in Egypt." This was undoubtedly a *mummy-chest*, such as are now found in the tombs of the same country, and frequently exhibited in modern museums, *SEE MUMMY*, — a mode of burial peculiarly favorable to the removal of that patriarch's remains to Palestine (ver. 25, where the term "bones" is evidently used in this general sense). *SEE BURIAL*; *SEE SEPULCHRE*.

Picture for Coffin 2

The same word is spoken in the original of a "money-chest" (2 Kings 12:10, 11), *SEE TREASURY*, but most frequently of the sacred "ark," in which were deposited the tables of the law. *SEE ARK*. It has been thought by some that the iron "bedstead" of Og (Deuteronomy 3:11) was rather his coffin. *SEE GIANT*.

Picture for Coffin 3

Numerous coffins of earthenware were disinterred by Loftus at Wurka and by Layard at Niffer, varying in length from three to six feet, and closed by an oval lid; the corpse having been swathed in linen and then smeared with bitumen, except the features (Layard, *Nin. and Bab*. p. 474 sq.).

Coffin

(prob. from Saxon *Cofa* = a cave). "The slight wooden case in which bodies are now interred appears to be of comparatively recent origin; in earlier ages the graves were sometimes lined with slabs of stone, but usually a stone coffin formed of a single block was used, and the body

placed in it, either enveloped in grave-clothes, or clad in some particular dress: ecclesiastics were generally buried in the habit of the order to which they belonged, the dignitaries of the Church frequently in their official robes and accompanied with the ensigns of their office, and sovereigns in their robes of state. Numerous stone coffins exist in this country which appear to be as old as the eleventh and twelfth centuries; they are formed of a single block of stone hollowed out to receive the body, with a small circular cavity at one end to fit the head. and they are usually rather wider at this end than at the other; there are generally one or more small holes in the bottom to drain off moisture: these coffins were never buried. deeply in the ground; very frequently they were placed close to the surface, so that the lid was visible, and when within a church formed part of the paving; sometimes, in churches, they were placed entirely above the ground."

Coffin Charles, D.D.,

a Presbyterian minister, was born at Newburyport, Mass., Aug. 15, 1775, and graduated with distinction at Harvard in 1793. Having completed his theological studies, and taught for some time in Phillips Academy, he was licensed in 1799. He now visited the Southern states for his health, and, after spending some time in Virginia, was appointed vice-president of Greenville College, Tenn., in 1803. Returning to New England in 1804, he was ordained as an evangelist, and removed with his family to Greenville in 1805. In connection with his college duties, he had charge of the Harmony Church, and supplied for many years the churches in Hawkins County, at Rogersville, and at Jonesborough. In 1810 he was elected president of Greenville College, and served till 1827, when he was called to the presidency of the East Tennessee University, Knoxville. He resigned in 1833, and returned to Greenville, where he died June 3, 1853.— Sprague, *Annals*, 4:246.

Cogan Thomas, M.D.,

an English Unitarian writer, was born at Rowell, Northamptonshire, in 1736. He officiated for some time as a Presbyterian minister at Amsterdam, but finally studied medicine, and practiced in London. He died in 1818. He published

(1) *A Treatise on the Passions* (Bath, 1802, 8vo; and 2d part, Bath, 1807-10):—

(2) *Theological Disquisitions on Natural Religion and Jewish Morals* (Lond. 1812, 8vo): —

(3) *Characteristic Excellencies of Christianity* (Lond. 1813, 8vo): —

(4) *Letters to Wilberforce, on the Doctrine of Hereditary Depravity* (Lond. 1815, 8vo): —

(5) *Ethical Questions* (Lond. 1817, 8vo). — Darling, *Cyclopaedia Bibliographica*, 1:714.

Cogitation

(Chald. ˆ/y[]r¿ rayon’, thought, <270728>Daniel 7:28), an earnest action of the mind, elsewhere translated simply “thought.”

Cogswell William, D.D.,

a Congregational minister, was born in Atkinson, N. H., June 5,1787, and graduated at Dartmouth in 1811. He was ordained pastor in Dedham April 20,1815, and resigned in 1829 to accept the situation of general agent of the American Education Society, of which, in 1832, he was chosen secretary and director. In April, 1841, he resigned, and was elected professor of history and national education in Dartmouth. In January, 1844, he went to Gilmanton as president of the theological seminary. He died April, 1850. Dr. Cogswell published *A Catechism on the Doctrines and Duties of Religion* (1818) — *Assistant to Family Religion* (1826): — *Theological Classbook* (1831): — *Harbinger of the Millennium* (1833): — *Letters to Young Men preparing for the Ministry* (1837); and several occasional sermons. He was editor of the *Amer. Quart. Register*, of the N. H. Repository, of the 1st vol. of the *New England Hist. and Genealog. Register* and some other works. — Sprague, *Annals*, 2:605.

Cohabitation

The delicacy of this subject did not prevent its being a subject of Mosaic legislation. *SEE CHILDBIRTH*. The following are some of the most important Scriptural notices respecting it. *SEE MARRIAGE*; *SEE CONCUBINE*.

1. Every *concubitus*, even conjugal and legitimate subjected both parties to a state of ceremonial impurity until evening (<031518>Leviticus 15:18; Joseph. *Apion*. 2:24; comp. Strabo, 16:745), a regulation which certainly served

not merely to restrain polygamy, but was also useful in a sanitary point of view. A similar statute originally prevailed among the Babylonians (Herod, 1:198; see Wesseling, in loc.). *SEE UNCLEANNESS*.

2. Whoever corrupted a maiden, either by deceit or force, was compelled to marry her, and pay her father a fine (properly 50 shekels, <05228>Deuteronomy 22:28 sq.); the latter must still be paid even when the father refused to permit the marriage (<02217>Exodus 22:17; comp. Philo, *Opp.* 2:311; Mishna, *Chetub* 3). If the man used violence he forfeited the right of divorcing the woman ever after (the Egyptian law was still more severe on this point, Diod. Sic. 1:78). *SEE TRESPASS*.

3. In the case of seduction or rape occurring to a betrothed female in an inhabited spot, she must cry for help, or be considered as assenting to the debauchment, and thus subjected to the same punishment of stoning as the male party; but if she was in a lonely field, where her screams for assistance could be of no avail, she was presumed to have been forced, and the ravisher alone was stoned (<05223>Deuteronomy 22:23 sq.; comp. Joseph. *Ant.* 4:8, 23; Philo, 2:312); yet even in these cases the later interpreters of the law understood a repudiation by a bill of divorce as allowable (comp. <40119>Matthew 1:19; see Paulus, *Comment.* 1:123). A priest's daughter thus playing the courtesan was (stoned and) burnt (<03209>Leviticus 21:9). (See generally Michaelis, Mos. Recht. 2:315 sq.; 4:298 sq.; v. 303 sq.) *SEE FORNICATION*.

Cohort

(cohors), a military term used by the Romans to denote a company generally composed of 600 foot soldiers; a legion consisted of ten cohorts, every cohort being composed of three maniples, and every maniple of 200 men; a legion, consequently, contained in all 6000 men. Others allow but 500 men to a cohort, which would make 5000 in a legion. It is probable that cohorts among the Romans, as companies among the moderns, often varied as to their number. *SEE ARMY*. Besides the regular legionary cohorts, there were certain others separate and distinct from any legion, as the *Cohortes Urbanoe* and *Praetorioe*. Such appears to have been the "Italian band" mentioned in <44101>Acts 10:1, which was in attendance on the Roman governor, who at that time was residing at Caesarea. Of the same description also was the "Augustan band" or cohort (<44201>Acts 27:1), which most probably derived its name from Sebaste, the capital of Samaria. The

commanding officer of an ordinary cohort was called *Tribunus Cohortis* if it was composed of Roman citizens, or *Prefectus Cohortis* if composed of auxiliary troops. *SEE BAND*.

Coin

Picture for Coin 1

Picture for Coin 2

Before the Babylonian exile (see Deyling, Observ. 3. 222 sq., also in Ugolini *Thesaur.* 28) the Hebrews had and knew no regularly stamped money, but generally made use of a currency in traffic consisting of uncoined shekels (or talents) of silver, which they weighed out to one another (<012316>Genesis 23:16; <022217>Exodus 22:17; <101812>2 Samuel 18:12; <112039>1 Kings 20:39; <243209>Jeremiah 32:9 sq.; comp. Pliny, 33:13), just as among other nations in most ancient times uncoined metal served for money (*A*Elian, *Var. Hist.* 12:10; Strabo, 3. 155), and even to this day the Chinese make their commercial transactions by means of silver bars (Rosenmüller, *Morgenl*. 1:98; see Sperling, *De nummis non cusis*, in Ugolini *Thesaur.* 28). Among the earliest Hebrews, but not afterwards (Crusius, *De origin ib. pecunioe a pecore ante nummum sign.* Petropol. 1748), an ox or other animal (comp. Pliny; 33:3) was traded instead of cash (see Michaelis, *De siclo ante ex'l. Babyl. in the Comment. Soc. Gott*. 2:1752, § 1). Yet already in the time of Abraham there circulated in hither Asia, as it seems, silver ingots (hfyvaq; <013319>Genesis 33:19; <061432>Joshua 24:32; see Gesenius, *Thes. Heb.* p. 1241; Bertheau, p. 24; Tuch, *Gen*. p. 399, 472) of a determined weight, which was probably indicated by marks (<012316>Genesis 23:16; 43:21) stamped upon them (so the Targum of Jonathan explains the former passage by ayfmqrp, i.e. πραγματεία). *SEE KESITAH*. Even under the regularly organized Hebrew state small silverpieces (comp, ἀργύρια, silverling) may have passed in exchange (as among their Phoenician neighbors; but see Herod. 1:94; Philostr. Her. 10:1), although destitute of national authority (see <090908>1 Samuel 9:8; comp. <023013>Exodus 30:13; Le.. 27:3 sq.; <051426>Deuteronomy 14:26), the bars being weighed only in payment of large sums (comp. <121204>2 Kings 12:4), although modern Oriental merchants weigh out even regularly coined money (Volney, Voyage, 2:315). *SEE MERCHANT*. For transportation and preservation, money, as at this day in the East, was deposited in bags (<120523>2 Kings 5:23;

12:10; see Harmor, Observ. 3. 262). See, generally, Bertheau, *Gesch.* d. Isr. p. 14 sq.) *SEE BAG*.

Picture for Coin 3

Picture for Coin 4

After the exile Persian money was most current, especially the *daric* (q.v.), then Graeco-Syrian of the Seleucidae (q.v.), till the time (B.C. 143) of prince Simon (q.v.) the Maccabee, who secured from the Syrian monarchs the right of a native coinage (1 Maccabees 15:6), and issued shekels (q.v.), both' whole and half of which several (some eight) are still extant. The following coin has on one side, in Samaritan, the name of Simon, and some emblems, upon which it is very difficult to pronounce, and on the other "The Deliverance of Jerusalem," with the palm-tree and two vases. There are other coins, bearing on one side the inscription, in Samaritan, "Simon," on the other, "Deliverance of Jerusalem," which are supposed to have been struck by Simon Barcochab, not by Simon Maccabaeus. There are marks on these coins of their having been struck twice, once by the Roman authorities, and again by the Jews; there are also examples of Greek and Roman coins of these double types applied one upon the other. A leaf and vase appear to be the general symbols of the coins struck in Judaea during the dominion of the high-priests, and the coins themselves are for the most part indifferently executed. Those of Alexander Jannaeus are all of bronze, as are also the coins of Antigonus; these last bear the symbol of a cornucopia, the type invariably found upon the coins of this prince. From the inscriptions on the above coins, it is supposed that Antigonus wished to declare that it was in the capacity of descendant of Mattathias that he was high-priest. The coins of the Judaean kings, from Herod the First, are all of bronze, with the exception of a silver one assigned to Herod the Third, which is supposed to be unique. Of Agrippa the Second there are many coins, struck after the destruction of Jerusalem, which present on their reverses portraits of the reigning emperors. The dates on these coins denote the year of the prince's reign. (See each of the kings in their order.) Eventually, however, these Maccabaean shekels passed out of circulation on account of foreign traffic (being especially supplanted by Tyrian mintage, according to Bertheau, p. 45 sq.). *SEE MONEY-CHANGERS*. In the time of Christ Greek currency had mostly prevailed (computed, probably, at a depreciated rate), of which the following pieces are mentioned: the drachma (q.v.), which was the unit of value; the didrachma

(q.v.), or double drachm (δίδραχμον, <401724>Matthew 17:24); and the stater (q.v.), or tetradrachm. The smallest coin was the lepton (λεπτόν, scale, "mite," <411242>Mark 12:42; <421259>Luke 12:59), which was the seventh part of a gold piece (χαλκοῦς), or half the Roman quadrans or "farthing." See MITE. Under the Roman rule the imperial currency naturally obtained in Palestine (see <401217>Matthew 22:17-21), so that thenceforth the Roman becomes the standard (so in the Mishna, Baba Mezia, 4) of Jewish valuation (see Strong's *Harm. and Expos. of the Gospels*, Append. 1). Single coins of this currency named in the N.T. are the following:

(a) The denarius (q.v.), in Greek denarium (δηνάριον, Talm. rnyDæA. V. incorrectly "penny"), the usual unit of popular estimation, corresponding about to the modern shilling;

(b) The assarius (from as [i.e. *aes*, brass], which was strictly the basis of the Roman monetary system, like the modern penny), in Greek *assarium* (ασσάριον, Talmudic usually rSyaæ), of copper (<401029>Matthew 10:29; <421206>Luke 12:6), originally one tenth, then one sisteenth the denarius; it bore the effigy of the emperor during whose reign it was struck. *SEE PENNY*. (Comp. Kype, Observ. 1:57 sq.; Barth, Das rom. As und seine Theile, Lips. 1834.)

(c) The quadrans (or quarter), in Greek kodrantes (κοδράντης, <400526>Matthew 5:26; <411242>Mark 12:42), which was one quarter the as, a copper coin. *SEE FARTHING*. The Attic drachma passed as equivalent to the Roman denarius. There are also occasional references to other and smaller coins (see the Mishna, Maaser Sheni. 2:9; 4:8; Kiddushin, 1:1; 2:1), e.g. the obolus (a[m; mea') = 4 assaria; thependiun (^/Ydæ) = 2 assaria; besides certain antique values, e.g. the zuz (zWz) = shekel, or .25 the stater; the perutah' (hfWrP) = piece of money in general, etc. (see Buxtorf, Lex. Talm. col. 175, 1235, 1754, 1812; Waserus, De nummis Hebraeor. 1. 2, c. 23). Coins were punctured and hung as nowadays around children's necks for ornament (Mishna, Chelim, 12:7). (See Otho, Lex. Rabb. p. 431 sq.; Klemm, De nummis Hebraeor. Tubing. 1730; Eisenschmidt, De ponder*ib.* et nensuris vett. Romans Gresc. et *Heb.* ed. 2, Argent. 1737; Wurnm, *De ponderum, nummorum et mensura. rationib. ap. Romans et Graec*. Stuttg. 1821.) *SEE MONEY*.

The intrinsic worth of money in the various periods of the Hebraeo-Jewish antiquity is very difficult to estimate from the occasional intimations of

mercantile value (see Michaelis, *De pretiis rer. ap. Hebr. ante exil.* in the *Comment.* Soc. Gott. 3. 145 sq.), especially as the measure and quality of articles thus estimated is also uncertain (see Bockh, *Metrolog. Untersuch.* p. 420 sq.). *SEE METROLOGY*. Examples somewhat indicative of this point, however, are the following: in times of plenty, 1 ephah of wheat sold for 1 shekel, and 2 ephahs of barley for 1 shekel (<120708>2 Kings 7:3; comp. Polyb. 1:15); an Egyptian horse in Solomon's time was worth 150 shekels (<111029>1 Kings 10:29); 30 shekels were generally given for a slave (<022132>Exodus 21:32; comp. <013728>Genesis 37:28); for 10 shekels a chaplain could be hired in the times of the Judges (<071710>Judges 17:10). But in flush times prices were often much higher, e.g. a choice vine-stock was held at 1 shekel (<232723>Isaiah 7:23); a threshing-floor, with the oxen, cost David 50 shekels (<102424>2 Samuel 24:24); a single vineyard brought Solomon in 1000 shekels yearly (<220811>Song of Solomon 8:11). Other less definite values may be collected as to fancy matters (<071704>Judges 17:4; <090908>1 Samuel 9:8; <160505>Nehemiah 5:15). In later times a learned slave might be bought (according to Greek and Roman money) for 1 (Alexandrian) talent (Joseph. *Ant.* 12:4, 9); a farm-laborer's daily wages was 1 denarius (<402002>Matthew 20:2); and the charge for more than a single day's tending of an invalid in a caravanserai was 2 denarii (<421035>Luke 10:35). (For other instances of expense, see Josephus, *Ant.* 14:2, 2; *War*, 1:33, 5; *Life*, 13:44.) The comparative cheapness of living among the Israelites (as among the ancients generally, see Bockh, *Staatshaush.* 1:65) is evident, owing, however, rather to the greater rarity of the precious metals as a circulating medium than to anything else. *SEE NUMISMATICS*.

Coislin Manuscript

(so called from the library of Coislin, bishop of Metz, which originally contained most of the leaves), a name applied to two very different Greek uncial MSS.

1. CODEX COISLINIANUS, the great copy of the Sept. Octateuch, first made known by Montfaucon (*Biblioth.* Coislin. 1715), and illustrated by a *fac-simile* in Silvestre's Paleogr. Univ. No. 65. It contains 227 leaves in two columns, 13 inches by 9: the fine massive letters of the sixth or seventh century are much like those of the Alexandrian MS. In the margin, prima manu, Wetstein found <442424>Acts 9:24, 25, and so inserted this as Cod. F in his list of MSS. of the Acts. In 1842 Tischendorf observed nineteen other passages of the N.T., which he published in his *Monumenta Sacra Inedita*

(p. 400 sq.), with a *fac-simile*. These texts are <4105B>Matthew 5:48; 12:48; 27:25; <4042>Luke 1:42; 2:24; 23:21; <4055>John 5:35; 6:53, 55; <4043>Acts 4:33, 34; 10:13, 15; 22:22; <4073>1 Corinthians 7:39; 11:29; <4073>2 Corinthians 3:13; 9:7; 11:33; <4021>Galatians 4:21, 22; <5106>Colossians 2:16, 17; <5805>Hebrews 10:26. These portions of the MS. are designated as F^a of the Gospels, etc. — Scrivener, *Introd. to N.T.* p. 105.

2. FRAGMENTA COISLINIANA, a relic of only fifteen leaves, written stichometrically, with a subscription referring to a comparison with the the copy at Caesarea, which had been written by Pamphilus himself. The letters are large and square. When somewhat faded, the whole (except the subscriptions, which were written in vermillion) was gone over again, most coarsely, by a corrector, who added the accents and breathings, but reblackened the letters in such a manner as thoroughly to destroy their elegance. Fourteen of these leaves were published by Montfau on (ut sup.), who ascribed the MS. to the fifth or sixth century. These sheets were used at Matthew Athos in 1218 as part of the covers of another book, which at length fell into Europeap hands, and was saved; the rest of the MS. had probably perished previously, or been destroyed in a similar manner. After the fire of St. Germain des Prex, where the fragments were preserved, twelve leaves only were found, which are now in the Imperial Library at Paris, and contain <4602>1 Corinthians 10:22-29; 11:9-16; <5407>1 Timothy 3:7-13; <5001>Titus 1:1-3; 1:15-2:5; 3:13-15; <5021>Hebrews 2:11-16; 3:13-18: 4:12-15. Two other leaves, however, were transferred to the Imperial Library at St. Petersburg, and contain <4804>Galatians 1:4-10; 2:9-14. Tischendorf has lately recovered another sheet from Matthew Athos, containing <5103>Colossians 3:4-11. These fragments are known as H of the Pauline Epistles. — Tregelles, in Home's Introd. new ed. 4:194. *SEE MANUSCRIPTS, BIBLICAL*.

Coke Thomas, Ll.D.,

first bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born at Brecon, Wales, Sept. 9, 1747; became a gentleman commoner of Jesus College, Oxford, in his 17th year, and after his graduation had charge of South Petherton parish, Somersetshire. While there he came under the influence of Methodism, and the increased fidelity and earnestness of his ministry excited so much opposition that he abandoned the place and joined Wesley, whom he equaled, if he did not surpass, in itinerant ministerial labors. In 1784 Wesley consecrated him a bishop for the Methodists in America, and

in the same year he presided at the organization of the Methodist Episcopal Church at Baltimore, Md., and consecrated Francis Asbury a bishop. If we except some local consecrations in the Moravian settlements, Coke was the first Protestant bishop of the Western hemisphere. For many years he visited Ireland annually, and presided in its Conferences; he was repeatedly president of the English Conference; he traversed England, Scotland, Wales, and America throughout his long life. He was especially the "foreign minister" of Methodism. His stature was small, his voice feminine, but his soul was as vast as ever dwelt in a human frame. Though he became the first bishop of Methodism in the United States, he found not in a diocese coextensive with the new republic room for his energies. He was continually contriving new measures for the extension of the Gospel. His plans, had he been a man of ordinary, abilities, would have entitled him to the name of fanatic; but he was one of those rare spirits whose greatest conceptions and schemes are the legitimate products of their energies. He crossed the Atlantic eighteen times at his own expense. To the end of his life he had charge of the Methodist missions throughout the. world. He founded the negro missions of the West Indies, which have exerted an important influence on the history of those islands. They included 17,000 members at the time of his death. He not only visited his missions, but spent almost the whole of his patrimonial fortune in their support, preached for them, and begged for them from door to door. The missionary spirit was with him "as a burning fire shut up in his bones;" and during his life it was not deemed necessary to organize a missionary society among the Wesleyans, for he embodied that great interest in his own person. When a veteran of almost seventy years, he presented himself before the Wesleyan Conference as a missionary for the East Indies. The Conference objected on account of the expense, but Coke offered to pay the charges of the outfit himself to the amount of $30,000, and so prevailed over all objections, and embarked with a small band of laborers. He died on the voyage, May 3, 1814, and was buried in the sea; but the undertaking succeeded, and the Wesleyan East India missions are the result. It has been justly asserted that, except Wesley, no man was ever connected with the Methodist body who contributed more to extend the blessings of Christianity. His colleague in the episcopacy of the American Church would not allow of even this exception; "a minister of Christ," said Asbury, when the news of his death arrived — "a minister of Christ, in zeal, in labors, and in services, the greatest man of the last century." Wesley used to say that Coke was a right hand to him. Withal he was a voluminous

writer, publishing *A Sermon on Education*, 1773; *An Address to the Inhabitants of Bristol*, 1782; his ordination sermon at Baltimore, 1784; and many other sermons on the Divinity of Christ, The Witness of the Spirit, and three funeral discourses on the deaths of Wesley, Rev. Mr. Richardson, and Hester Ann Rogers; four sermons on the Christian Ministry; A *Discourse on the Seventh Chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews*. He also issued An Address to the Societies in England on the Settlement of the Chapels, 1795; *An Address to the Weepers*, on a pamphlet of William Hammet, of South Carolina; *Letters to the Societies*, in reply to Rev. Melville Home, 1810; *Life of Wesley*, prepared jointly with Henry Moore; *History of the West Indies*, in 3 vols. 1808; numerous reports and addresses on the missionary cause; *Commentary on the Holy Scriptures*, 6 vols. 4to, completed in 1807; and, subsequently, *Recent Occurrences of Europe considered in Relation to such Prophecies as are now fulfilling or remain yet to be fulfilled*; and the *Cottagers' Bible*, with reflections at the end of the chapters for family reading. See London *Review*, Oct. 1860, art. 3; Drew, *Life of Coke* (New York, 1837); Etheridge, *Life of Coke* (Lond. 1860); Sprague, *Annals*, 7:130; Benson, *Life of Coke* (N. Y. 8vo); Stevens, *History of Methodism*, vols. 2 and in passim, and *Hist. of the Methodist Episcopal Church*, 4 vols. passim.

Co'la

(Χωλά, v. r. Κωλά and Κειλά), a place named only in the Apocrypha (Judith 15:4) in connection with Chobai (q.v.), as one of the cities to which Ozias sent orders to expel the enemies of the Jews after the death of Holofernes. Simonis (Onom. N.T. p. 170) suggests Abel-mecholah. Reland, however (*Paloest.* p. 729), thinks it may be the CULON *SEE CULON* (q.v.) inserted by the Sept. among the cities of Judah (⁶⁵⁶⁰Joshua 15:60).

Colarbasians

SEE COLARBASUS.

Colarbasus

the name of a Gnostic mentioned by Hippolytus (Elenchos, 4:13; 6:5, 55), Epiphanius (*Hoer*. 35), Theodoretus (*Hoeret. fabul*, 1:12), Tertullian (adv. Valentin. 4, and in the appendix to the *Praescripts*, c. 50), and Augustine (de *Hoer*. c. 15), and whose system, according to these writers, was akin

to that of Valentinus, and still more to that of Marcus, representing likewise the emanation of aeons according to the order of the letters of the alphabet and of numbers. According to these writers, in the system of Colarbasus, the first emanation (the "Ogdoas" of Valentinus) did not signify eight different substances, but only eight different relations and effects of the one God, which, according to their different signification, received different names. In the system ascribed to Colarbasus, the aeons were not successively begotten, but all simultaneously brought into existence. To the λόγος and the ζωή place was assigned in this system after the ἄνθρω ος and the ἐκκλησία, an order differing from that in the system of Valentinus. Dr. Volkmar, in an essay entitled *Die Koiarbasus-Gnosis* (in Niedner's Zeitschriftfii *Hist. Theol.* 1855), undertook to show that all the accounts of Colarbasus in the writers above mentioned can be traced to the description by Irenaeus (1, 12, 3 sq.) of the system of the Gnostic Marcus and some modified systems; that the word Colarbasus with Irenaeus (1, 14, 1) is nothing but the mystical designation of the personified number Four ([Bir][i l B) of the highest aeons, the holy τετρακτύς; and that all the subsequent accounts arose from an erroneous confusion of the two statements. This view of Volkmar has been adopted by most of the recent writers on Gnosticism. — Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 8:19 (of which our article is a free translation); Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* 2:691.

Colbert Charles-Joachim,

a relative of the great Colbert, was born at Paris, June 11, 1667, became vicar of Rouen, and general agent of the French clergy. In 1797 he was made bishop of Montpellier, and devoted himself a great deal to induce the Reformed to apostatize. It was under his episcopate that the noted catechism called Catechisme de Montpellier was drawn up by father Poujet. Colbert, in several pastorals and mandements, opposed the bull Unigenitas (q.v.). Some of his writings (3 vols. 4to, 1740) were condemned at Rome. He died April 8,1738. — Hoefer, *Nouvelle Biog. Generale,* 11:114.

Colbert, Jacques Nicolas,

Roman Catholic archbishop of Rouen, of the same family, was born at Paris in 1654, was made archbishop at an early age, and was noted in his administration for his tolerance of the Reformed. He was one of the first

members of the Academy of Inscriptions and Belles-Lettres. He died Dec. 10, 1707. — Hoefer, *Nouvelle Biographie Generale*, 11:112.

Colbert Manuscript

Picture for Colbert Manuscript

(CODEX COLBERTINUS), the latest critical designation of a beautiful cursive Greek MS. of the N.T., now deposited in the Royal or Imperial Library at Paris, of which it is No. 14 (Colbert. 2844); usually designated as 33 of the Gospels, 13 of the Acts and catholic Epistles, and 17 of the Pauline Epistles. It is very important in Biblical criticism, being styled by Eichhorn "the queen among the MSS. in cursive letters" (Einleit. ins N.T. v. 217). It contains all the Greek Test. except the Apocalypse, and includes a portion of the Sept. version of the Prophets. The order of the books is now much confused, but from the writing they appear once to have been arranged as usual. The edges of nearly all the leaves are torn, or cut away, or have otherwise decayed. The MS. has been much injured by exposure to dampness, and the ink has set off on the opposite page, especially in the Acts, so that it is very difficult to read (Tregelles, *Account of the Printed Text of the Greek N.T.*, p. 162). In this way, however, by reading backward the parts thus transferred, many passages have been recovered of which the original writing has become totally effaced, or even the material containing it has perished. It is written on vellum, in folio form, with 42 long lines in each page, in a fine round hand (which undergoes a gradual change in the course of the work), the accents sometimes neglected. Larroque first collated it, but very negligently, and his readings, as communicated by Allix, were inserted in Mill's edition of the New Testament, whence they were transferred to Wetstein's. Griesbach re-examined it in part; then Begtrup to some extent; and Scholz fully, but it would seem cursorily; Tregelles carefully collated it in 1850. "Its text was published by Sabatier" (Davidson, *Treatise on Biblical Criticism*, 2:246). It evidently belongs to the eleventh century, and remarkably confirms the readings of the oldest codices, especially those known as B, D, and L, leaning chiefly to the Alexandrian recension. — Scrivener, *Introduction to the Criticism of the N. Test.*, p. 145; Tregelles, in Horne's *Introduction, new ed.* 4:209. *SEE MANUSCRIPTS, BIBLICAL*.

Colbert William,

a pioneer of the Methodist Episcopal Church in Western New York, was a native of Maryland. He was admitted on trial into the Philadelphia Annual Conference in 1790. In 1792 we find him at the General Conference in the city of Baltimore; he then became connected with the circuits of Tioga and the lake country (a perfect wilderness at the time), and here he labored faithfully and uncomplainingly, notwithstanding the difficulties of all kinds which he had to encounter, until 1811, when he located. In 1826 he was readmitted as a supernumerary, which relation he retained until his death in 1833. — *Minutes of Conferences*, 2:281; Peck, *Early Methodism*, p. 39, 121, 272.

Cole, Henry, D.D.,

an English Romanist divine, and opponent of the Reformation, was born at Godshill, Isle of Wight, and was educated at Winchester School and New College, Oxford, where he became fellow in 1523. In 1540 he became rector of Chelmsford; in 1542, warden of New College. On the accession of Edward VI, Dr. Cole inclined to the Reformation, but afterwards returned to his original views, and after Queen Mary's accession he became a zealous Romanist. 'When Cranmer was burnt, Cole preached a violent sermon at the execution. In 1557 he was made "vicar-general of spiritualities" under Cardinal Pole. He was prominent in "all the proceedings against Protestants in those dreadful times." In the first year of Elizabeth he was fined 1000 marks "for contempt of the queen's majesty," and in May, 1560, he was sent to the Tower, where he did not remain long. He died in London in 1579. Among his writings are, *Disputation with Cranmer and Ridley*, 1554; *Funeral Sermon at the burning of Cranmer* (both in Fox's *Arts and Monuments*); *Letters to Bishop Jewell*, Lond. 1560, 8vo. — Strype, *Annals*; Burnet, *History of the Reformation*; Hook, *Ecclesiastes Biography*, 4:126.

Cole, Thomas,

an English Nonconformist, was educated at Westminster School, and at Christ Church, Oxford. In 1656 he became principal of St. Mary's Hall, where he was tutor to John Locke. In 1660 he was ejected from Oxford by the king's commissioners for nonconformity, and opened an academy at Nettle. head, Oxfordshire. Thence he removed to London, where he became pastor of a large congregation, and one of the lecturers at Pinner's

Hall. He was a strong opponent of the Neonomian (q.v.) doctrine. He died in September, 1697. Among his writings are, *A Discourse on Regeneration, Faith, and Repentance*, Lond. 1689, 8vo*; A Discourse of the Christian Religion; Imputed Righteousness for Justification incomprehensible by human Reason*. — Calamy, *Nonconfornmist's Memorial*, 1:196.

Coleridge, Samuel Taylor,

was born at Ottery St. Mary, in Devonshire, of which parish his father was the vicar, on the 21st of October, 1772. An orphan at the age of nine, he was sent to Christ's Hospital, where Charles Lamb was among his contemporaries. Here he made very great progress in classical knowledge, and at an early age plunged deeply into metaphysics. Speaking of himself in the *Biographia Literaria* (vol. 1, p. 15), he says: "At a very premature age, even before my fifteenth year, I had bewildered myself in metaphysics and in theological controversy. Nothing else pleased me. History and particular facts lost all interest in my mind. Poetry itself, yea, novels and romances, became insipid to me." In 1791 he entered Jesus College, Cambridge, but in the second year of his residence he suddenly left the University in a fit of despondency, occasioned, it is said, by unrequited love; and after wandering for a while about the streets of London in extreme pecuniary distress, terminated this adventure by enlisting in the 15th Dragoons, under the assumed name of Comberbatch. One of the officers, questioning him in a friendly manner, and eliciting his real history, communicated Coleridge's situation to his friends, who forthwith effected his discharge. Coleridge now betook himself to Bristol, where he joined with three other young and clever men, like himself of ardent poetic temperaments, and imbued with strong but vague ideas of universal brotherhood — Southey, George Burnet from Oxford, and Lovell, a young Quaker. They formed a scheme for emigrating to the banks of the Susquehanna in North America, to form a social colony, where selfishness was to be proscribed. But money was needed to establish this "pantisocracy," as they termed it, and Coleridge had not enough to furnish him with daily subsistence. Joseph Cottle, a benevolent bookseller at Bristol, finding that he had written enough poems to make up a small volume, offered him thirty guineas for them. The volume was published in 1794, and other literary schemes were projected. In 1795 Coleridge married Miss Sarah Fricker, of Bristol, a sister of the wife of his friend Charles Lloyd. In 1796 he published a volume of poems, the greater number of which had been written at earlier periods,

interspersed with some by Charles Lamb; and in 1797 a second edition appeared, with the addition of some poems by Charles Lloyd.

Coleridge was at this period of his life a Unitarian. He says of himself, "I was at that time, and long after, though a Trinitarian (i.e. *ad normam Platonis*) in philosophy, yet a zealous Unitarian in religion; more accurately, I was a *psilanthropist*, one of those who believe our Lord to have been the real son of Joseph, and who lay the main stress on the resurrection rather than the crucifixion" (*Biog. Lit.* 1:168). In 1798 Coleridge visited Germany, and went through a course of German literature. On his return to England he went to live at the Lakes, where Southey and Wordsworth had then settled, the one at Keswick, and the other at Grasmere. The appellation of "Lake-poets" was given to these three writers after the publication of the *Lyrical Ballads*. Coleridge now became connected with the *Morning Post*, and wrote both on politics and literature. From about 1808 to about 1814 he contributed to the *Courier*. In 1809 he edited the *Friend*, first published as a periodical at the Lakes. He left the Lakes in 1810, and did not afterwards return to them; his wife and children remained in the house of Southey, and wholly dependent on him. On Coleridge's first arrival in London he resided with Mr. Basil Montagu, and in 1816 he became the guest of Mr. Gillman at Highgate, in whose house he died. The many friendships which Coleridge attracted to himself through *Life*, the sincerity and constancy of which were abundantly shown, place in a striking light the amiability of his character; his neglect of his family and extreme carelessness respecting the obligations, both personal and pecuniary, which devolved upon him, as strikingly illustrate its weakness. It was not before the commencement of his residence in London that he formed any very extensive acquaintance with the writings of the later German metaphysicians, by the adoption of whose method and terminology, rather than by any development of a system, in his subsequent publications, he came to be accounted the representative of German metaphysics in England. He published successively, between the years 1817 and 1825, the *Lay Sermons*, the *Biographia Literaria*, the bound volume of the *Friend*, the *Constitution of the Church and State according to the Idea of each*, and the *Aids to Reflection*. During most of his life Coleridge was poor and dependent, from careless improvidence. He suffered also from chronic ill health, combined with, and to a certain extent caused by, a habit of using opium. He died July 25, 1834. — *English Cyclopaedia*.

Of Coleridge as a *poet* we do not here speak. As a metaphysical theologian, his influence upon his own age, and especially upon its younger men of genius, was greater than that of any other Englishman. His mental attributes were of a high order, strangely blended, and thoroughly cultivated. To a subtlety which would have distinguished him in the age of scholasticism, he added a great compass of thought. The devotional and expository writings of the best English divines, such as Hooker, Taylor, Baxter, Leighton, and Wesley, were congenial food for his mystical and religious nature. With his enlarged knowledge he abandoned Unitarianism. and formed for himself a half-complete theology, partly orthodox, partly mystical, and partly (though unconsciously) pantheistic. "It was one of his most cherished schemes — his favorite vision in cloudland — to compose a work of colossal proportions which should embrace the whole range of mental philosophy taken in its widest meaning, including, of course, theology and religion. He really only wrote a few disconnected fragments of his mighty task. But these fragments have proved of immense suggestiveness to younger intellects," and Coleridgeans may be found now among every class of English divines, from the Broad Church to the highest Puseyites. The condition of the English mind at the time of Coleridge's appearance is to be noted, as accounting for the wonderful influence he gained. "The received philosophy was sensationalism in intelligence and thought, and utilitarianism in morals; and the received theology contented itself with dealing forth, when didactic, the dry husks of a powerless moralism, and, when argumentative, with insisting upon the external evidences of Christianity. Grotius and Paley (whose Moral Philosophy was a text-book at Cambridge) were the oracles on the subject of the Christian evidences. Arianism and Unitarianism, always found alongside of sensationalism and materialism, had crept like a fog-blight over half the face of British Christianity. In such a state of things, it is easy to understand how the appearance of a teacher like Coleridge would be welcomed. He was the declared enemy of the sensational and utilitarian philosophers. He was reputed to have mastered the German philosophy, to have abstracted from it what was sound and true, and to have attained to a clear vision, from the utmost height of human thought, of the ultimate unity, the perfect and vital harmony, of philosophy and theology, of the revelation of reason and the revelation of God. He professed himself a devout and orthodox Christian believer. Most of all, he impressed and attracted the young men of his time by his noble ideal of thought and purpose, his reverent spirit, his far-seeing, practical wisdom, his critical and

intuitive sagacity, his union of deep learning, fine taste, and recluse habits, with philosophic breadth of view and wide human sympathies.

"One main point, perhaps the main point, of Coleridge's *Philosophy* was the Kantian distinction between the reason and the understanding. Upon this distinction Coleridge grafted his peculiar, and, as we think, unchristian doctrine of the Logos. Many who have not followed Coleridge in the theological doctrine have agreed with him in reference to the metaphysical distinction, according to which the understanding is the logical faculty in man, the reason is the intuitive faculty, which stands face to face with spiritual and essential truth; and the immediate object of which is, as Mr. Morell says, 'the good, the beautiful, and the true.' The intuitive faculty in man has thus assigned to it an entirely separate sphere, and that the very highest. It dwells in a region apart, elevated above that of the logical understanding, and is quite independent of it. Being thus independent of the understanding, it is independent, so far as the morally good and right is concerned, of revelation also (which must be presented to it through the understanding), except in so far as it may, by its own light and authority, approve and warrant that which revelation brings before it. For reason, understood as above defined, must, whether in matters of taste, criticism, or morals, he the supreme judge, and be a law unto itself. Thus the scintillations of genius and the light of piety are but different manifestations of the same faculty. How well this accords with Coleridge's supplementary doctrine, that reason is the light in man of the divine Logos, and how naturally it is developed into Maurice's doctrine of the identification of the Word or Son of God, with all men, will be readily seen. How nearly related it is to the modern Pantheism is no less obvious. Coleridge, in a passage of his *Table Talk*, with which many passages in his writings fully accord, speaks of 'that higher state, to which Aristotle could never raise himself, but which was natural to Plato, and has been to others' [himself, for instance], 'in which the understanding is distinctly contemplated, and, as it were, looked down upon from the throne of actual ideas, or living, inborn, essential truths.' He speaks of the spirit's ascending into 'the empyreon of ideas.' He identifies the reason with the divine-Logos, making him, in this sense, to be the 'light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world.' He denies, as many have learned from him to deny, the possibility of a *revelation ab extra*. He speaks of the Trinity as an 'idea,' and analyzes this 'idea' in such a way as to resolve the Tri-unity into what is really no better than a refined, Platonized Sabellianism — only not Sabellianism,

because not allowed to be conceived under any conditions of time and space. Such are some of the results of Coleridge's peculiar philosophy as applied to solve, or as used to measure and define, the mysteries of being, human and divine" (see Curry, in *Methodist Quarterly*, Jan. 1854, art. 2; and Rigg, in *Methodist Quarterly*, April, 1856, art. 1; July, 1856, art. 1). His views of Inspiration, as given in the *Confessions of an Inquiring Spirit*, are almost as low as those of the Rationalists. His theory of the atonement seems to exclude almost entirely the idea of substitution, in order to avoid what he calls the "commercial" theory.

The only uniform edition of Coleridge's works is that of Professor Shedd (N. Y. Harpers, 1853, 7 vols. 12mo). Prefixed to it will be found Marsh's admirable *Preliminary Essay to the Aids to Reflection*, and also an able and genial *Introductory Essay* by Professor Shedd. The work needs nothing but an index to be complete. Of Gillman's *Life of Coleridge* (Lond. 1838), two volumes were promised, but only one has appeared. In 1866 appeared Dr. J. H. Green's *Spiritual Philosophy*, founded on the *Teaching of S. T. Coleridge*, edited by J. Simon (Lond. 2 vols. 8vo). Critical essays on Coleridge abound in the leading reviews: among those that examine his philosophical theology and its results are papers in the *Christian Spectator*, 6:617; *Princeton Review*, 20:144; *Bibliotheca Sacra*, 4:117; *Theological Journal* (Lord's), 1:631; *Am. Biblical Repository*, July, 1849, art. 1; British Quarterly, Jan. 1854, art. 4.

Coles, Elisha,

a native of Northamptonshire, was made steward of Magdalen College, Oxford, during the Commonwealth, when the famous Independent, Dr. Goodwin, was head of that college. After the Restoration be obtained a clerkship in the East India House, which he is supposed to have held until his death in 1688. His name is preserved by his well-known treatise entitled A practical Treatise on God's Sovereignty, originally published in 1673, 4to, and many times reprinted. It is thoroughly Calvinistic.

Coles, George,

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and for many years a journalist. He was born in England, June 2, 1792; converted at twelve; became a local preacher in 1814; emigrated to America in 1818, and immediately entered the itinerant ministry in the New York Conference. He was an "effective preacher" for thirty-three years, and on the 1st of May,

1858, he died in New York. He was an invalid more than half of his *Life*, yet eminently cheerful and useful. Though his advantages of education while young were limited, he was nevertheless a very well-read man, and for twelve years was eminently successful as assistant editor of the *Christian Advocate and Journal*, and three years sole editor of the *Sunday-school Advocate* and Sunday-school books. Among his published works are *The Antidote* (18mo), *Lectures to Children* (18mo), *Scripture Concordance* (18mo), *My youthful Days* (18mo), *My first seven Years in America* (18mo), and *Heroines of Methodism* (12mo). Mr. Coles was a sincere and simple-hearted Christian gentleman, loving all, by all beloved. As a preacher, although not powerful, he was clear, instructive, persuasive, and eminently consolatory. “His journal, which was carefully kept for nearly fifty years, shows how he longed to live and labor for God.” His death was peaceful and beautiful. — *Minutes of Conferences*, 1858, p. 148.

Colet, Dr. John,

was born in London in 1466; was educated at Oxford, and traveled on the Continent for seven years, where he made the acquaintance of many eminent scholars, especially of Erasmus, Bus daeus, and Linacer, and where he also learned Greek. He obtained Church preferment when very young. In 1497 he commenced lecturing at Oxford on St. Paul’s Epistles, and drew crowds of students. In 1505 he was made dean of St. Paul’s, in which capacity his endeavors to restore discipline brought on him, though happily without effect, a charge of heresy. He introduced divinity lectures at St. Paul’s, delivered by himself and others. “These lectures raised in the nation a spirit of inquiry after the Holy Scriptures, which had then long been laid aside for the school divinity, and so might be said to prepare a way for the reformation which soon after ensued. We cannot but think that Colet was in some measure instrumental towards it, though he did not live to see it effected, for he expressed a great contempt for religious houses, exposed the abuses that prevailed in them, and the mischiefs attending the imposing celibacy on the clergy. This way of thinking, together with his free and public manner of communicating his thoughts, which were then regarded as impious and heretical, rendered him very obnoxious to the clergy, and exposed him to a persecution from the bishop of London. Latimer tells us in his sermons, not only was Colet brought into trouble, but he would certainly have gone to the stake had not God turned the king’s heart.” In 1512 he founded and endowed the noble institution of St.

Paul's School for 153 scholars. He died in 1519. He wrote a Latin Grammar for St. Paul's School, which was long in use. Among his religious writings were, *Daily Devotions*, or the *Christian's morning and evening Sacrifice* (Lond. 1693, 12mo); *Monition to a godly Life* (Lond. 1534); *Epistolae ad Erasmusn*, etc. See Knight's *Life of Dean Colet* (Lond. 1724, 8vo); Jones, *Christ. Biog.*; Seebohm, *Oxford Reformers* (Lond. 1867).

Col-he'zeh

(*Heb. Kol-chozeh'*, hz,joA lK; *every seer*; Sept. Χολεζέ, Χαλαζά), a descendant of Judah, being the son of Hazaiah, and father of one Baruch (16105Nehemiah 11:5), B.C. ante 536. He had also a son named Shallun, who repaired part of the walls of Jerusalem after the Captivity (16315Nehemiah 3:15).

Coligni, Gaspard De,

admiral of France, was born February 16, 1517, at his ancestral castle, Chatillon-sur-Loing. His father, Gaspard de Coligni, marshal of France, died early (1522), and bequeathed to his widow the task of educating three sons. In this she was assisted by two masters, one of whom instructed the boys in languages and philosophy, and the other in bodily exercises. Gaspard early distinguished himself for a firmness of character and purity of private life very rare in those days. His only friend was the young duke Francis of Guise, afterwards among his bitterest enemies. He entered upon the career of arms, and early won high celebrity in the wars against Italy and Spain. In 1547, at thirty, Coligni was made commander of the French infantry. The very severe discipline introduced by him changed the wild bands of lawless soldiery into an organized army. In 1547 the year in which his mother died, he was married to Charlotte de Laval. But the troubles of his times called him soon again and again to the front of battle; the happy issue of the campaign of 1552-55 is to be ascribed to him. He became governor of Champagne, later of Picardy and Isle de France. In 1552 he was made admiral of France. When King Henry II violated the truce, and the war with Spain broke out anew, Coligni was commissioned to defend St. Quentin against the Spaniards. In spite of a heroic defense, on the 27th of August St. Quentin fell. Coligni was taken prisoner and brought to the Netherlands, where he remained two years. Here he became a Protestant. At the peace of Chateau-Cambresis in 1559, he regained his liberty for a

ransom of 50,000 florins. Through the sudden death of Henry II (1559), and the ascension of his throne by Francis II, the Guises became temporarily all powerful, and Coligni lost many of his honors. He left the court with a light heart. He had been suspected of “heresy,” but had not yet publicly confessed himself a Protestant. Aware that this step might be fatal to his family, it was only after his wife had gladly confessed to the “Church of Christ” that he partook of the Lord’s Supper in presence of the whole village. The news was received with rejoicing among all Protestants. While Coligni lived a peaceful, secluded life with his family, the public discontent at the usurpations of the Guises had reached a climax. The conspiracy of Amboise in 1560 amply shows the state of popular opinion in France. Coligni did not participate in, though he seems to have known of the plot. But at the Convention of the Notables he made brave but ineffectual attempts to gain more freedom of worship for the Protestants.

The death of Francis II, in 1560, however, changed the whole aspect of affairs. Coligni and his brother Andelot were reinstated in their honors, and now more than ever Protestantism found a powerful protector in him. He took part in the terrible religious wars which lasted for thirty years. At the head of the Roman Catholic party stood the Guises, while Conde and Coligni led the Protestants. But the latter suffered severe reverses, and only after the assassination of Francis of Guise, 1563, by Jean Poltrot, fortune began to be once more favorable to them. Coligni was not implicated in this murder, as has sometimes been asserted. After the peace of Amboise, concluded March 19, in which freedom of conscience and of worship was granted the Protestant nobility, the admiral again retired to his estates in Chatillon. Four years, later the war broke out anew, and was on both sides waged with the old spirit and bitterness. For a time the prospects of the Reformed party looked very dark. In 1569 Conde fell, and only a few weeks later Coligni’s brother Andelot. The admiral’s siege of Poitiers was a failure; and, while he withdrew his troops, the Parliament in Paris had condemned him to death, hung him in effigy, broke his escutcheon, and offered a price of 50,000 florins for his head. Coligni’s life, indeed, was endangered by several attempts to assassinate him. But no reverses could break Coligni’s spirit or daunt his energy In 1570, at Arnay le Due, the Protestants gained a complete victory; and shortly after all further movements were ended by a truce, which resulted in the peace of St. Germains.

Coligni's wife had died three years before, and in 1571 the admiral, although already at an advanced age, married Jaqueline, countess of Montlul and Entremont, a young, beautiful, intelligent, and pious lady of Savoy. Meanwhile the current of opinion at court seemed to be gradually settling in favor of the Protestants. — The union of the two parties was to be completed by the marriage of Henry of Navarre (later Henry IV) to Margaret of Valois. Charles IX needed a man who would be equally respected by all parties, and Coligni was summoned to court. He went full of confidence in the king's good-will; and, indeed, it does not appear that Charles and his mother, Catharine de Medicis, had at that time any hostile intentions towards him. The admiral wept tears of joy at his reception in Blois (Sept. 13, 1571). The king embraced him, and both Charles and his mother showed him every honor. Gradually Coligni gained a decided influence over the king, and made good use of it in favor of the Huguenots. Catharine became alarmed, and her jealousy of Coligni changed into hatred, although it appears that as yet Charles was not ill disposed towards the admiral. On the 18th of August, 1572, the marriage of Henry and Margaret took place. On the same day Coligni wrote to his wife that he hoped to see her soon, as he was weary of court life. These were the last Ilines she ever received from his hand. Four days I later, as he was walking in the street, a shot was fired at him from a house in the present Rue de Rivoli; a finger of his right hand was destroyed, and his left arm wounded. The assassination of the admiral was ascribed to the Guises, and filled all Paris with alarm and horror. The king visited Coligni, professed the greatest sympathy, and swore to the Protestants he would be revenged for the bloody deed. But Catharine de Medicis had resolved on Coligni's death. On the evening of the 23d, everything was prepared for the terrible massacre that was to take place on the following night. On the 23d, after midnight, a guard of only five men and a few servants remained with the admiral. In the morning, between one and two (Sunday, August 24), a murderous band approached the house. It had been resolved to kill the admiral first, and then give the signal for the general massacre. The young Duke of Guise had undertaken to destroy his great enemy. The doors were burst open and the guards killed. At the first noise Coligni requested to be lifted from his bed, and said to his minister, "Say a prayer, sir; I put my soul into the Savior's hand." A servant burst into the room, and on being questioned, replied, "God calls us." "I have long been ready to die," Coligni replied; "but you others save yourselves." The murderers entered the room, and found the admiral standing upright. One called to him, "Are

you not the admiral?" "Yes," Coligni answered with dignity; "and you, young man, should respect my gray hairs, and not take my life." With an oath the soldier thrust his sword into Coligni's breast. His body, in which life was still not entirely extinct, was thrown out of the window. Guise, who had been waiting below, wiped the blood from the face of the corpse to recognize it, and kicked the body with his foot. An Italian, Petrucci, cut off the head and brought it to the Louvre. The body was mutilated, dragged through the streets of Paris, and at last hung upon the gallows by the feet. When Charles IX came to see it a few days later, he is said to have repeated the words of Vitellius, "The body of an enemy always smells well." In Parliament, on the 26th of August, he stated that the massacre of St. Bartholomew had been necessary to prevent the execution of a plot in which the king was to be assassinated, and accused Coligni of ingratitude and treason. The servile Parliament accepted these statements, declared Coligni a traitor, and decreed the forfeiture of all his rights and honors, which resolution was, however, afterwards completely revoked. — Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 19:331 sq.; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 11:137; Haag, *La France Protestante*, vol. 3.

Co'lius

(Κώλιος v. r. Κώ ος, Vulg. *Coluis*), a Levito "also called Calitas" (1 Esdras 9:23), for which the Heb. text (<15102>Ezra 10:23) has " KELAIAH *SEE KELAIAH* (q.v.), the same as Kelita."

Collar

the rendering of one Gr. and two Heb. words in the Auth. Vers. 1. hP, (*peh*, <18308>Job 30:18; where, however, some merely read /mK] as), properly signifies a *mouth*, in which sense it often occurs, and is hence applied to any aperture or orifice. *SEE MOUTH*. It is frequently applied elsewhere (as in the passage cited) to the opening of a garment that closes around the. neck, such as the tunic (<12823>Exodus 39:23, <19332>Psalm 133:2). See EPHOD. 2. t/pyfa} (*netiphoth'*, drops, <07086>Judges 8:26), "collars," mentioned among the spoils of the Midianites, were a peculiar kind of pendant, or ear-drop, probably of pearls, and hence different from the ordinary ear-ring (q.v.). The same term occurs in the list of female attire in <23819>Isaiah 3:19, where it is translated "chains" (q.v.). 3. "Ιμας (Ecclesiasticus 33:26), a thong, i.e. strap for harnessing a beast of burden to the yoke (q.v.).

Collation

(Lat. *collatio*). When a bishop gives a benefice, which either he had as patron, or which came to him by lapse, he is said to "collate" to that benefice the clergyman on whom he bestows it. Where the living is not in the gift of the bishop, he is said to "institute" the clergyman to it. The word collation is also used among ecclesiastical writers to denote the spare meal on days of abstinence, consisting of bread or other fruits, but without meat. — Hook; Eden.

Collect

Picture for Collect

(Lat. *Collecta*, from *colligeare*, to collect), a short form of prayer in the liturgies of the Roman Catholic and the Anglican churches. In a wider sense, the word *collecta* was used by ancient writers of the Latin Church, like the Greek σύναξις, to designate a meeting of Christians for public worship. But soon it came to be restricted to several portions of the liturgy. The origin of this signification of the word is doubtful. According to some ritualists, the name indicates the comprehensive brevity of such prayers, the matter of the epistle and gospel, e.g. being gathered up, or collected, into the collect for the day Others derive the name from an ancient practice of the chief minister collecting into a single brief and public prayer at the end of some part of the service the previous (private) devotions of the people; accordingly, one of the service-books of the ancient Catholic Church was called *Collectarium*, as containing such prayers. Liturgical writers trace some of the collects to the Leonian Sacramentary used in the Roman Church about 483 A.D.; others to the Sacramentary of Bishop Gelasius of Rome (494); and the majority to the Sacramentary of Gregory I (590).

The collects in the Roman Missal begin with *Oremus* (Let us pray), and conclude with the invocation, "*Per Dominum nostrum Jesum Christum, filium tuum, qui tecum vivit et regnat in unitate Spiritus Sancti Deus per omnia scecula sceculorum. Amen.*" They occur before the Epistle, before the Preface and after the Communion, and consist sometimes of one, sometimes of several petitions; but if consisting of more than two, the introductory *Oremus* and the concluding "*Per Dominum*," etc., are used only twice, all the intermediate petitions being joined to the last. In solemn

masses, the collects before the epistle and after the communion are sung. Similar collects as in the Missal occur in the Breviary.

On the collects retained in the *Anglican Prayerbook*, Dr. Comber remarks: "Our reformers observed, first, that some of those collects were corrupted by superstitious alterations and additions, made by some later hand. Secondly, that the modern Roman Missals had left some of the primitive collects quite out, and put in their stead collects containing some of their false opinions, or relating to their innovations in practice. When the mass had struck out an old and put in a new collect, agreeable to their new and false doctrines or practices, there the Reformers restored the old collect, being pure and orthodox. At the restoration of king Charles II, even those collects made or allowed at the Reformation were strictly reviewed, and what was deficient was supplied and all that was but incongruously expressed was rectified, so that now they are complete and unexceptionable, and may be ranked into three several classes. First, the ancient primitive collects, containing nothing but true doctrine, void of all modern corruptions, and having a strain of the primitive devotion, being short but regular, and very expressive. The second order of collects are also ancient as to the main; but where there were any passages that had been corrupted, they were struck out, and the old form restored, or that passage rectified; and where there was any defect it was supplied. The third order are such as had been corrupted in the Roman Missals and Breviaries, and contained something of false doctrine, or at least of superstition, in them; and new collects were made instead of these at the Reformation, under king Edward VI; and some few which were added anno 1662."

The following tables of the Collects for Sundays and other holidays used in the English Liturgy were partly formed by bishop Cosins, and were published by Comber:

See Wetzer u.Welte, *Kirchenz-Lex*. 2:665; Eadie, *Eccl. Dict.* 157; Hook, *Church Dictionary*, s.v.; Bingham, *Orig. Eccl.* bk. 15, ch. 1; Palmer, *Orig. Liturg*. 1:319 sq.; Comber, *Companion to the Temple* (London, 1841, 7 vols.); *Despense, Traite des Collectes*; Lebrun, *Explication des Ceremonies*, 1:192. *SEE LITURGY*.

Collection

(1.) t a e a e *maseth'*, something taken up, e.g. *tribute* (2 Chronicles 24:6, 9; elsewhere "gift," "mess," etc.);

(2.) for συνάγω, to *contribute* (Baruch 1:6);

(3.) λογία, a pecuniary collection ([461601]1 Corinthians 16:1; “gathering,” ver. 2). *SEE ASSESSMENT*.

In the apostolic age the Christians of Palestine were more straitened than other churches, and this might be from their being assailed with every cort of oppression by the Jews. The activity of Paul in taking up collections on their behalf is evident from what is said in [442417]Acts 24:17; [451525]Romans 15:25, 26; 2 Corinthians 8 and 9, and [480210]Galatians 2:10. For this purpose the apostle, in [461602]1 Corinthians 16:2, says, “Upon the first day of the week let every one of you lay by him in store as God hath prospered him.” The reason why this day was appointed for this purpose seems to be that, by the early Christians, the first day of the week was observed as the Sabbath of the Lord; and consequently, as on that day they commemorated that which formed the great bond of union between them and other Christians, it was the most suitable occasion for their displaying their love in the way prescribed, and also the time when they would be most liberal ([461601]1 Corinthians 16:1-3). *SEE ALMS*.

Collector

(ἄρχων φορολογίας, *chief of the tribute-levy*), a tax-gatherer (1 Maccabees 1:29). *SEE PUBLICAN*.

College

occurs ([122214]2 Kings 22:14; [143422]2 Chronicles 34:22) as the translation of hn,v]mi (mishneh’, second rank), the residence of the prophetess Huldah (q.v.). The same term is used in [360110]Zephaniah 1:10 (translated “second”), where the different quarters of Jerusalem are spoken of, and is found more fully in [161109]Nehemiah 11:9 (where, instead of “the *second* over the city,” the original has hn,v]Mæ ry[ihæ l[i, “upon the city second,” i.e. over the second part of the city). From all these notices we can only gather that there was anciently a quarter or district that went by this appellation, but there is no definite intimation of its position. It may have been only another name for ACRA *SEE ACRA* (q.v.), or the Lower City, which was built subsequently to the more fashionable portion of the city on Matthew Zion. The word occurs frequently elsewhere in its ordinary signification of persons or things that occupy a second place in order, dignity, honor, etc. *SEE JERUSALEM*.

College

(Lat. *collegium*, a collection or assemblage).

(1.) "In its Roman signification, a college signified any association of persons for a specific purpose. In many respects it was synonymous with *corpus*, a body or collection of members, a corporation — with *universitas*, a whole as contrasted with its parts — and with *societas*, a company or partnership, as opposed to all the members of which it was composed. A Roman college had a common chest, and it could sue and be sued in the name of its manager (actor or syndicus), just like an incorporation with us. It required, also, to be incorporated by some sort of public authority, springing either from the Senate or the emperor. A college could not consist of fewer than three persons."

(2.) The term is applied to any company of persons associated upon some common principle; so we speak of the college of the apostles; the college of cardinals; a college or synod of bishops; and as "three" are required for a college, it has come to be usage that three bishops unite in the act of ordination of bishops.

(3.) The word "college" is used also, in England, to designate an endowed institution connected with a university, having for its object the promotion of learning. In this relation a college is a sub-corporation, i.e. a member of the body known as the University. The constitution of a college in this sense depends wholly on the will of the founder, and on the regulations which may be imposed by the visitors whom he has appointed. In Scotland and in America, the distinction between the college as the member and the university as the body has been lost sight of, and we consequently hear of the one and the other indiscriminately granting degrees, a function which in the English and in the original European view of the matter belonged exclusively to the university. Where there is but one college in a university, as is the case in the universities of Scotland and most of those in America, the two bodies are of course identical, though the functions which they perform are different. In Germany there are no colleges in the English sense; and though the universities in that country perform precisely the same functions as in Scotland, the verbal confusion between the college and the university is avoided by the latter performing the functions of both in its own name, as two separate parts of its proper duties. In France the title 'college' has a meaning totally different from: that which we attach to

it: it is a school, corresponding, however, more to the gymnasium of Germany than to the grammar-school of this country. All the colleges are placed under the University of France, to which the centralizing tendencies of that country have given a meaning which also differs widely from that which the term university bears in England." *SEE UNIVERSITY*.

Collegia Pontificia

(papal colleges), institutions for training Romish missionaries for service among "heretical" and pagan nations. The first was the German college at Rome, founded by Loyola in 1552. Greek, English, Hungarian, Maronite, and Thraco-Illyrian colleges were established by Gregory XIII. Scottish and Irish colleges followed; and the institution of the Congregation de propaganda fide was succeeded by the erection of the college which bears the same title. More recently, an "American college" (1854) and a South American college have been established. *SEE PROPAGANDA*.

Coliegial Or Collegiate Church

(1.) In the Roman Church, a church served by canons regular or secular. They originated in a desire to have mass conducted in towns which had no cathedral (q.v.), with greater pomp than could be had with one priest. Originally the canons dwelt in common in one college, but this was afterwards abandoned. *SEE CANONS*.

(2.) In England there are several *collegiate* churches, which are served by a dean and a body of canons. They differ from cathedrals in that the see of the bishop is at the latter. The service is or should be the same in both. They are under the jurisdiction of the bishop of the diocese in which they are situated, and he exercises visitorial powers over them. (3.) Several churches connected in one corporation are called "collegiate" churches: e.g. a combination of several Reformed Protestant Dutch churches in New York is so styled.

Collegial Or Collegiate System

a mode of exhibiting the relation of Church and State employed by Puffendorf and Pfaff in Protestant Germany. The churches were regarded as being, after Constantine's time, legal corporations (*collegia licita*), with rights to form their creeds, conduct their worship, choose their presiding officer, admit and expel members; to make and administer by-laws, correct

such abuses as might creep in among them, call in the aid of the civil power if necessary, or in certain cases to leave the exercise of these rights to others. It was assumed that the rights originally belonging to the congregations, which had been in course of time usurped by the hierarchy, were restored to the congregations by the Reformation, and were left by the Reformed congregations to the civil authorities. According to this view, the civil authority would have a double power with regard to the Church, the *jus circa sacra*, the light of superintendence and of patronage, which inheres in the secular authority, and the *jus in sacris*, the sum of the collegial rights in internal affairs of the Church, transferred to it (the secular government) as the representative of the congregations of the country. For some time this view was eagerly made use of by most of the Protestant state governments, but in modern times it has more or less given way in every country to a sounder conception of the relation between Church and State. — Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* 2:667. *SEE CHURCH AND STATE*.

Collegiants

a party of the Remonstrants of Holland. It derived its name from the members calling their assemblies colleges. They rejected all creeds, all regular ministers, and all tests of communion and forms of ecclesiastical government. They are sometimes called Rhinsbergers, because they met twice a year at Rhinsberg, a village near Leyden. The Collegiants were confined to Holland; but some of their practices are followed by other religious bodies in other countries, as by the Plymouth Brethren (q.v.) in England. — Mosheim, *Church History*, cent. 17, pt. 2; ch. 7.

Collegiate Church

SEE COLLEGIAL OR COLLEGIATE CHURCH.

Collier, Jeremy, an English non-juror, was born Sept. 23,1650, at Stow-with-Quy, Cambridgeshire. He passed M.A. at Caius College, Cambridge, in 1676, and obtained the living of Ampton, Sussex, which he resigned for the lectureship of Gray's Inn, 1685. At the Revolution of 1688 he not only refused the oaths, but was active in behalf of the dethroned monarch. In 1696 he was outlawed. At last he turned his talents to better ends, and made war on the licentiousness of the theater. His first work on this subject was, *A Short View of the Immorality and Profaneness of the Stage* (Loud. 1738, 3d ed. 8vo). The wits in vain opposed him, and after a ten years'

struggle, in which he wrote other books and pamphlets on the subject, he accomplished his object. The rest of his life was spent in various literary labors. He was consecrated a nonjuring bishop by Dr. Hicks in 1713, and died April 26, 1726. Collier was a man of eminent abilities, but of small reasoning faculty. Besides the books above named, he wrote *Ecclesiastical History of Great Britain* (new edition, with Life of Collier, Lend. 1840, 9 vols. 8vo); *Essays on Moral Subjects* (Lond. 3 vols. 8vo); *Historical, Geographical, and Poetical Dictionary*, from Moreri, with additions (Lond. 1701-27, 4 vols. fol.), besides numerous controversial tracts. — Macaulay, *Hist. of England*, 3. 363; *Life of Collier* (prefixed to his *Ec. History of England*); Hook, *Eccles. Biography*, 4:137 *Biographia Britannica*, 4:12.

Collier, Joseph Avery

a minister of the Reformed Protestant Dutch Church, was born at Plymouth, Mass., Oct. 26, 1828, graduated at Rutgers College, New Brunswick, N. J., July, 1849, and at the theological seminary of the Reformed Dutch Church in that city, July, 1852. Died at Kingston, N. Y., August, 1864. He was a clear, methodical, persuasive, and eloquent preacher. His literary attainments were unusually large, and entirely consecrated to his ministry. As a preacher to children and the young men he is entitled to the first rank. His publications were the following: *The right Way, or the Gospel applied to the Intercourse of Individuals and Nations* (a prize essay on *Peace*, Am. Tract Society, N. Y. 1854, of which over ten thousand copies have been circulated): — *The Christian Home, or Religion in the Family* (prize essay, Presbyterian Board, Phila. 1859): — *The Young Man of the Bible* (Am. Tract Soc. N. Y. 1861): — *Little Crowns, and how to Coin them* (N. Y. 1864; republished in England): — *Pleasant Paths for little Feet* (Am. Tract Soc. N. Y. 1864): — *The Dawn of Heaven, or the Principles of the heavenly Life applied to the earthly*, a posthumous work, to which is prefixed a brief and just biographical sketch by his brother, Rev. Ezra W. Collier (N. Y. 1865).

Collier, William

a Baptist minister, was born in Scituate, Mass., Oct. 11, 1771. He graduated at Brown University in 1797, studied theology under president Maxcy, and was licensed to preach in 1798. In 1799 he was ordained at Boston as minister at large, but soon went as pastor to Newport, spent one

year there, and four as pastor of the First Baptist Church, New York. In 1804 he became pastor of the Baptist church in Charlestown, Mass., where he remained sixteen years, a faithful and successful minister. In 1820, his health failing, he resigned his charge, and removed to Boston, where he remained during the rest of his life, doing service as minister at large. He was a pioneer of the temperance reform, and from 1826 to 1828 edited the *National Philanthropist*, the first temperance paper. He died March 19, 1843. Among his literary labors were a *Hymn-book*, a series of *Sermons from living Ministers* (begun in 1827), editions of Saurin and of Andrew Fuller, and several occasional Sermons. — Sprague, *Annals*, 6:376.

Collins, Anthony

an English Deist, was born at Heston, near Hounslow in 1676, and was educated at Eton and King's College, Cambridge. Being a man of property, he spent his life chiefly in literary pursuits. He died in 1729. His infidel principles brought him into collision with Bentley, Chandler, and many others. His chief works are: *Discourse on the Grounds and Reasons of the Christian Religion* (Lond. 1737, 8vo): — *Priestcraft in Perfection* (London, 1710, 8vo): — *Discourse on Free-thinking* (1713): — *Essay on the Thirty-nine Articles, in reply to Bennet* (Lond. 1724, 8vo), besides various pamphlets. In 1715 he published his *Philosophical Inquiry concerning Liberty and Necessity*, which was reprinted in 1717 in 8vo, with corrections, and was translated into French by Des Maizeaux (1720). Dr. Samuel Clarke replied to the necessarian doctrine of Collins chiefly by insisting on its inexpediency, considered as destructive of moral responsibility. Bentley's *Remarks upon a late Discourse of Freethinking* (given in Randolph's *Enchiridion Theologicum*, vol 5) is a sharp and sarcastic, but fully adequate reply to the skeptical arguments of Collins. See Leland, *Deistical Writers*, ch. 6; Farrar, *Critical History of Free Thought.*

Collins, John

a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in New Jersey in 1769. In 1803 he removed to Ohio, and entered the itinerant ministry in 1807. He was one of the pioneers of Methodism in the West. In 1804, while yet a local preacher, he preached the first Methodist sermon in Cincinnati to a dozen persons, in an upper room. With a brief interval, he labored as an itinerant until 1836, when he became superannuated. He died Aug. 21,1845. He was

an able and faithful preacher, often impressively eloquent, and eminently successful as an evangelist. Revivals of religion followed his footsteps everywhere. An instructive sketch of his *Life,* from the pen of Justice M'Lean, was published in 1850 (Cincinnati. 18mo). — *Minutes of Conferences,* 3. 650; *Methodist Quarterly Review,* 1850, p. 324.

Collins, John A.

a distinguished Methodist Episcopal minister, was born near Seaford, Del., 1801. His parents removed to Ohio in 1805, and to Georgetown, D. C., in 1812, and his academical education was obtained at the latter place. Giving early promise of talent, he was placed as a law student in the office of William Wirt; but the plan of his life was changed by his conversion at a camp-meeting in Loudoun Co.,Va., in 1820. He joined the Methodist Episcopal Church, and in 1826 was licensed as a local preacher. In 1830 he entered the itinerant ministry in the Baltimore Conference, and his great talent as a preacher soon gained him a commanding reputation. He filled all the prominent appointments in his Conference as pastor, and served several terms as presiding elder. In 1836 he was elected assistant editor of the Christian Advocate at New York. This office he soon resigned, partly on account of the effect of the climate upon the health of his family, but mainly because he believed he could better serve the Church in the more regular duties of the ministry. Few men in any period of the history of the Methodist Episcopal Church have more successfully preached her doctrines, or more faithfully defended her discipline. He was elected to the General Conference as soon as he was eligible, and to every subsequent one down to the last, when he led the delegation. He had pre-eminent pulpit power. His sermons were marked with great clearness of thought, apt and scriptural *Illustration*s, and were delivered with elegance of speech, and often with an eloquence, earnestness, and power that were overwhelming. As a debater on the floor of the General or Annual Conference he had few equals, certainly no superior. He died of pneumonia, after a short illness, May 7,1857. — *Minutes of Conferences,* 1858, p. 16.

Collins, Judson Dwight

superintendent of the Methodist Episcopal missions in China, was born in Wayne County, N. Y., Feb. 12, 1822. He removed with his parents to Michigan in 1831, was converted in 1838, graduated in Michigan

University 1845, entered the itinerant ministry in the Michigan Conference, and was appointed teacher in the Wesleyan Seminary at Albion in the same year. He was sent as missionary to China and superintendent in 1847, returned with impaired health in 1851, and died May 13, 1852, in Washtenaw County, Michigan. His mind was clear and vigorous, more solid than brilliant, and more logical than eloquent. “Years before the Church established the China mission, and while prosecuting his collegiate studies, he pursued a course of reading on China, preparatory to a whole life of missionary labor among its benighted millions, and his mind had no rest until it was actually surrounded by their darkness and misery. No temporary impulse led him thither, no transient fervent feelings urged him to a life of toil in that distant land; but a permanent conviction of duty possessed his mind, one great idea of supreme service to Christ controlled his whole existence, and carried all his thoughts, all his affections, all his impulses, to that extensive territory of heathenism, and his martyr-like attachments to his work were only loosened by death.” — *Minutes of Conferences*, 1852, p. 113; Sprague, *Annals*, 7:831.

Collins, Wellington H.

a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born May, 1816, in Wolcott, Wayne County, N.Y.; removed with his parents to Michigan in 1830, was converted in 1835, began preaching in 1837 under the presiding elder, and entered the Michigan Conference in 1838. The Conference then-included all of Michigan and North-western Ohio. After twenty years’ service as a stationed minister and seven years as presiding elder, he died at Detroit, Aug. 11, 1858. He was delegate to the General Conference at Boston 1852, and also to that at Indianapolis in 1856. Mr. Collins was a man of great force of character. He was a masterly preacher, and was remarkably able in debate; but perhaps his highest excellence was in his safe judgment as a counselor, by which he was always influential among his brethren. — *Minutes of Conferences*, 1858, p. 334; *Ladies’ Repository*, 19:449.

Colln, Daniel Georg Conrad Von,

was born Dec. 21, 1788, at Oerlinghausen, in the principality of Lippe-Detmold, where his father was minister. His family were of Moravian origin. He studied at Detmold, Marburg, Tibingen (under Flatt and Schnurrer), and finally in Gottingen. In 1816 he became professor extraordinarius of theology at Marburg, and in 1817, at the Reformation

Jubilee, he became doctor of theology. In 1818 he received a double call, one from Heidelberg to the philosophical, the other from Breslau to the theological faculty. He accepted the latter. His academic discourses, embracing exegetic and historical theology, attracted the more gifted among the students. Besides his occasional academical writings (*De Joelis prophetae cetate* [Marb. 1811], *Spicilegium observationum exegetico-criticarum ad Zephanioe vaticinia* [Vratisl. 1818], *Memoria professorum Theol. Marburg. Philippo Magnaninmo regnante* [Vratisl. 1827], *Confessionum Melanchthonis et Zwinglii Augustanarum capitagraviora inter se conferuntur* [Vratisl. 1830]), and many valuable articles in journals, two books particularly have made his name universally known. First, his revision of the first volume, and the first part of the second volume, of the third edition of Munscher's *Christliche Dogmengeschichte* (Cassel, 1832 and 1834). This edition formed an epoch in the History of Dogmas. But his principal book is the *Biblische Theologie* (2 vols. Leips. 1836, edit. by Schulz), which for a long time, especially in its Old-Testament part, was considered as the most excellent work on this science. He died on the 17th of February, 1833. In theology he was a moderate Rationalist. See a sketch of him by Schulz in the above-mentioned *Bibl. Theologie*, vol. 1. — Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 19:330.

Collops Of Fat

(hmyPa, *pimah'*, fatness), spoken of the thick flakes of fat flesh upon the haunches of a stall-fed ox, put as the symbol of irreligious prosperity (<18527>Job 15:27). *SEE FAT*.

Collyridians

a sect of heretics which arose towards the close of the fourth century, so named from a small cake of a cylindrical form (κολλυρίδες, *collyridae*) which they offered to the Virgin Mary with libations and sacrifices. They were chiefly Arabian women, who rendered divine honors to the Virgin Mary as a goddess. It is conjectured by Neander that the cake-offering was a transfer of the oblations of the Lord's Supper to the worship of the Virgin, the whole taking the shape of a pagan ceremony; the truth probably being that the corruption was introduced from the pagan worship of Ceres, and that the customary breadofferings at the heathen feast of the harvest, in honor of Ceres, had been changed for such offerings in honor of Mary. —

See Epiphanius, *Haer.* 78; Mosheim, *Church History*, 1:311; Neander, *Church History* (Torrey's transl.), 2:339.

Colman

an Irish missionary of the 7th century. Colman was the third ecclesiastic who by royal authority had been called from Ireland to preside over the see of Lindisfarne, in North Britain. During his and his predecessors' superintendency, the churches in that country which had been devastated by Penda, the last Pagan king, were restored, and were enjoying great temporal and spiritual prosperity. But about A.D. 662, the Anglo-Saxon clergy, who had deserted these churches in the hour of danger, wished to return and to share them at least with the Irish and Ionian missionaries. But here a difficulty arose. The English Catholic Church, as recently reconstructed by Augustine, and that of the Scoto-Irish, were found to be so dissimilar in doctrine and usage that they could not conduct worship in the same edifices. The differences were numerous; among them were the question of the Three Chapters (q.v.), the tonsure, and the time of keeping Easter. An appeal to the pope was useless, for long before he had put forth his decision; but the Irish Church and those of Iona had not complied with it. Oswy, the king, required the whole to be presented to him for adjustment. The discussion was in Irish and Anglo-Saxon, by Colman and Wilfred, the venerable Ceada, bishop of the East Angles, acting as interpreter. When the arguments had ended, the king and a majority of the assembly decided for Wilfred and the Anglo-Catholics (see Bede, l*ib.* 3. c. 25). This decision, however, was far from effecting peace. The dominant party soon became intolerant, and required the clergy of Colman to be reordained; that their churches, previous to the performance of Catholic worship, "should be sprinkled with exorcised water (Usher, vol. 6, p. 274); and also that they should observe many new rites and usages to which they had been entire strangers. To all of these, like the Welsh Christians before them, Colman and the most of his clergy refused to submit, and quietly relinquished in North Britain the churches which they had built or had restored, and in which they had successfully preached for nearly seventy years. Colman, now returned to Ireland, taking with him all his own, countrymen and thirty-six ecclesiastics or students who adhered to his teaching. For the latter he established on the east of the island an institution long known as "Mayo of the English," to which Bede says many flocked from England, that they might "gain knowledge and lead a holy life." But, notwithstanding his success in his new enterprise, he could not recover

himself from his former defeat; he went abroad, traveled on the Continent, visited the East, and died about A.D. 676. See Bede, *Hist. Eccl., l. c.*, and also 4:4; Moore, *History of Ireland* (Am. edit., Philad.).

Colman, Benjamin, D.D.

an eminent Congregational minister, was born in Boston, Oct. 19,1673. He graduated at Harvard 1692, and sailed for London 1695, but on the voyage was taken by a French vessel and carried to France. After remaining in England some three years, he was called to take charge of Brattle Street Church, Boston. He accepted, and was ordained Aug. 4,1699, in London. He died Aug. 29,1747. He was made D.D. by the University of Glasgow, 1731. Dr. Colman published a *Poem on 'Elijah's Translation*, occasioned by the Death of Rev. Samuel Willard (1707); *The Incomprehensibleness of God*, in four Sermons (1715); *Five Sermons from* <421121>*Luke* 11:21, 22 (1717); *Observations on Inoculation* (1722); *A Treatise on Family Worship* (1730); *A Dissertation on the Image of God wherein Man was created* (1736); and a large number of occasional sermons. — Sprague, *Annals*, 1:223.

Cologne

a celebrated city on the Rhine, the seat of an early bishopric. The legend that a disciple of the apostle Peter, by the name of Maternus, was the founder and first bishop of the church of Cologne, is now generally abandoned even by Roman Catholic writers. Maternus, the first (historical) bishop of Cologne, is mentioned as early as 313 (Mansi, *Collectio Concil*. t. 2, fol. 436). The successor of Maternus, Euphrates, attended in 347 the Synod of Sardica, and was one of the delegates of this synod to the Emperor Constantius. The acts of a Synod of Cologne of 346, which state that Euphrates was deposed for being an Arian, are now generally regarded as spurious. In 623-663 we: find Cunibert mentioned as archbishop of Cologne (Rettberg, *Kirchengesch. Deutschlands*. 2:602); yet it does not appear to have been at the time a regular archbishopric, for bishops of Cologne are mentioned after that date, and Bonifacius (q.v.) in 748 subjected it to the metropolitan of Mayence, from which it was probably detached under Charlemagne, between 794 and 799, in order to be, raised to the dignity of an archbishopric. A national synod was held at Cologne in 874, to regulate the administration of the goods of the Church, and to consecrate the cathedral. The importance this see had obtained in the 10th

century is proved by the fact that the Emperor Otto I gave it to his brother Bruno I, the first archbishop who was at the same time a prince of the German Empire. Popes and emperors vied in increasing the wealth and power of the archbishop of Cologne, and synods held at that place declared him to have the right of precedence over all other clergy, the papal legates a latere alone excepted. About the middle of the 12th century, the archbishops of Cologne were elevated to the rank of electors. Prominent among the archbishops of this period were Anno II, who abducted the young emperor Henry IV, and Rainald, count of Dossel, an able general of the Emperor Frederick I, who patronized the anti-popes, and brought from Milan to Cologne the pretended bodies of the "three holy kings," which up to this day are venerated as the most precious relics of Cologne. The political troubles of the 12th and 13th centuries diminished the power of the archbishopric, but it rose again under Conrad von Hochstaden (1238-1261). But, while outwardly prospering, the see was inwardly weakened by the relaxation of the clergy, which became so great that complaint was made of it to Pope Alexander IV, by whose direction Conrad held a synbd at Cologne in 1260, for the purpose of reforming abuses (Hartzheim, Concil. Germ. 3. p. 588 sq.). In 1266 (according to others, 1271 or 1272) another council was held against the violators of the rules of discipline. After the Reformation of the 16th century, two archbishops of Cologne, Herman V, count of Wied, and Gebhard II, turned Protestants, and were on that account deposed. After that, the see was held for 178 years without interruption (until 1761) by Bavarian princes. Joseph Clement († 1723), who was elected in 1688, was not even ordained a priest until 1706. Clement Augustus (1723-1761) was at the same time bishop of Munster, Paderborn, Hildesheim, and Osnabruck. Maximilian Frederick (1761-1784) founded the Academy of Bonn. Maximilian Francis, archduke of Austria (1784-1801), changed the Academy of Bonn into a university, and supported his brother, Emperor Joseph II, in his ecclesiastical reforms, *SEE EMS, CONGRESS OF*. His successor, Anthony Victor, archduke of Austria, was the last elector, as in 1803 the dominions of the archbishop were secularized, and divided among other princes. The electorate of Cologne at that time had about 2545 English sq. miles ana 230,000 inhabitants. But the diocese of Cologne was much more extensive than the electorate. Even the city of Cologne, being a free city of the empire, was subject only to the spiritual, not to the temporal rule of the archbishops who resided at Bonn. At the time of the Reformation the diocese had about 800 parishes, divided into 22 deaneries; in the 18th century the number of

parishes was about 1300 (a map of the diocese is given in Spruner's Histor. Atlas, No. 11). After the reorganization of Germany by the Vienna Congress, Cologne, now belonging to Prussia, was reconstituted an archbishopric by a bull of July 16, 1821, with the sufferagan bishoprics of Treves, Munster, and Paderborn. The diocese of Cologne had, in 1867, 44 deaneries, about 600 parishes, and a population of about 1,000,000. The first archbishop, Ferdinand Joseph, count Spiegel (1824-1835), was a man of moderate principles, and a patron of the Hermesians (q. v). His successor. Clement Augustus Droste von Vischering (1835-1845), had a violent controversy with the Prussian government on the subject of marriages between Protestants and Roman Catholics, was arrested in 1837, and set free in 1840 only on condition that he resigned the administration of the diocese into the hands of a coadjutor. Joannes von Geissel, who succeeded him in 1845, was created a cardinal in 1850, and died in 1864. He was succeeded by Paul Melchers, who was the incumbent in 1867. *SEE GERMANY AND PRUSSIA*.

Of the councils of Cologne, besides those already mentioned, the most important were, (1) in 1280, called by the Archbishop Sifridnss (Sifroi), in which eighteen canons of discipline were drawn up; (2) in 1536, by Herman, on discipline, the duties of bishops, offices of the Church, etc.; (3) in 1549, by Adolphus, where several statutes were made for the reformation of the Church. The restoration of learning was recommended as one of the means of accomplishing this end. Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* 2:673; Rettberg, *Kirchen-Gesch. Deutschlands* (Gott. 1846); Friedrich, *Kirchen-Gesch. Deutschlands* (Bamberg, 1867); Binterim & Mooren, *Die alte und neue Erzdioc. Coln* (4 vols. Mayence, 1828); Mering u. Reischert, *Die Bischafe u. Erzbisch. von Coln* (Cologne, 1843); Ersch u. Gruber, s.v. (vol. 18:175 sq.; here a complete list of the bishops and archbishops of Cologne is given); Landon, *Manual of Councils*, s.v.; Smith, *Tables of Ch. History*.

Colombia, United States of

a republic in South America (until 1861 called New Granada). The country was discovered in 1498 by Christopher Columbus. In 1732 the viceroyalty of New Granada was established of what are now the United States of Colombia and Ecuador. In 1810 New Granada separated herself from the Spanish monarchy, and maintained a constant war until 1824, when the Spanish army was conquered by the Colombian. New Granada formed with

Venezuela (since 1817) and with Ecuador (since 1821) the republic of Colombia. But Venezuela separated herself in Nov. 1829, and Ecuador in May, 1830, and the central part constituted itself as the republic of New Granada on Nov. 21, 1831. Several times some of the states forming the republic declared themselves independent: thus the state of Panama was independent from 1863 to 1865. Since then the united republic has been constituted of the nine states of Antioquia, Bolivar, Boyaca, Cauca, Cundinamarca, Magdalena, Panama, Santander, Tolima, together, according to the census of 1867, with a population of 2,794,473 inhabitants. The population is rapidly increasing; in 1810, when the revolution commenced, there were 800,000 inhabitants; in 1826, 1,300,000; in 1835, 1,685,038; in 1885, 3,500,000. According to a decree of 1851, slavery ceased on January 1, 1852. The whole native population belongs to the Roman Catholic Church, whose ministers receive a salary from the state. The hierarchy consists of one archbishop at (Santa Fe de) Bogota, and seven bishops at Antioquia, Cartagena, Santa Martha, New Pampelona, Panama, Pasto (established in 1859), and Popayan. Church affairs have for many years been the subject of violent controversies between the Liberal party, who are in favor of absolute freedom of worship, of separating the state from the Church, of expelling the Jesuits, and similar measures, and the Conservative party, to whom belong all the fanatical partisans of the Church of Rome. Generally the government has been in the hands of the Liberal party, which several times has made attempts to enforce a full separation of the Church from Rome. Protestant foreigners received the right of public worship in 1822, and later the same right was given to the natives. In all the large towns the government enforces the legal toleration of all religions, but in the country the ignorance and fanaticism of the populace make it often difficult to obtain the full benefit of the law. In 1856 the Old School Presbyterian Church of the United States occupied Bogota as a missionary station, and in 1866 a second missionary was sent to the same place. A boys' school was opened January 1, 1867. The American Bible Society, in 1866, opened a depository at Bogota. At the English services the average attendance on the Sabbath, during the year 1866, was over thirty; but worship was still held in private houses, no suitable hall or edifice having yet been obtained by the missionaries. A large number of foreign Protestants, chiefly from the United States and England, have settled at Panama and Aspinwall (Colon), and they have a church and school, but hardly any progress has been made toward establishing a native Spanish congregation. — See the *Annual*

Reports of the Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church; *New American Cyclopaedia* and Lippincott's *Gazetteer*, s.v. New Granada; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 2:792.

Colonna

(De Columna), the name of an ancient princely family in Italy, which was famous for many centuries, and especially during the Middle Ages, for the number of cardinals and bishops which it gave to the Roman Church, and for the prominent influence which it exercised upon the election of the popes and the government of the papal states. In the quarrels between the popes and the emperors, the Colonnas mostly sided with the emperors. Boniface VIII became so incensed at the hostile attitude of the family, that the descendants of the princes John III and Otto XVII were declared by him to be "irregular" until the fourth generation. According to some ecclesiastical writers, Pope Alexander III (according to others Gregory IX) declared all the members of the family, for all time to come, incapable of holding any ecclesiastical office. The authenticity of this decree is doubtful; if it was ever issued, it soon fell into disuse, for there is no other family which counts so large a number of cardinals among its members as the Colonnas. Only one of the family ascended the papal chair under the name of Martin V (q.v.); in general, public opinion in Rome was so much opposed to the election of a Colonna as pope, that there was a proverb: *Nec frater, nec Gallus, nec Columna erunt papa* (Neither a brother [of the deceased pope], nor a Frenchman, nor a Colonna, must be elected pope). A great many of the cardinals of this family were known for their fighting propensities; and as late as 1527 the Cardinal Pompey Colonna expelled Pope Clement VII from Rome, who on that account deposed him from his ecclesiastical dignity, and pronounced the ban against him. He was, however, restored to all his dignities in 1529. But very few of the Colonnas published any theological writings; one of these few was

Colonna, Giovanni

born at the beginning of the 13th century. He entered the Dominican order; was in 1236 provincial of his order in Tuscany; became in 1255 archbishop of Messina, and in 1262 archbishop of Nicosia, in Cyprus. The latter see he resigned in 1263, on account of political disturbances in Cyprus. He died between 1280 and 1290. He wrote *Liber de viris illustribus ethnicis et Christianis* (published in 1720, with notes by B. Zoanelli). A number of

other works (as *Mare historiarum, Epistolae ad diversos, De gloria Paradisi*, etc.) have never been printed. See Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* 2:679 sq.

Colony

(κολώνια, for the Lat. colonia), a distinction applied to the city of Philippi, in Macedonia (<44162>Acts 16:12). After the battle of Actium, Augustus assigned to his veterans those parts of Italy which had espoused the cause of Antony, and transported many of the expelled inhabitants to Macedonia, by which means the towns of Philippi, Dyrrachium, etc., acquired the right of Roman colonies (*Dio Cass*. p. 455). Accordingly, we find Philippi described as a "colonia" both in inscriptions and upon the coins of Augustus (Orelli, *Inscr*. 512, 3658, 3746, 4064; Rasche, vol. 8, pt. 2, p. 1120). See PHILIPPI. Such towns possessed the *jus coloniarium* (Pliny *Nat. Hist.* v. 1), i.e. so-called *jus Italicum* (*Digest. Leg*. 8:8), consisting, if complete, in a free municipal constitution, such as was customary in Italy, in exemption from personal and land taxes, and in the commerce of the soil, or the right of selling the land. Originally and properly a colony was a body of Roman citizens sent out as volunteers (Livy, 10:21) to possess a commonwealth, with the approbation of their own state (Servius, ad *A*Eneid. 1:12). The old Roman colonies were thus in the nature of garrisons planted in conquered towns, having a portion of the conquered territory (usually a third part) assigned to them, while the native inhabitants retained the rest, and lived together with the new settlers (Dionys. *Ant. Rom*. 2:53). Such colonists, of course, remained Roman citizens in the fullest sense. The original natives, however, and their descendants, did not become Roman citizens by having a colony planted among them, unless it was conferred, either at the time or subsequently, by a special act of the Roman people, senate, or emperor. Their exact relation in this respect it is somewhat difficult to determine in the absence of such a specific act, as the jus Italicum, readily and often conferred upon provincial cities, and which now would be more likely to obtain than colonial ones, conferred only the above rights upon the community, without making the individual inhabitants Roman citizens in full. (See Smith's *Dict. of Class. Antiq.* s.v. Colonia.) *SEE CITIZENSHIP*.

In one passage of the Apocrypha (Wisdom of Solomon 12:7) the term "colony" stands for ἀποικία, a settlement, referring to Palestine as the seat of the chosen people of God.

Color

Names of colors expressly mentioned as such in the Old Test. are: (a.) ˆb;l; laban’, white; j [i; tsach; bright; rW;j , chivvar’, pale; byce, seyb, gray; r j x; tsachor’, cream-colored; (b.) b/hx; tsahob’, yellow; q ry; yarak’, green; (c.) µda; adom’, red; q r c; sarok’, fox-colored; ynæ; t [il /T, tola’ath-shani’ crimson r v e; shasher’, ochre-red; (d.) ˆ/mG;r]a; argamo.’’, purple, t l k,T; teke’th, violet; (e.) r j v; sliacho’, black; µW j , chum, brown; (f.) dqn; nakod`, speckled; aW l T; talu’, spotted; d rB; bared’, pie-bald; r q ; striped. In the N.T. the colors mentionod are: λευκός, white; μέλας, black; πυῤῥός, red; χλωρός, green; πορφύρα, πορφύρεος, purple κόκκινος, scarlet. The following statements cover the whole subject in general.

The terms relative to color, occurring in the Bible, may be arranged in two classes, the first including those applied to the description of natural objects, the second those artificial mixtures which were employed in dyeing or painting. In an advanced state of art, such a distinction can hardly be said to exist; all the hues of nature have been successfully imitated by the artist; but among the Jews, who fell even below their contemporaries in the cultivation of the fine arts, and to whom painting was unknown until a late period, the knowledge of artificial colors was very restricted. Dyeing was the object to which the colors known to them were applied: so exclusively, indeed, were the ideas of the Jews limited to this application of color, that the name of the dye was transferred without any addition to the material to which it was applied. The Jews were not, however, by any means insensible to the influence of color: they attached definite ideas to the various tints, according to the use made of them in robes and vestments; and the subject exercises an important influence on the interpretation of certain portions of Scripture. *SEE DYE*.

I. The *natural* colors noticed in the Bible are white, black, red, yellow, and green. It will be observed that only three of the prismatic colors are represented in this list; blue, indigo, violet, and orange are omitted. Of the three, *yellow* is very seldom noticed; it was apparently regarded as a shade of green, for the same term *greenish* (q riq]ry]) is applied to gold (<196813>Psalm 68:13), and to the leprous spot (<031349>Leviticus 13:49), and very probably the *golden* (bhx) or *yellow* hue of the leprous hair (<031330>Leviticus 13:30-32)

differed little from the *greenish* spot on the garments (Leviticus 13:49). *Green* is frequently noticed, but an examination of the passages in which it occurs will show that the reference is seldom to color. The Hebrew terms are *raanan'* (ˆn;[}r) and *yarak* (qrey): the first of these applies to what is vigorous and flourishing; hence it is metaphorically employed as an image of prosperity (Job 15:32; Psalm 37:35; 52:8; 92:14; Jeremiah 11:16; 17:8; Daniel 4:4; Hosea 14:8); it is invariably employed wherever the expression "green tree" is used in connection with idolatrous sacrifices, as though with the view of conveying the idea of the outspreading branches, which served as a canopy to the worshippers (Deuteronomy 12:2; 2 Kings 16:4); elsewhere it is used of that which is fresh, as oil (Psalm 92:10), and newly-plucked boughs (Song of Solomon 1:16). The other term, *yarak*, has the radical signification of putting forth leaves, sprouting (Gesenius, *Thes. Heb.* p. 632): it is used indiscriminately for all productions of the earth fit for food (Genesis 1:30; 9:3; Exodus 10:15; Numbers 22:4; Isaiah 15:6; comp. χλωρός, Revelation 8:7; 9:4), and again for all kinds of garden herbs (Deuteronomy 11:10; 1 Kings 21:2; 2 Kings 19:26; Proverbs 15:17; Isaiah 37:27; contrast the restricted application of our *greens*); when applied to grass, it means specifically the young, *fresh grass* (avD, de'she, Psalm 37:2) which springs up in the desert (Job 39:8). Elsewhere it describes the sickly yellowish hue of mildewed corn (Deuteronomy 28:22; 1 Kings 8:37; 2 Chronicles 6:28; Amos 4:9; Haggai 2:17); and, lastly, it is used for the entire absence of color produced by fear (Jeremiah 30:6; comp. χλωρός, Hom. *Il.* 10:376); hence χλωρός (Revelation 6:8) describes the ghastly, livid hue of death. In other passages "green" is erroneously used in the A.V. for *white* (Genesis 30:37; Esther 1:6), *young* (Leviticus 2:14; 23:14), *moist* (Judges 16:7, 8), *sappy* (Job 8:16), and *unripe* (Song of Solomon 2:13). Thus it may be said that green is never used in the Bible to convey the impression of proper color. *SEE GREEN*.

The only fundamental color of which the Hebrews appear to have had a clear conception was *red*; and even this is not very often noticed. They had, therefore, no scientific knowledge of colors, and we cannot but think that the attempt to explain such passages as Revelation 4:3, by the rules of philosophical truth must fail (see Hengstenberg, *Comm.* in loc.). Instead of assuming that the emerald represents green, the jasper yellow, and the sardine red, the idea intended to be conveyed by these images may be

simply that of pure, brilliant, transparent light. The emerald, for instance, was chiefly prized by the ancients for its glittering, scintillating qualities (αἰγλήεις, Orpheus, De lap. p. 608), whence, perhaps, it derived its name (σμάραγδος, from μαρμαίρειν). The jasper is characterized by John himself (<66211>Revelation 21:11) as being crystal-clear (κρυσταλλίζον), and:ot as having a certain hue. The sardine, may be compared with the amber of <261004>Ezekiel 1:4, 27, or the burnished brass of <270106>Daniel 10:6, or, again, the fine brass, "as if burning in a furnace," of <660115>Revelation 1:15, each conveying the impression of the color of fire in a state of pure incandescence. Similarly the beryl, or, rather, the chrysolite (the Hebrew tarshish) may be selected by <270106>Daniel 10:6 on account of its transparency. An exception may be made, perhaps, in regard to the sapphire, in as far as its hue answers to the deep blue of the firmament (<022410>Exodus 24:10; compare <261026>Ezekiel 1:26, 10:1), but even in this case the pellucidity (הנבלאת, libnah', omitted in A. V., <022410>Exodus 24:10) or polish of the stone (comp. <250407>Lamentations 4:7) forms an important, if not the main, element in the comparison. The highest development of color in the mind of the Hebrew evidently was light, and hence the predominance given to white as its representative (comp. the connection between λευκός and *lux*). This feeling appears both in the more numerous allusions to it than to any other color — in the variety of terms by which they discriminated the shades from a pale, dull tint (הכהה, *keheh'*, blackish, <031321>Leviticus 13:21 sq.) up to the most brilliant splendor (זהר, zo'har, <261801>Ezekiel 8:2; <270123>Daniel 12:3)and in the comparisons by which they sought to heighten their ideas of it, an instance of which occurs in the three accounts of the Transfiguration, where the countenance and robes are described as like "the sun" and "the light" (<401702>Matthew 17:2), "shining, exceeding white as snow" (<410903>Mark 9:3), "glistening" (<420929>Luke 9:29). Snow is used eleven times in a similar way, the sun five times, wool four times, milk once. In some instances the point of the comparison is not so obvious, e.g. in <183814>Job 38:14, "they stand as a garment" in reference to the white color of the Hebrew dress, and in <196813>Psalm 68:13 where the glancing hues of the dove's plumage suggested an image of the brilliant effect of the white holiday costume. Next to white, black, or rather. dark, holds the most prominent place, not only as its opposite, but also as representing the complexion of the Orientals. There were various shades of it, including the brown of the Nile water (whence its name *Sihor*) — the reddish tint of early dawn, to which the complexion of the bride is likened (<220510>Song of

Solomon 6:10), as well as the lurid hue produced by a flight of locusts (<290202>Joel 2:2) — and the darkness of blackness itself (<250408>Lamentations 4:8). As before, we have various heightening images, such as the tents of Kedar, a flock of goats, the raven (<220105>Song of Solomon 1:5; 4:1; 5:11), and sackcloth (<660612>Revelation 6:12). Red was also a color of which the Hebrews had a vivid conception; this may be attributed partly to the prevalence of that color in the: outward aspect of the countries and peoples with which they were familiar, as attested by the name Edom, and by the words adamah (earth) and adam (man), so termed either as being formed out of the red earth, or as being red in comparison with the fair color of the Assyrians and the black of the Ethiopians. Red was regarded as an element of personal beauty: comp. <091612>1 Samuel 16:12; <220201>Song of Solomon 2:1, where the lily is the red one for which Syria was famed (Pliny 21:11); <220403>Song of Solomon 4:3; 6:7, where the complexion is compared to the red fruit of the pomegranate; and <250407>Lamentations 4:7, where the hue of the skin is redder than coral (A. V. “rubies”) contrasting with the white of the garments before noticed. The three colors, white, black, and red, were sometimes intermixed in animals, and gave rise to the terms rjæ; *tsahor’*, dappled (A.V. “white”), probably white and red (<070510>Judges 5:10); rqo[; *akod’*, ringstreaked, either with white bands on the legs, or white-footed; dqon; *nakod’*, speckled, and alf; *tala’*, spotted, white and black; and lastly drB; *barod*, piebald (A. V. “grizzled”), the spots being larger than in the two former (<013032>Genesis 30:32, 35; 31:10); the latter term is used of a horse (<380603>Zechariah 6:3, 6) with a symbolical meaning: Hengstenberg (*Christol.* in loc.) considers the color itself to be unmeaning, and that the prophet has added the term strong (A. V. “bay”) by way of explanation; Hitzig (*Comm.* in loc.) explains it, in a peculiar manner, of the complexion of the Egyptians. It remains for us now to notice the various terms applied to these three colors. (See each of the above words in its place.)

1. WHITE. The most common term is ˆbl; *laban’*, which is applied to such objects as milk (<014912>Genesis 49:12), manna (<021631>Exodus 16:31), snow (<230118>Isaiah 1:18), horses (<380108>Zechariah 1:8), raiment (*Eccl.* 1:8); and a cognate word expresses the color of the moon (<232423>Isaiah 24:23). hxi *tsach*, dazzling white, is applied to the complexion (<220510>Song of Solomon 5:10); rW:j} *chivvar’*, a term of a later age, to snow (<270709>Daniel 7:9 only) and to the paleness of shame (<232922>Isaiah 29:22, rwj); bycæ; *sib*, to the hair alone. Another class of terms arises from the textures of a naturally white

color, as שֵׁשׁ *shesh*, and בּוּץ, *buts*. These words appear to have been originally of foreign origin, but were connected by the Hebrews with roots in their own language descriptive of a white color (Gesenius, *Thesaur.* p. 190,1384). The terms were without doubt primarily applied to the material; but the idea of color is also prominent, particularly in the description of the curtains of the tabernacle (Exodus 26:1), and the priests' vestments (Exodus 28:6). *Shesh* is also applied to white marble (Esther 1:6; Song of Solomon 5:15); and a cognate word, שׁוּשָׁן, *shoshan'*, to the lily (Song of Solomon 2:16). In addition to these we meet with חוּר, *chur* (βύσσος, Esther 1:6; 8:15), and כַּרְפַּס, *karpas'* (κάρπασος; A. V. green," Esther 1:6), also descriptive of white textures.

White was symbolical of innocence; hence the raiment of angels (Mark 16:5; John 20:12), and of glorified saints (Revelation 19:8, 14), is so described. It was also symbolical of joy (Ecclesiastes 9:8); and, lastly, of victory (Zechariah 6:3; Revelation 6:2). In the Revelations (6:2) the term λευκός is applied exclusively to what belongs to Jesus Christ (Wordsworth's *Apoc.* p.' 105). *SEE WHITE*.

2. BLACK. The shades of this color are expressed in the terms שָׁחַר; *shachor'*, applied to the hair (Leviticus 13:31; Song of Solomon 5:11); the complexion (Song of Solomon 1:5), particularly when affected with disease (Job 30:30); horses (Zechariah 6:2, 6): חוּם, *chum*, lit. scorched (φαιός, A. V. "brown," Genesis 30:32), applied to sheep; the word expresses the color produced by influence of the sun's rays: קָדַר; *'kadar'*, lit. to be dirty, applied to a complexion blackened by sorrow or disease (Job 30:80); mourner's robes (Jeremiah 8:21; 14:2; Malachi 3:14; Zechariah 6:2, 6; see Plutarch, *Pericl.* 38; Mishna, *Middoth*, 5:3; comp. *vestes fuscoe*, Apulei, *Metam.* 2, p. 40, *Bip.*; see generally Gotze, *De vestium nigrar. usu*, Helmst. 1726); a clouded sky (1 Kings 18:45); night (Micah 3:6; Jeremiah 4:28; Joel 2:10; 3:15); a turbid brook (whence possibly KEDRON), particularly when rendered so by melted snow (Job 6:16). Black, as being the opposite to white, is symbolical of evil (Zechariah 6:2, 6, Revelation 6:5). *SEE BLACK*.

3. RED. אָדֹם; adom', is applied to blood (2 Kings 3:22); a garment sprinkled with blood (Isaiah 63:2); a heifer (Numbers 19:2); pottage made of lentiles (Genesis 25:30); a horse (Zechariah 1:8; 6:2); wine

(Proverbs 23:31); the complexion (Genesis 25:25; Song of Solomon 5:10; Lamentations 4:7). אדמרעה *adamdam'*, is a slight degree of red, reddish, and is applied to a leprous spot (Leviticus 13:19; 14:37). קרוֹ; *sarok'*, lit. fox-colored, bay, is applied to a horse (A. V. "speckled;" Zechariah 1:8), and to a species of vine bearing a purple grape (Isaiah 5:2; 16:8): the translation "bay" in Zechariah 6:3, A. V. is incorrect. The corresponding term in Greek is πυῤῥός, lit. red as fire. This color was symbolical of bloodshed (Zechariah 6:2; Revelation 6:4; 12:3). *SEE RED*.

II. ARTIFICIAL COLORS. — The art of extracting dyes, and of applying them to various textures, appears to have been known at a very early period. We read of scarlet thread at the time of Zarah's birth (Genesis 38:28); of blue and purple at the time of the Exodus (Exodus 26:1). There is, however, no evidence to show that the Jews themselves were at that period acquainted with the art; the profession of the dyer is not noticed in the Bible, though it is referred to in the Talmud. They were probably indebted both to the Egyptians and the Phoenicians; to the latter for the dyes, and to the former for the mode of applying them. The purple dyes which they chiefly used were extracted by the Phoenicians (Ezekiel 27:16; Pliny 9:60), and in certain districts of Asia Minor (Hom. *Il*. 4:141), especially Thyatira (Acts 16:14). It does not appear that those particular colors were used in Egypt, the Egyptian colors being produced from various metallic and earthy substances (Wilkinson, *Anc. Egypt*. 3. 301). On the other hand, there was a remarkable similarity in the mode of dyeing in Egypt and Palestine, inasmuch as the color was applied to the raw material previous to the processes of spinning and weaving (Exodus 35:25; 39:3; Wilkinson, 3. 125). The dyes consisted of purples, light and dark (the latter being the "blue" of the A. V.), and crimson (A. V. "scarlet"): vermilion was introduced at a late period.

1. PURPLE (ארגמן *argaman'*; Chaldaic form, ארגונא *argevana'*, Daniel 5:7, 16; πορφύρα; *purpura*). This color was obtained from the secretion of a species of shell-fish (Pliny 9:60), the *Murex trunculus* of Linnaeus, which was found in various parts of the Mediterranean Sea (hence called πορφύρα θαλασσία, 1 Maccabees 4:23), particularly on the coasts of Phoenicia (Strab. 16:757), Africa (Strab. 17:835) Laconia (Hor. *Od*. 2:18, 7), and Asia Minor. *SEE ELISHAH*. The derivation of the Hebrew name is uncertain; it has been connected with the Sanscrit

ragaman, “tinged with red;” and again with *arghamana*, “costly” (Hitzig, *Comment. in* <270507>*Daniel* 5:7). Gesenius, however (*Thesaur*. p. 1263), considers it highly improbable that a color so peculiar to the shores of the Mediterranean should be described by a word of any other than Shemitic origin, and connects it with the root µgir; *ragam’*, to heap up or overlay with color. The coloring matter was contained in a small vessel in the throat of the fish; and as the quantity amounted to only a single drop in each animal, the value of the dye was proportionately high; sometimes, however, the whole fish was crushed (Pliny 9:60). It is difficult to state with precision the tint described under the Hebrew name. The Greek equivalent was, we know, applied with great latitude, not only to all colors extracted from the shell-fish, but even to other brilliant colors; thus the purple upper garment (ἱματίον πορφυροῦν) of <431902>John 19:2 = the crimson cloak (χλαμὺς κοκκίνη) of <402728>Matthew 27:28 (comp. Pliny 9:62). The same may be said of the Latin *purpureus*. The Hebrew term seems to be applied in a similarly broad sense in <220705>Song of Solomon 7:5, where it either = *black* (comp. v. 11), or, still better, shining with oil. Generally speaking, however, the tint must be considered as having been defined by the distinction between the purple proper and the other purple dye (A. V. “blue”), which was produced from another species of shell-fish. The latter was undoubtedly a dark violet tint, while the former had a light reddish tinge. Robes of a purple color were worn by kings (<070826>Judges 8:26), and by the highest officers, civil and religious; thus Mordecai (<170815>Esther 8:15), Daniel (A. V. “scarlet,” <270507>Daniel 5:7, 16, 29), and Andronicus, the deputy of Antiochus (2 Maccabees 4:38), were invested with purple in token of the offices they held (comp. *Xenoph. Anab*. 1:5, 8); so also Jonathan, as high-priest (1 Maccabees 10:20, 64; 11:58). They were also worn by the wealthy and luxurious (<241009>Jeremiah 10:9; <262707>Ezekiel 27:7; <421619>Luke 16:19; <661704>Revelation 17:4; 18:16). A similar value was attached to purple robes both by the Greeks (Hom. *Od*. 19:225; Herod. 9:22; Strab. 14:648) and by the Romans (Virg. *Georg*. 2:495; Hor. *Ep*. 12, 21; Suet. *Coes*. 43; *Nero*, 32). Of the use of this and the other dyes in the textures of the tabernacle, we shall presently speak. *SEE PURPLE*.

2. BLUE (tl,kT] *teke’leth*; Sept. ὑάκινθος, ὑακίνθινος, ὁλοπόρφυρος, <040407>Numbers 4:7; Vulg. *hyacinthus, hyacinthinus*). This dye was procured from a species of shell-fish found on the coast of Phoenicia, and called by the Hebrews *Chilzon* (*Targ*. Pseudo-Jon. in <053319>Deuteronomy 33:19), and by modern naturalists *Helix ianthina*. The Hebrew name is derived,

according to Gesenius (*Thesaur.* p. 1502), from a root signifying to unshell; but according to Hitzig (*Comment.* in Ezekiel 23:6), from לָלַק; kalal', in the sense of dulled, blunted, as opposed to the brilliant hue of the proper purple. The tint is best explained by the statements of Josephus *(Ant.* 3. 7, 7) and Philo that it was emblematic of the sky, in which case it represents not the light blue of our northern climate, but the deep dark hue of the eastern sky (*Opp.* 1:536). The term adopted by the Sept. is applied by classical writers to a color approaching to black (Hom. *Od.* 6:231; 23:158; Theoc. Id. 10, 28); the flower, whence the name was borrowed, being, as is well known, not the modern hyacinth, but of a dusky red color (*ferrugineus*, Virg. *Georg.* 4:183; *celestis luminis hyacinthus*, Colum. 9:4, 4). The A. V. has rightly described the tint in Esther 1:6 (margin) as violet; the ordinary term blue is incorrect; the Lutheran translation is still more incorrect in giving it *gelbe Seide* (yellow silk), and occasionally simply *Seide* (Ezekiel 23:6). This color was used in the same way as purple. Princes and nobles (Ezekiel 23:6; Ecclesiasticus 40:4), and the idols of Babylon (Jeremiah 10:9), were clothed in robes of this tint; the riband and the fringe of the Hebrew dress was ordered to be of this color (Numbers 15:38); it was used in the tapestries of the Persians (Esther 1:6). The effect of the color is well described in Ezekiel 23:12, where such robes are termed לִיכְמָה־כְלִיל; robes of perfection, i.e. gorgeous robes. We may remark, in conclusion, that the Sept. treats the term שָׁחַשׁ; *tach'ash* (A. V. "badger") as indicative of color; and has translated it ὑακίνθινος, hyacinthine (Exodus 25:5). *SEE BLUE*.

3. SCARLET (CRIMSON, Isaiah 1:18; Jeremiah 4:30). The terms by which this color is expressed in Hebrew vary: sometimes . שָׁנִי; *shani'*, simply is used, as in Genesis 38:28-30; sometimes שָׁנִי תוֹלַעַת, *tola'ath shani'*,as in Exodus 25:4; and sometimes תוֹלַעַת, *otola'ath*, simply, as in Isaiah 1:18. The word כַּרְמִיל; *carmil'* (A. V. "crimson;" 2 Chronicles 2:7, 14; 3:14) was introduced at a late period, probably from Armenia, to express the same color. The first of these terms (derived from שָׁנָה; *shanah'*, to shine) expresses the brilliancy of the color; the second, תוֹלַעַת, *tola'ath*, the worm, or grub, whence the dye was procured, and which gave name to the color occasionally without any addition, just as vermilion is derived from vermiculus. The Sept. generally renders it κόκκινον, occasionally with the addition of such terms as κεκλωσμένον

(<2601>Exodus 26:1), or διανενησμένον (<2608>Exodus 28:8); the Vulgate has it generally coccinum, occasionally *coccus bis tinctus* (<2608>Exodus 28:8), apparently following the erroneous interpretation of Aquila and Symmachus, who render it βίβαφος, double-dyed (<2504>Exodus 25:4), as though from הנש; to repeat. The process of double-dying was, however, peculiar to the Tyrian purples (Pliny 9:39). The dye was produced from an insect, somewhat resembling the cochineal, which is found in considerable quantities in Armenia and other Eastern countries. The Arabian name of the insect is *kermez* (whence crimson); the Linnaean name is *Coccus ilicis*. It frequents the boughs of a species of ilex: on these it lays its eggs in groups, which become covered with a kind of down, so that they present the appearance of vegetable galls or excrescences from the tree itself, and are described as such by Pliny, 16:12. The dye is procured from the female grub alone, which, when alive, is about the size of a kernel of a cherry, and of a dark amaranth color, but when dead shrivels up to the size of a grain of wheat, and is covered with a bluish mould (Parrot's *Journey to Ararat*, p. 114). The general character of the color is expressed by the Hebrew term /Wmj} *chamuts'* (<2301>Isaiah 63:1), lit. sharp, and hence dazzling (compare the expression χρῶμα ὀξύ), and in the Greek λαμπρά (<4231>Luke 23:11), compared with κοκκίνη (<4728>Matthew 27:28). The tint produced was crimson rather than scarlet. The only natural object to which it is applied in Scripture is the lips, which are compared to a scarlet thread (<2403>Song of Solomon 4:3). Josephus considered it as symbolical of fire *(Ant.* 3. 7, 7; comp. Philo, 1:536). Scarlet threads were selected as distinguishing marks from their brilliancy (<0138>Genesis 38:28; <0618>Joshua 2:18, 21), and hence the color is expressive of what is excessive or glaring (<2318>Isaiah 1:18). Scarlet robes were worn by the luxurious (<1024>2 Samuel 1:24; <2321>Proverbs 31:21; <2404>Jeremiah 4:30; <2505>Lamentations 4:5; <6704>Revelation 17:4; 18:12, 16); it was also the appropriate hue of a warrior's dress from its similarity to blood (<3403>Nahum 2:3; comp. <2905>Isaiah 9:5), and was especially worn by officers in the Roman army (Pliny 22:3; <4728>Matthew 27:28). *SEE SCARLET*.

The three colors above described, purple, blue, and scarlet, together with white, were employed in the textures used for the curtains of the tabernacle, and for the sacred vestments of the priests. The four were used in combination in the outer curtains, the vail, the entrance curtain (<2601>Exodus 26:1, 31, 36), and the gate of the court (<2716>Exodus 27:16), as also in the high-priest's ephod, girdle, and breastplate (<2805>Exodus 28:5, 6,

8, 15). The first three, to the exclusion of white, were used in the pomegranates about the hem of the high-priest's robe (Exodus 28:33). The loops of the curtains (Exodus 26:4), the lace of the high-priest's breastplate, the robe of the ephod, and the lace on his mitre, were exclusively of blue (Exodus 28:28, 31, 37). Cloths for wrapping the sacred utensils were either blue (Numbers 4:6), scarlet (8), or purple (13). Scarlet thread was specified in connection with the rites of cleansing the leper (Leviticus 14:4, 6, 51), and of burning the red heifer (Numbers 19:6), apparently for the purpose of binding the hyssop to the cedar wood. The hangings for the court (Exodus 27:9; 38:9), the coats, mitres, bonnets, and breeches of the priests, were white (Exodus 39:27, 28). The application of these colors to the service of the tabernacle has led writers both in ancient and modern times to attach some symbolical meaning to them (see Philo and Josephus, *ut sup*.). The subject has been followed up with a great variety of interpretations, more or less probable (see Krause, *De colore sacro*, Vit. 1707; Creuzer, *Symbolik*, 1:125 sq.; Bahr, *Symbolik*, 1:335 sq.; Friederich, *Symbol. d. Mlos. Stifts-hiltte*, Lpz. 1841; *Stud. u. Krit.* 1844, 2:315 sq.). Without entering into a disquisition on these, we will remark that it is unnecessary to assume that the colors were originally selected with such a view; their beauty and costliness is a sufficient explanation of the selection. *SEE CRIMSON*.

4. VERMILION. (רִשׁ; *shashar'*; Sept. μίλτος; Vulg. *sinopis*). This was a pigment used in fresco-paintings, either for drawing figures of idols on the walls of temples (Ezekiel 23:14), for coloring the idols themselves (Wisdom of Solomon 13:14), or for decorating the walls and beams of houses (Jeremiah 22:14). The Greek term μίλτος is applied both to minium, red lead, and rubrica, red ochre; the Latin sinopis describes the best kind of ochre, which came from Sinope. Vermilion was a favorite color among the Assyrians (Ezekiel 23:14), as is still attested by the sculptures of Nimroud and Khorsabad (Layard, 2:303). *SEE VERMILION*.

III. *Hebrew Symbolical Significance of Colors*. Throughout antiquity color occupied an important place in the symbology both of sentiment and of worship. Of the analogies on which these symbolical meanings were founded, some lie on the surface, while others are more recondite. Thus white was everywhere the symbol of purity and the emblem of innocence; hence it was the dress of the high-priest on the day of atonement, his holy dress (Leviticus 16:4, 32); the angels, as holy (Zechariah 14:5;

(Job 15:15), appear in white clothing (Mark 16:5; John 20:12; and the bride, the Lamb's wife, was arrayed in white, which is explained as emblematical of the δικαιώματα τῶν ἁγίων (Revelation 19:8). White was also the sign of festivity (Ecclesiastes 9:8; comp. the *albatus* of Horace, Sat. 2:2, 6) and of triumph (Zechariah 6:3; Revelation 6:2; see Wetstein, *N.T.* in loc.) As the light-color (comp. Matthew 17:2, etc.) white was also the symbol of glory and majesty (Daniel 7:9; comp. Psalm 104. 2; Ezekiel 9:3 sq.; Daniel 12:6 sq.; Matthew 28:3; John 20:12; Acts 10:30). As the opposite of white, black was the emblem of mourning, affliction, calamity (Jeremiah 14:2; Lamentations 4:8; 5:10; comp. the *atratus and toga pulla* of Cicero, in *Vatin*. 13); it was also the sign of humiliation (Malachi 3:14) and the omen of evil (Zechariah 6:2; Revelation 6:5). Red indicated, poetically, bloodshed and war (Nahum 2:4 [A. V. 3]; Zechariah 6:2; Revelation 6:4). Green was the emblem of freshness, vigor, and prosperity (Psalm 92:15; 52:10; 37:35). Blue, or hyacinth, or *coerulean*, was the symbol of revelation; it was pre-eminently the celestial color, even among heathen nations (comp. e.g. Jeremiah 9:10, of the idols of Babylon, and what Eusebius says, *Prep. Evang*. 3. 11, of the δημιουργός Κνήφ, and the Crishna of the Hindoo mythology); and among the Hebrews it was the Jehovah color, the symbol of the revealed God (comp. Exodus 24:10; Ezekiel 1:26). Hence it was the color predominant in the Mosaic ceremonial; and it was the color prescribed for the ribbon of the fringe in the border of the garment of every Israelite, that as they looked on it they might remember all the commandments of Jehovah (Numbers 15:38, 39). With purple, as the dress of kings, were associated ideas of royalty and majesty (Judges 8:26; Esther 8:15; Song of Solomon 3:10; 7:5; Daniel 5:7, 16, 29; comp. Odyss. 19:225, the *pallium purpureum* of the Jupiter Capitolinus at Rome, the *purpurea vestis* of Phoebus [Ovid, Metam. 2:1, 23], the χλαμύδες πορφύραι of the Dioscuri [Pausan. 4:27], the πορφυρογέννητος of the Byzantines, etc.). Crimson and scarlet, from their resemblance to blood (probably), became symbolical of life; hence it was a crimson thread which Rahab was to bind on her window as a sign that she was to be saved alive when Jericho was destroyed (Joshua 2:18; 6:25), and it was crimson which the priest was to use as a means of restoring those who had contracted defilement by touching a dead body (Numbers 19:6-22). From its intensity and fixedness this color is also used to symbolize what is indelible or deeply engrained (Isaiah 1:18). The colors chiefly used in

the Mosaic ritual were white, hyacinth (blue), purple, and crimson. It is a superficial view which concludes that these were used merely from their brilliancy (Braun, *De Vest. Sa. Heb*.; Buhr, *Sym. d. Mos. Cult*.). See further below.

Colors, Christian Symbolism Of

Colors are made use of in religious symbolism among the Jews, and in several branches of the Christian Church. Specific directions were given in the O.T. for the colors to be used in building of the tabernacle and the making of the dress for the Jewish priests. Colors are also introduced in giving moral or spiritual lessons, and in describing scenes in revelation, as in <2Isa 1:18>Isaiah 1:18, in the description of the Transfiguration, and often in the imagery of the Apocalypse. See article above.

Very early in the history of Christianity the symbolism of colors was introduced in the ritualism and the art of the Church. In the Greek Church this symbolism has been worked out to such a degree of minuteness that little or no discrimination in the use of colors is allowed to the painter. In the Romish Church somewhat more latitude is allowed to the artist. Five colors are recognised as having a theological meaning or expression: White, Red, Green, Violet, and Black.

I. *White* is the most often referred to in the Scriptures. As the union of all the rays of light, it is the symbol of truth and spotless purity. It is applied to:

(1.) *God the Father*, the source and essence of immutable truth. In <27Dan 7:9>Daniel 7:9 the Ancient of Days has garments white as snow, with his hair like pure wool. The manna in the wilderness, being white, has been considered as the emblem of the Word of God.

(2.) *Christ*, at the Transfiguration, appeared in garments “white as the light” (<40Mat 17:2>Matthew 17:2; <41Mar 9:3>Mark 9:3). As the Great Judge, he will be seated on a great white throne (<66Rev 20:11>Revelation 20:11). In works of art, when Christ appears as the Lord of truth among the doctors of the law, he is represented in white garments.

(3.) The *angels* are never represented in the Scriptures as clothed otherwise than in white — as at the sepulcher of Christ (<40Mat 28:3>Matthew 28:3), at the Ascension (<44Act 1:10>Acts 1:10).

(4.) The *saints* in glory shall walk in white (Revelation 3:4), shall be arrayed in white (Revelation 4:4; 7:9; 15:6, and Revelation 19:8, where the fine linen, clean and white, is the righteousness of the saints), and they shall receive a white stone (Revelation 2:17).

(5.) The *priests*, at the consecration of the Temple, were "arrayed in white linen" (2 Chronicles 5:12). In the fourth century the priests of the Christian Church wore white garments while performing their offices. In the Romish Church white is yet retained for the alb, the cope, the amice, etc., and in the entire priestly garments on the festivals of the Nativity, Epiphany, Easter, etc. In the Church of England the white surplice of the Romish Church is retained. It is the same as the alb, except that the sleeves are broad and full.

(6.) The *catechumens* formerly were dressed in white for one week from their baptism, and white is yet usually the dress worn by girls in their confirmation.

II. *Red* is a symbol of fire and of glowing love. It was used in the dress of the Jewish priesthood. It is usually adopted largely in painting Christ performing his miracles or other labors of love, or as he is giving to his disciples the mission to carry into the world the fire of his word (Luke 12:49). On the famous standard or labarum of Constantine, the monogram of Christ rested on a purple cloth. Bede says that at his time the holy sepulcher was painted white and red. Some *angels* have been painted with red wings (perhaps from the word seraph — plenitude of love). The priestly vestments in the Romish Church are red on Whitsuntide and on days of the martyrs. The Ambrosian rite prescribes red during the consecration of the host, and the Ambrosian and Lyonnese rites during the festival of the Circumcision. The red dress of the cardinals is professedly intended to keep before them constantly the love and passion of the Savior. The pope wears red on Good Friday. The Greek priests wear red ornaments during funeral services.

The red spoken of above is always scarlet. Crimson red is appointed for certain days in certain rites of the Romish Church.

III. *Green*, from its analogy to the vegetable world, indicates life and hope, especially in the future life and in the coming of our Lord. The perpetual youth of angels is often indicated by painting them in garments of green. The saints, and especially John the Evangelist, were often

represented in green by painters and sculptors (who often colored their works). The tree of life in Paradise is painted green. An old tradition has it that a twig of the tree of life was transplanted, and produced the tree from which the cross of Christ was made! John the Baptist and the Virgin Mary are often represented in mantles of green. Branches of cypress, laurel, and other evergreens are often placed in the coffins or over the graves of the dead, as emblems of the hope in a future life. The Romish Church directs the priests to wear green from the Epiphany to Sexagesima Sunday, and from the third after Easter to Advent. The Ambrosian rite orders the cloth that covers the host to be green.

IV. *Violet* is considered the color of penitence and sorrow. The Romish Church orders it to be worn during all times of penance. In painting, this color is, often applied to John the Baptist, who preached repentance; to the Virgin Mary, as the mother of grief; and to the angels, who are sent to call men to repentance.

V. *Blue* is forbidden by the Romish Church, but it is sometimes used as the color peculiarly appropriate to the Virgin Mary.

VI. *Black* is the universal representative of sorrow, destruction, and death, and is considered only appropriate on mourning occasions. It was also appointed in one of the later reforms of the Benedictine order of monks as the dress of that order. The students of the universities of Oxford and Cambridge thus were given the black gown, which they wear yet. This gown was adopted by the Reformed Church of England as the dress of ministers, who were all students of the universities, and thus it passed over to the Protestant Episcopal Church of America, and, further, gave the color of clerical dress to all Protestant churches. Kreuser, *Bilderbuch* (Paderborn, 1863); Martigny, *Dictionnaire des Antiquites Chretiennes* (Paris, 1865); Palmer, *Antiquities of the English Ritual*; Pariser *Messbuch*:(1766); Jamieson, *Sacred and Legendary Art*, 1:35 sq.

Colos'sae

(Κολοσσαί, Colossians 1:2; but the preponderance of MS. authority is in favor of Κολασσαί, *Colasse*, a form used by the Byzantine writers, and which perhaps represents the provincial mode of pronouncing the name. On coins and inscriptions [see Eckhel, *Doct. Num*. I, 3, 147], and in classical writers [see Valcken. *ad Herod*. 7:30], we find Κολοσσαί), a city

of Phrygia Pacatiana, in the upper part of the basin of the Maeander, on one of its affluents named the Lycus. Hierapolis and Laodicea were in its immediate neighborhood (<51201>Colossians 2:1; 4:13, 15, 16; see <66111>Revelation 1:11; 3:14). Colossae fell as these other two cities rose in importance. At a later date they were all overthrown by an earthquake. Herodotus (7, 30) and Xenophon (Anab. 1:2, 6) speak of it as a city of considerable consequence (comp. Pliny, v. 29). Strabo (12:576) describes it as only a πόλισμα, not a πόλις; yet elsewhere (p. 578) he implies that it had some mercantile importance; and Pliny, in Paul's time, describes it (5, 41) as one of the "*celeberrima oppida*" of its district. Colossae was situated close to the great road which led from Ephesus to the Euphrates. Hence our impulse would be to conclude that Paul passed this way, and founded or confirmed the Colossian Church on his third missionary journey (<44823>Acts 18:23; 19:1). He might also have easily visited Colossse during the prolonged stay at Ephesus, which immediately followed. The most competent commentators, however, agree in thinking that <51201>Colossians 2:1, proves that Paul had never been there when the epistle was written (but see the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1829, 3. 612 sq.). *SEE PAUL*. Theodoret's argument that he must have visited Colossas on the journey just referred to, because he is said to have gone through the whole region of Phrygia, may be proved fallacious from geographical considerations; Colossae, though ethnologically in Phrygia (Herod. *l. c.*; Xen. *l. c.*), was at this period politically in the province of Asia (see Rev. *l. c.*). That the apostle hoped to visit the place on being delivered from his Roman imprisonment is clear from Philemon 22 (compare <50724>Philippians 2:24). Philemon and his slave Onesimus were dwellers in Colossae. So also were Archippus and Epaphras. From <51007>Colossians 1:7; 4:12, it has been naturally concluded that the latter Christian was the founder of the Colossian Church (see Alford's Prolegomena to Gr. Test. 3. 35). *SEE EPAPHRAS*. The worship of angels mentioned by the apostle (<51218>Colossians 2:18) curiously reappears in Christian times in connection with one of the topographical features of the place. A church in honor of the archangel Michael was erected at the entrance of a chasm in consequence of a legend connected with an inundation (Hartley's *Researches in Greece*, p. 52); and there is good reason for identifying this chasm with one which is mentioned by Herodotus. This kind of superstition is mentioned by Theodoret as subsisting in his time; also by the Byzantine writer Nicetas Choniates, who was a native of this place, and who says that Colossse and Chonae were the same (Chronicles p. 115). The probability is that under the later

emperors, Colossae, being in a ruinous state, made way for a more modern town, Chonae (Χῶναι, so Theophylact. *ad* Colossians 2:1), situated near it. The neighborhood (visited by Pococke) was explored by Mr. Arundel (*Seven Churches*, p. 158; *Asia Minor*, 2:160); but Mr. Hamilton was the first to determine the actual site of the ancient city, which appears to be at some little distance from the modern village of Chonas (*Researches in Asia Minor*, 1:508). The huge range of Mount Cadmus rises immediately behind the village, close to which there is in the mountain an immense perpendicular chasm, affording an outlet for a wide mountain torrent. The ruins of an old castle stand on the summit of the rock forming the left side of this chasm. There are some traces of ruins and fragments of stone in the neighborhood, but barely more than sufficient to attest the existence of an ancient site (Pococke, *East*, 3. 114; Schubert, Reise, 1:282; see generally Hofmann, *Introd. in lection. ep. ad Colos*. Lips. 1749; Cellarii Notit. 2:152 sq.; Mannert, *Geogr*. VI, 1:127 sq.; Smith, *Dict. of Class. Geogr* s.v.). *SEE COLOSSIANS (EPISTLE TO THE).*

Colossians, Epistle To The

the seventh of the Pauline epistles in the New Test. (see Davidson's *Introd. to the N.T.* 2:394 sq.). *SEE EPISTLE*.

I. *Authorship*. — That this epistle is the genuine production of the apostle Paul is proved by the most satisfactory evidence, and has never, indeed, been seriously called in question. The external testimonies (Just. M. *Trypho* , p. 311 b; Theophil. *ad Autol*. 2, p. 100, ed. Colossians 1686; Irenaeus, *Haer.* 3. 14, 1; Clem. Alex. *Strom.* 1, p. 325; 4, p. 588, al., ed. Potter; Tertull. *de Praescr*. ch. 7; *de Resurr*. ch. 23; Origen, *contra Cels.v.* 8) are explicit, and the internal arguments, founded on the style, balance of sentences, positions of adverbs, uses of the relative pronoun, participial anacolutha, unusually strong and well defined. It is not right to suppress the fact that Mayerhoff (*Der Brief an die Kol*. Berl. 1838) and Baur (*Der Apostel Paulus*, p. 417) have deliberately rejected this epistle as claiming to be a production of the apostle Paul. The first of these critics, however, has been briefly, but, as it would seem, completely answered by Meyer (*Komment*. p. 7); and to the second, in his subjective and anti-historical attempt to make individual writings of the N.T. mere theosophistic productions of a later Gnosticism, the intelligent and critical reader will naturally yield but little credence (see Rabiger, *De Christologia Paulina*, etc. Vratisl. 1852; Klopper, *De origine Epp. ad Ephesios et Collossenses*,

Gryph. 1853). It is, indeed, remarkable that the strongly-marked peculiarity of style, the nerve and force of the arguments, and the originality that appears in every paragraph, should not have made both these writers pause in their ill-considered attack on this epistle (see Tregelles, in Horne's *Introd*. new edit. vol. 3).

II. It is less certain, however, *when* and *where* it was composed. The common opinion is that Paul wrote it at Rome during his imprisonment in that city (<44816>Acts 28:16, 30). Erasmus, followed by others, supposes that Ephesus was the place at which it was composed; but this suggestion is obviously untenable from its incompatibility with the allusions 'contained' in the epistle itself to the state of trouble and imprisonment in which the apostle was whilst composing it (<51024>Colossians 1:24; 4:10, 18). In Germany, the opinions of theologians have been divided of late years between the common hypothesis and one proposed by Schulz in the *Theologische Studien und Kritiken* for 1829 (p. 612 sq.), viz., that this epistle, with those to the Ephesians and Philemon, was written during the apostle's (two years') imprisonment at Caesarea previous to his being sent to Rome. This opinion has been adopted and defended by Schott, Bottger, and Wiggers, whilst it has been opposed by Neander, Steiger, Harless, Ruckert, Credner, and others. In a more recent number of the same periodical, however, the whole question has been subjected to a new investigation by Dr. Wiggers, who comes to the conclusion that, of the facts above appealed to, none can be regarded as decisive for either hypothesis (*Stud. u. Krit.* 1841, p. 436). The above opinion that this epistle and those to the Ephesians and to Philemon were written during the apostle's imprisonment at Caesarea (<44217>Acts 21:27 - 26:32), has been recently advocated by several writers of ability, and stated with such cogency and clearness by Meyer (Einleit. z. *Ephes*. p. 15, sq.), as to deserve some consideration. It will be found, however, to rest on ingeniously-urged plausibilities; whereas, to go no further into the present epistle, the notices of the apostle's imprisonment in <51043>Colossians 4:3, 4, 11, certainly seem historically inconsistent with the nature of the imprisonment at Caesarea. The permission of Felix (<44223>Acts 24:23) can scarcely be strained into any degree of liberty to teach or preach the Gospel, while the facts recorded of Paul's imprisonment at Rome (<44823>Acts 28:23, 31) are such as to harmonize admirably with the freedom in this respect which our present epistle represents to have been accorded both to the apostle and his companions (see chap. 4:11, and comp. De Wette,

Einleit. z. Coloss. p. 12, 13; Wieseler, *Chronol*. p. 420). Finally, the foundation for this opinion is taken away by the fact that the imprisonment of Paul at Cesarea was not so long as commonly supposed. See PAUL. It is most likely, therefore, that it was written during Paul's first imprisonment at Rome, probably in the spring of A.D. 57, and apparently soon after the Epistle to the Ephesians, with which it contains numerous and striking coincidences. In support of this date the following facts may be adduced: Timothy was with Paul at the time (<51001>Colossians 1:1; comp. <50219>Philippians 2:19); Epaphroditus (Epaphras) had lately come from Asia Minor (1, 4, 7, 9; comp. <50725>Philippians 2:25; 4:18), and was now with Paul (<51042>Colossians 4:2); Paul was in prison, and had been preaching in his confinement (<51043>Colossians 4:3, 18; see <44830>Acts 28:30, 31); various friends were at this time with him (<51047>Colossians 4:7-14; these had therefore had time to gather about him, and it was not a season of danger); Tychicus (on his second journey) and Onesimus carried the letter (<51047>Colossians 4:7, 8; and subscription; comp. <49621>Ephesians 6:21; <57012>Philemon 1:12). From this last circumstance, it would appear that the epistle could not have been written very early in his imprisonment, as the letter to Philemon (doubtless written not long after) speaks confidently of a speedy release (see Conybeare and Howson's *Life and Epistles of St. Paul*. 2:384).

"The striking similarity between many portions of this epistle and of that to the Ephesians has given rise to much speculation, both as to the reason of this studied similarity, and as to the priority of order in respect to composition. These points cannot here be discussed at length, but must be somewhat briefly dismissed with the simple expression of an opinion that the similarity may reasonably be accounted for,

(1) by the proximity in time at which the two epistles were written;

(2) by the high probability that in two cities of Asia, within a moderate distance from one another, there would be many doctrinal prejudices, and many social relations, that would call forth and need precisely the same language of warning and exhortation. The priority in composition must remain a matter for a reasonable difference of opinion." *SEE EPHESIANS* and *SEE PHILEMON* (*Epistles to*).

III. *Design*. — The Epistle to the Colossians was written, apparently, in consequence of information received by Paul through Epaphras concerning

the internal state of their church (Colossians 1:6-8). Whether the apostle had ever himself before this time visited Colossa is matter of uncertainty and dispute. From Colossians 2:1, where he says, “I would that ye knew what great conflict I have for you and for them at Laodicea, and for as many as have not seen my face in the flesh,” etc., it has by some been very confidently concluded that he had not. It has been urged, however, that when, in ver. 5, the apostle says, “though I am absent in the flesh, yet am I with you in the spirit,” etc., his language is strongly indicative of his having formerly been amongst the Colossians, for the ἄπειμι is used properly only of such absence as arises from the person’s having gone away from the place of which his absence is predicated. In support of the same view have been adduced Paul’s having twice visited and gone through Phrygia (Acts 16:6; 18:23), in which Colossae was a chief city; his familiar acquaintance with so many of the Colossian Christians, Epaphras, Archippus, Philemon (who was one of his own converts, Philippians 13, 19), and Apphia, probably the wife of Philemon; his apparent acquaintance with Onesimus, the slave of Philemon, so that he recognized him again at Rome; the cordiality of friendship and interest subsisting between the apostle and the Colossians as a body (Colossians 1:24, 25; 2:1; 4:7, etc.); the apostle’s familiar acquaintance with their state and relations (Colossians 1:6; 2:6, 7, etc.); and their knowledge of so many of his companions, and especially of Timothy, whose name the apostle associates with his own at the commencement of the epistle, a circumstance which is worthy of consideration from this, that Timothy was the companion of Paul during his first tour through Phrygia, when probably the Gospel was first preached at Colossae. Of these considerations it must be allowed that the cumulative force is very strong in favor of the opinion that the Christians at Colossa had been privileged to enjoy the personal ministrations of Paul. At the same time, if the Colossians and Laodiceans are not to be included among those of whom Paul says they had not seen his face, it seems unaccountable that in writing to the Colossians he should have referred to this class at all: If, moreover, he had visited the Colossians, was it not strange that he should have no deeper feeling towards them than he had for the multitudes of Christians scattered over the world whose faces he had never seen? In fine, as it is quite possible that Paul may have been twice in Phrygia without being once in Colossae, is it not easy also to account for his interest in the church at Colossae, his knowledge of their affairs, and his acquaintance with individuals among them, by supposing that members of that church had frequently visited him

in different places, though he had never visited Colossae? *SEE LAODICEANS (EPISTLE TO)*.

A great part of this epistle is directed against certain false teachers who had crept into the church at Colossae (see Rheinwald, *De pseudo doctoribus Colossensibus*, Bonnae, 1834). To what class these teachers belonged has not been fully determined. Heinrichs (*Nov. Test. Koppian*. VII, 2:156) contends that they were disciples of John the Baptist. Michaelis and Storr, with more show of reason, conclude that they were Essenes. Hug (*Introd*. 2:449) traces their system to the Magian philosophy, of which the outlines are furnished by Iamblichus. But the best opinion seems to be that of Neander (*Planting and Training*, 1:374 sq.), by whom they are represented as a party of speculatists who endeavored to combine the doctrines of Oriental theosophy and asceticism with Christianity, and promised thereby to their disciples a deeper insight into the. spiritual world, and a fuller approximation to heavenly purity and intelligence than simple Christianity could yield. (See below.) Against this party the apostle argues by reminding the Colossians that in Jesus Christ, as set before them in the Gospel, they had all that they required; that he was the image of the invisible God; that he was before all things; that by him all things consist; that they were complete in him, and that he would present them to God holy, unblamable, and unreprovable, provided they continued steadfast in the faith. He then shows that the prescriptions of a mere carnal asceticism are not worthy of being submitted to by Christians, and concludes by directing their attention to the elevated principles which should regulate the conscience and conduct of such, and the duties of social and domestic life to which these would prompt. (See *Jour. Sac. Lit*. vol. 3) *SEE PHILOSOPHY*.

What these dangerous tendencies therefore were that had appeared in the doctrine and practice of the Colossian Church we discover more particularly from three specifications:

1. A pretentious philosophy, which affected an esoteric knowledge, received through tradition, and which, abandoning Christ the Head, indulged in unhallowed speculations on the number and nature of the spiritual beings with which the invisible world is peopled (Colossians 2:8, 18).

2. The observance, if not the asserted obligation (for this does not appear), of Jewish ordinances (Colossians 2:16, 20-22).

3. The practice of ascetic regulations (<51023>Colossians 2:23). A question here at once arises, Were these various errors found united in the same party or individual? At first sight they seem mutually to exclude each other. The pharisaic Judaizers exhibited no proneness either to a speculative gnosis or to asceticism; the Gnostic ascetics, on the other hand, were usually opposed to a rigid ceremonialism. It is so improbable, however, that, in a small community like that of Colossae, three distinct parties should have existed, that we are driven to the conclusion that the corrupt tendencies in question did really exist in combination in the same persons; and the difficulty will perhaps be alleviated if we bear in mind that in the apostolic age two classes of Judaizing teachers, equally opposed to the simplicity of the apostolic message, though in different ways, busied themselves in sowing tares among the wheat in the visible Church. The former consisted of the rigid formalists, chiefly Pharisees, who occupy so prominent a place in the history of the Acts and in several of Paul's epistles, and who contended for the continued obligation of the law of Moses upon Gentile converts; the latter were speculative adherents of the Alexandrian school, whose principle it was to subordinate the letter to the spirit, or rather to treat the former as a mere shell, which the initiated were at liberty to cast away as worthless, or intended only for the vulgar. With this false spiritualism was usually combined an element of Oriental theosophy, with its doctrine of the essential evil of matter, and the ascetic practices by which it was supposed that the soul is to be emancipated from the material thraldom under which it at present labors. To angelology, or the framing of angelic genealogies, the Jews in general of that age were notoriously addicted; in the pastoral epistles (see <54104>1 Timothy 1:4) we again meet this idle form of speculation. That persons imbued with these various notions should, on becoming Christians, attempt an amalgamation of them with their new faith is but natural; and the ill-assorted union seems to have given birth to the Gnosticism of a subsequent age, with its monstrous tenets, the product of an unbridled imagination. Teachers then, or perhaps a single teacher (<51016>Colossians 2:16), of this cast of Judaism had effected an entrance into the Colossian Church, and seems to have there experienced a favorable reception. In a Gentile community like this, pharisaic Judaism could not so easily have gained a footing; but the mixture of mystical speculation and ascetic discipline, which distinguished the section of the Alexandrian school alluded to, was just adapted to attract the unstable, especially in Phrygia, from time immemorial the land of mystic rites, such as those connected with the worship of Cybele, and of magical

superstition. From this congenial soil, in a subsequent age, Montanism sprang; and, as Neander remarks (*Apostelgeschichte*, 1:442), it is remarkable that in the 4th century the Council of Laodicea was compelled to prohibit a species of angel-worship, which appears to have maintained its ground in these regions (Can. 35). We must not, however, suppose that these tendencies had worked themselves out into a distinct system, or had brought forth the bitter practical fruits which were their natural consequence, and which, at a later period, distinguished the heresiarchs alluded to in the pastoral epistles, and the followers of Cerinthus. The corrupt teaching was as yet in its bud. The apostle therefore recommends no harsh measures, such as excommunication: he treats the case as one rather of ignorance and inexperience; as that of erring but sincere Christians, not of active opponents; and seeks by gentle persuasion to win them back to their allegiance to Christ. *SEE GNOSTICISM*.

IV. *Contents*. — Like the majority of Paul's epistles, that to the Colossians consists of two main divisions, one of which contains the doctrinal, the other the practical matter.

After his usual salutation (Colossians 1:1-2), the apostle returns thanks to God for the faith of the Colossians, the spirit of love they had shown, and the progress which the Gospel had made among them as preached by Epaphras (Colossians 1:3-8). This leads him to pray without ceasing that they may be fruitful in good works, and especially thankful to the Father, who gave them an inheritance with his saints, and translated them into the kingdom of his Son — *his Son, the image of the invisible God*, the first-born before every creature, the *Creator* of all things earthly and heavenly, the Head of the Church, He in whom an things subsist, and by whom all things have been reconciled to the eternal Father (Colossians 1:9-20). This reconciliation, the apostle reminds them, was exemplified in their own cases; they were once alienated, but now so reconciled as to be presented holy and blameless before God, if only they continued firm in the faith, and were not moved from the hope of which the Gospel was the source and origin (Colossians 1:21-24). Of this Gospel the apostle declares himself the minister; the mystery of salvation was that for which he toiled and for which he suffered (Colossians 1:24-29). Nor were his sufferings only for the Church at large, but also for them and others whom he had not personally visited, even that they might come to the *full knowledge of Christ*, and might not fall victims to plausible sophistries; they were to walk in Christ and to be built on him (Colossians 2:1-7).

Here the apostle brings in the particular theme of the epistle. Especially were the Colossians to be careful that no philosophy was to lead them from Him in whom dwelt all the fullness of the Godhead, who was the *Head of all spiritual powers*, and who had quickened them, forgiven them, and in his death had triumphed over all the hosts of darkness (Colossians 2:8, 15). Surely with such spiritual privileges they were not to be judged in the matter of mere ceremonial observances or beguiled into creature-worship. *Christ was the head of the body*; if they were truly united to him, what need was there of bodily austerities? (Colossians 2:16-23.)

In the latter half of the epistle the apostle enforces the practical duties flowing from these truths. The Colossians were, then, to mind things above — spiritual things, not carnal ordinances, for their life was hidden *with Christ* (Colossians 3:1-4): they were to mortify their members and the evil principles in which they once walked; the old man was to be put off, and the new man put on, in which all are one *in Christ* (Colossians 3:5-12). Furthermore, they were to give heed to special duties; they were to be forgiving and loving, as was Christ. In the consciousness of his abiding word were they to sing; in his name were they to be thankful (Colossians 3:13-17). Wives and husbands, children and parents, were all to perform their duties; servants were to be faithful, masters to be just (Colossians 3:18 - 4:1).

In the last chapter the apostle gives further special precepts, strikingly similar to those given to his Ephesian converts. They were to pray for the apostle, and for his success in preaching the Gospel; they were to walk circumspectly, and to be ready to give a seasonable answer to all who questioned them (Colossians 4:2-7). Tychicus, the bearer of the letter, and Onesimus would tell them all the state of the apostle (Colossians 4:7-9): Aristarchus and others sent them friendly greetings (Colossians 4:10-14). With an injunction to interchange this letter with that sent to the neighboring church of Laodicea (Colossians 4:16), a special message to Archippus (Colossians 4:17), and an autograph salutation, this short but striking epistle comes to its close. *SEE EPISTLE*.

V. *Commentaries*. — The following are expressly on this Epistle (including, in some instances, one or more of the other Pauline letters), the most important being designated by an asterisk (*) prefixed: Jerome, *Commeint*. (in *Opp.* [*Suppos.*] 2); Chrysostom, Hoan. (in *Opp.* 2:368); Zuingle, *Annotationes* (in *Opp.* 4:512); Melancthon, *Enarrationes*

(Wittenb. 1559, 4to); Zanchius, *Comment.* (in *Opp.* vi); Musculus, *Commentarius* (Basil. 1565, 1578, 1595, fol.); Aretius, *Commentarii* (Morg. 1580, 8vo); Olevianus, *Notae* (Genesis 1580, 8vo); Grynaeus, *Explicatio* (Basil. 1585, 8vo); Rollock, *Commentarius* (Edinb. 1600, 8vo; Genev. 1602); also *Lectures* (Lond. 1603, 4to); Cartwright, *Commentary* (Lond. 1612, 4to); *Byfield, *Exposition* (Lond. 1615, fol.; also 1627, 1649); Elton, *Exposition* (Lond. 1615, 4to; 1620, 1631, fol.); Quiros, *Commentarius* (in *Disput*., Lugd. B. 1623); Crellius, *Commentarius* (in *Opp.* 1:523); Cocceius, In *Ep.* ad Colossians (in *Opp.* 12:213); Alting, Analysis (in *Opp.* iv); *Davenant, *Expositio* (*Cantab*. 1627, fol.; also 1630, 1639, fol.; Genev. 1655, 4to; in English, London, 1831, 2 vols. 8vo); Calixtus, *Expositio* (Brunsw. 1654, 4to); Daille, *Sermons* (in French, Genesis 1662, 2d ed. 3 vols. 8vo; in English, Lond. 1672, fol.); and *Exposition* (Lond. 1841, 8vo); Fergusson, *Commentarius* (Lord. 1658, 8vo); Martin, *Analysis* (in *Opp.* 4:389); *D'Outrein, *Sendbrief*, etc. (Amst. 1695, 4to; in German, Frankfort, 1696, 4to); Schmid, *Commentarius* (Hamb. 1696, 4to; also 1704).; Suicer, *Commentarius* (Tiguri. 1699, 4to); Streso, *Meditationes* (Amst. 1708, 8vo); Gleich, *Predigten* (Dresden, 1717, 4to); Lutken, *Predigten* (Gardel. 1718, 1737, 4to); Hazevoet, *Verklaering* (Lugd. B. 1720, 4to); Van Til, *Commentarius* (Amst. 1726, 4to); Roell, *Exegesis* (Traj. 1731, 4to); Peirce, *Paraphrase* (London, 1733, 4to); Koning, *Openlegging* (L. B. 1739, 4to); Storr, *Interpretatio* (in his Opusc. Acad. 2:120-241); Boysen, *Erklarung* (Quedlb. 1766-1781); Jones, *Version* (London, 1820,12mo); Junker, *Commentar* (Mannheim, 1828, 8vo); Bohmer, *Auslegwng* (8vo, Berl. 1829; Breslau, 1835); Flatt, *Erklar*. ed. by Kling (Tub. 1829, 8vo); *Blhr, *Commentar* (Basel, 1833, 8vo); Watson, *Discourses* (Lond. 1834, 8vo; also 1838); Steiger, *Uebers*. u. *Erklar*. (Erlang. 1835, 8vo); Schleiermacher, *Predigten* (Berlin, 1835, 2 vols. 8vo); Lange, *Homilien* (Barmen, 1839); Decker, *Bearbeitung* (Hamb. 1848, 8vo); Hither, *Commentar* (Hamb. 1841, 2 vols. 8vo); *De Wette, *Erklarung* (Lpz. 1843, 1847, 8vo); Wilson, *Lectures* (London, 1845, 8vo; also 1846); Baumgarten-Crusius, *Commentar* (Jena, 1847, 8vo); Meyer, *Handbuch* (Gott. 1848, 8vo, pt. ix); Kahler, *Auslegung* (Eisleb. 1853, 8vo); Bisping, *Erklarung* (Munst. 1855, 8vo); *Eadie, *Commentary* (Glasg. 1856, 8vo); Dalmer, *Auslegung* (Gotha, 1858, 8vo); *Ellicott, *Commentary* (London, 1858, 1861, 8vo; Andover, 1865, 8vo); Gisborne, *Exposition* (Lond. 1860, 12mo); Messmer, *Erklarung* (Brixen, 1863, 8vo); Passavant, *Auslegung* (Basel, 1865, 8vo); *Bleek, *Vorlesungen* (Berlin, 1865, 8vo). *SEE COMMENTARY*.

Colt

(prop. Per, r yi[; a young ass, <070104>Judges 10:4; 13:14; <181112>Job 11:12; <380909>Zechariah 9:9; πῶλος, <402102>Matthew 21:2, etc.), spoken of the young of the horse, ass, or camel. *SEE FOAL*.

Colton, Calvin, D.D.

was born in Longmeadow, Mass., and graduated at Yale College in 1812. He studied divinity at Andover, and was ordained a Presbyterian clergyman in 1815, when he settled at Batavia, N. Y., where he preached until 1826, at which time he lost his voice, and thenceforth devoted his time to writing for periodicals. He traveled in Europe for several years, returning to New York in 1835, when he took orders in the Protestant Episcopal Church. After this he turned his attention to political subjects, and from 1838 to 1842 wrote many pamphlets. He held for some years before his death the chair of Political Economy in Trinity College, Hartford. Among his theological writings are *The Genius and Mission of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States* (12mo); *The Religious State of the Country* (12mo). He died at Savannah, March 20, 1857.

Columba

was the first of the numerous Irish missionaries of the sixth and seventh centuries. He was born about A.D. 520, in Donegal, Ireland, of the royal family. His real name was Colum, but, from his dovelike appearance in childhood, it was Latinized to Columba (dove). Among his own countrymen he was called *Colum na Cielle*, or *Columbkille*, Colum of the Church. His mother, Ethena, was of the royal house of Leinster. Before Columba went abroad on his mission he had traveled over Leinster, Connaught, Meath, and other parts, preaching and calling upon all immediately to repent and believe in Christ. The Venerable Bede (*Eccl. Hist.* l*ib.* in) says, “Before Columb came into North Britain he founded a noble monastery in Ireland, which, in the language of the Scots [Irish], was called Dairmach, that is, the ‘Field of Oaks.’” Archbishop Usher, who studied the life of this saint carefully, says “that, directly or indirectly, Columba founded nearly one hundred monasteries in Ireland.” The bishop may have meant simply Christian schools; for, like his prototype St. Patrick, wherever he had built a church he founded a school. With these early Irish Christians religion and learning were twin sisters. But Columba

is better known in history as “The Apostle of the Picts, or the Western Isles.” Passing over on a religious visit to the Irish colony in Albyn or North Britain, the chieftains of which were his own relatives, for the ‘first time he was brought into contact with the Picts, who were then pagans. From that moment he resolved to devote his life to their evangelization. For this purpose, about A.D. 563, Columba formed a company of twelve, and embarked for Druids’ Island, situated west of Mull, in the country afterwards called Scotland. Here he founded the monastery, or, more properly, the great theological school known on the Continent during the Dark Ages as “The Western Star of literature and religion.” Its government was wholly within itself, presbyterian and republican; the abbot or head invariably to be a presbyter, and to be chosen only by the inmates. Having built his huts, and left some of his men to till the ground for their support, with a few attendants he set out to preach to the Picts and the Highlanders on the north side of the Grampian Range. At first he was sternly resisted by the chieftain and his Druidic priest. At last, however, the king not only embraced Christianity, but became active in spreading it among his people. Columba and his companions afterwards set sail for the Western and Orkney Islands, and founded several churches and schools upon them. Having thus established his mission beyond the, Grampian Hills, he returned to Iona and Albyn. For several years his field of labor was very large, extending from the Western Islands to the Lowland Picts, to the Irish colony in Argyleshire, to the Angle-Saxons in Northumberland, and occasionally to Ireland. Although never episcopally ordained, he thus became the greatest missionary bishop of his day. His last visit to Ireland was one of peace, to adjust a political difference between two princes. On reaching Iona, “the isle of his heart,” as he usually called it, he was very feeble. Finding that he was drawing near the close of life, he was taken to a little eminence from which he could see the holy settlement, and from which he invoked God’s blessing upon it. Having returned, he began his favorite employment of transcribing the Scriptures. That night, being led to the altar, he fell on his knees and began to pray; soon, however, he was discovered leaning against the railing in a dying state. The brotherhood, now gathering around him with their lighted torches, began to weep and to crave his last blessing. Recovering for a moment, and feebly opening his eyes and smiling on all around, he attempted to raise his hand to pronounce the blessing, but it immediately fell. He then sank down in death, and breathed his last, in the 78th year of his age.

Columba was no ordinary man. In person he is said to have been very comely — beautiful even to old age. He was never idle. When not engaged in study, prayer, or missionary duty, he employed himself in transcribing the Holy Scriptures. When traveling he was always seeking for opportunities to do good. If he met a child, he gave it his blessing; if an adult, he inquired in regard to his soul. On entering a house, he invoked God's blessing upon it; and often, when reaching the threshing-floor, he would request all to stop work till they had thanked God, the giver of bread. His early biographers say that he was a powerful preacher, speaking the Irish and Latin with equal ease, and both with great fluency. His voice was tender, tremulous, musical, and sufficiently strong to be heard at a great distance. His soul was in his preaching, and was constantly manifesting itself through his words, tones, and gestures. He was a man of great prayer; the spirit of devotion seemed to have been the atmosphere in which he lived. If he entered a boat, mounted a horse, administered medicine, or parted with a friend, in all these he acknowledged God, and asked his protection. He was not a Romanist — Romanism proper had not reached Ireland in his day. He enjoined on all his disciples to receive nothing as religious truth that was not sustained by proof drawn from the Holy Scriptures (*Prolatis sacrae Scripturae testimoniis*). — Adamnan, *Life of Columba*; Bede, *Eccl. Hist.* 3. 4; Moore, *Hist. of Ireland*, often; *Pict. Hist. of England*, 1:277; Montalembert, *Monks of the West*, vol. 3; Todd, *Ancient Irish Church*; Smith, *Religion of Ancient Britain*, p. 256; McLear, *Christian Missions in the Middle Ages*, Lond. 1863; *Princeton Rev.* Jan. 1867, p. 5.

Columbanus

a missionary of the sixth century, was born in Leinster, Ireland, about A.D. 543, and descended from a noble family of that province. In early *Life*, from talents, position, and property, the world opened to him with unusual attractions, but he decided to enter the monastery of Banchor, in Ulster, then giving instruction to about one thousand students. Having formed a company of missionaries, Columbanus set out for France, and settled at the foot of the Vosges Mountains, among the wildest, poorest, and most uncivilized of all the Franks. Here he built huts. The daily routine of the fraternity was, in their cabins, reading, praying, and transcribing the Scriptures and other books; in the field, cultivating the ground for their sustenance and to give to the poor; and when abroad, visiting the people, and inviting them to hear the Gospel. Their establishment, although

generally called a monastery, was far more like one of our modern missionary stations. After a few years another was commenced at Fontaines — “The Springs” — which soon became a place of general resort, and which greatly enlarged their sphere of usefulness. In these places they continued for about twenty years, exerting the most benign influence on all the surrounding country; and through the wives and daughters of the semi-barbarous chieftains, Christianizing its political institutions. “The common people had followed these missionaries gladly; but the keen rebukes of Columbanus had long chafed the most of the ruling classes. At a royal festival a glass of wine was presented to him, which he dashed on the floor because it had ‘been polluted by the touch of an adulterer’“ (Godwin’s Ancient Gaul, p. 338). At another time four illegitimate children of Theuderik, or Thierry, the king, were placed before him to receive his blessing, which he refused, and pronounced them to be the offspring of sin. Upon this the famous Brunehilda vowed his destruction. When the soldiers came to disperse his establishment, he met them with intrepidity. But the monastery was broken up. The brotherhood now rallied around him, and were willing to die with him; but he advised them to go to Germany.

Columbanus went to Italy, where new troubles awaited him. Holding with the Irish Church in regard to the Three Chapters (q.v.) and the time of keeping Easter (q.v.), he learned that the Roman Church had condemned these views under severe penalties. He found, however, a protector in Theodolinda, the pious queen of the Lombards, who agreed with him about the Three Chapters. He had everywhere avowed his principles, and even addressed a letter to pope Boniface, in which he charged him and the General Council with departing from the faith of the apostles. He reminded him that in Rome and Italy there had been many disputes and dissensions, while in Ireland “there never had been a heretic or schismatic but that from the beginning they had held without wavering (inconcussa) the true catholic faith.” Soon afterwards he retired to Bobbio, in the Apennines, where he founded his last monastery, and died prematurely about A.D. 615.

Columbanus was one of those men who cannot pass easily through this world. The subjects of his rebukes were generally shining marks — kings, queens, dukes, popes, and others in high places. By nature he was a poet; and the fragments of Irish poetry left by him are said by competent judges to have been imitated in Macpherson’s *Ossian*. He has been almost

overlooked in English literature, while the authors of the *Literary History of France* are even extravagant in his praise. He left a treatise on *Penitence*, from which it is evident that communion in both kinds was allowed in the Irish Church in his day. Of the works written by Columbanus are still extant: *De octo vitiis principalibus, Poenitentiale, Instructiones de officis Christiani*, and some letters and poems. They have been published by Fleming (Louvain, 1607), and in Gallandius, *Bibl. veterum Patr*. tom. 10. Columbanus's monastic rule has been published in Holsten-Brockie, *Codex Regul*. 1:166 sq. Biographies of Columbanus were written by his companion Jonas and by the monk Walafrid Strabo, both of which are given by Mabillon, Acta SS. Ord. S. Ben. i, sec. 2. — See Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* 2:700; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 2:789; Hefele, *Gesch. der Einfuhr. des Christ. in Siddeutsch*. p. 262-280; Knottenbelt, *Disp. de Columbano* (Leyd. 1859); *Histoire Litt. de la France*, 3. 279-505; Usher, 6:281; *Lives of Illust. Men of Ireland*, 1:125 (Dublin, 1838); Moore's *Hist. of Ireland*, p. 136 (Philadelphia); Neander, *Light in Dark Places*, p. 187.

Column

(Lat. *columna*), a pillar to support a roof or other part of a building. It is more usually applied to ancient architecture, the columns of Gothic buildings being usually termed pillars. Still, this distinction of terms is not universally observed. A column generally has a base, shaft, and capital. The proportions vary with the style of architecture, and the size and purpose of the building. It was frequently merely an architectural ornament, and was used in all cultivated ages. Those employed by the ancient Egyptians, Greeks, and Persians may be taken as the best and most classical examples of antiquity. *SEE PILLAR*.

Picture for Column 1

1. Egyptian columns may be classed in eight orders, as in the accompanying wood-cut, where, being drawn to the same scale, their respective dimensions are shown. For, though columns of the same order vary very much in different buildings, an average proportion may be assigned to them, which, indeed, is all that can be done in those of Greece, though they varied less than in Egyptian architecture. In point of antiquity, the first was certainly the square pillar; then the polygonal and round fluted column of the second order; and soon afterwards the third and fourth came

into use. But the fourth and fifth. though used long before, were not common till the 18th dynasty, and the fourth assumed a larger size than any other, as at Karnak and Luxor. The sixth, though mostly in Ptolemaic and Roman temples, dates at least as early as the 18th dynasty; as does the eighth, which is, in fact, the square pillar, with a figure attached, and the evident original of the Caryatide of Greece; but the seventh is limited to the age of the Ptolemies, and has an endless variety in the form and ornaments of its capital. It was, however, quite Egyptian, and in no way indebted to Greek taste for its introduction. Of the same kind were the columns described by Athenaeus (v. 103), with circular capitals, set round with rose-like ornaments, or with flowers and interlaced leaves, some of which were made of the long tapering form used in their houses, to which he also alludes. There was also a pilaster surmounted by a cow's head (Wilkinson's *Anc. Egyptians*, 2:285, 286, abridgm.).

Picture for Column 2

2. Among the Greeks, also, the grandeur of the temples, which were very simple in form, was greatly owing to the beautiful combinations of columns which adorned the interior as well as the outside. These columns either surrounded the building entirely, or were arranged in porticoes on one or more of its fronts, and according to their number and distribution temples have been classified both by ancient and modern writers on architecture. Columns were originally used simply to support the roof of the edifice; and, amidst all the elaborations of a later age, this object was always kept in view. Hence we find the column supporting a horizontal mass technically called the entablature. Both the column and the entablature are again divided into three distinct parts. The former consists of the base, the shaft, and the capital; the latter of the architrave, the frieze, and the cornice. The architrave is the chief beam (ἐπιστύλιον, *epistlium*), resting on the summit of the row of columns; the frieze (ζωφόρος, *zophorus*) rises above the architrave, and is frequently adorned by figures in detail; and above the frieze projects the cornice (κορωνίς, *coronis*), forming a handsome finish (Smith's *History of Greece*, p. 144; see Miller, ANCIENT ART [Lond. 1842], § 277).

3. The Persian style of columns, *SEE ASSYRIA*; *SEE JACHIN*, greatly resembled the Ionic, having a circular and ornamental base, a fluted shaft, and a capital, consisting either of two half-formed animals (the horse-head or demi-bulls were the favorites) crosswise of the architrave, or of a

complex pyramidal ornament surmounted by volutes (Fergusson's *Nineveh and Persepolis*, p. 159 sq.). *SEE ARCHITECTURE*.

Comander

SEE KOMANDER.

Comb

SEE HONEY.

Combat

SEE SINGLE COMBAT.

Combefis, Francois

a learned Dominican monk was born in November, 1605, at Marmande, in the Department of Lot-et-Garonne, in France. He was educated by the Jesuits at Bordeaux, and in 1624 entered the Dominican order. After completing his theological studies, he was appointed professor of philosophy and theology in several houses of his order (in 1640 at Paris). But soon he withdrew from his professorship in order to devote all his time to literary labors, and, in particular, to the study and publication of the ancient writers of the Church. After publishing, in 1644, the works of Amphilochius, bishop of Iconium, of Methodius and Andreas of Crete (2 vols. fol., Greek and Latin, with notes), and in 1645 the *Scholia of St. Maximus on Dionysius*, he attracted great attention by the publication of the *Novum Auctarium Greeco-Latinoe. Bibliothecae Patrum* (Paris, 1648), which consists of an exegetical and a historical part. The former contains homilies and sermons of St. Asterius, bishop of Amasea, of St. Proclus, of St. Anastasius of Alexandria, and of several other Church fathers and writers. The second part contains a history of the Monothelites, which was not well received in Rome, and the writings of several Greek writers, ecclesiastical and secular. In 1655 he published the *Chronography* of the Byzantine writer Theophanes, which had been begun by the Dominican monk Goar, but left unfinished at his death. In order to encourage these literary labors, the French bishops, at a meeting in Paris in 1655, assigned to Combefis an annual salary of 500 livres, which in the next year was increased to 800, and later to 1000 livres. In 1656 he published several works of Chrysostom; in 1660 the acts of martyrs of the Greek Church (*Illustrium Christi Martyrum Lecti Triumphi*, Greek and Latin). In 1662

appeared one of his greatest works, the *Bibliotheca Patrum Concionatoria* (8 vols. Paris). Among the most important of his later works are the following: *Auctarium novissimum Bibliothecoe Graecorum Patrum* (Paris, 1672, 2 vols.), containing *Liber Flavii Josephi de imperio rationis in laudem Maccabceorum*, two books of Hippolytus, one essay of Methodius, two works against the Manicheans by Alexander of Lycopolis (formerly himself a Manichean). and by Didymus of Alexandria; some essays of the Hesychast Palamas and his opponent Manuel Kalakas, who, on account of his Romanizing tendencies, had been expelled from the Greek Church and had entered the Dominican order; the *Eccles. Groecus* (Par. 1674), containing a Latin translation of select works of Basil the Great and Basil bishop of Seleucia; and new editions of the works of Maximus Confessor (Paris, 1675, 2 vols. fol. this work was left incomplete in consequence of the death of Combefis) and of Basil the Great. The edition of *Gregory of Nazianzus*, and of the works of those Byzantine writers who wrote after Theophanes, were prepared by Combefis, but not finished. The latter was published by Du Fresne (Paris, 1685); the former was made use of by the Maurine Louvard for his edition of Gregory. Combefis died March 23,1679. See Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen Lex*. 2:701 sq.; Quetif and Echard, *Script. Ord. Praedic*. 2:678 sq.

Comber, Thomas

a learned English divine, was born at Westerham, Kent, March 19, 1644. It is said that he could read Greek at ten years old. Admitted B.A. at Cambridge in 1662, he was made Prebendary of York in 1677, dean of Durham in 1691, and died in 1699. His chief works are: *Companion to the Temple* (new edit., Oxford, 1841, 7 vols. 8vo, one of the most complete works extant on the *Book of Common Prayer*): — *Short Discourses on the Common Prayer* (1684, 8vo): — *Roman Forgeries in the Councils of the first four Centuries* (London, 1689, 4to). His *Memoirs*, by his great grandson, T. Comber, were published in London in 1799 (8vo). — Hook, *Ecclesiastes Biography*, 4:156; Kippis, *Biographia Britannica*, 4:45.

Comber, Thomas

grandson of the preceding, passed M.A. at Cambridge in 1770, and LL.D. in 1777. He was rector of Hickby-Misherton, Yorkshire, afterwards of Morbone, and died rector of Buckworth in 1778. He wrote *The Heathen Rejection of Christianity in the first Ages considered* (Lond. 1747, 8vo):

—*Examination of Middleton's Discourse against Miracles* (8vo): — *Treatise of Laws, from the Greek of Sylburgius* (1776, 8vo),

Comenius

(properly *Komensky*), JOHN AMOS, was born at Comna, in Moravia, March 28, 1592. Having studied at Herborn and Heidelberg, he entered the ministry of the Bohemian Brethren's Church, and took charge (1616) of the parish of Prerau, as also of the rectorship of its theological seminary. In 1618 he removed to Fulneck, where he filled the same offices. Driven from his native country in the Bohemian anti-Reformation, he settled at Lissa, in Poland, where he superintended the high school of the Brethren. In 1632 he became one of their bishops, and, as such, prepared the way for their renewal as a church, caring in particular for the continuance of their episcopal succession. His skill as an educator, especially his new method of teaching Latin, gave him great celebrity, and he traveled through a large part of Protestant Europe to improve the methods of education, being called to England for this purpose in 1641, and to Sweden in 1642. He became closely connected with the mystic Antoinette Bourignon (q.v.), and in 1657 published *Lux in Tenebris* (4to), in which he reported the "visions" of Kotter, Poniatovia, and Drabicius. In after years, however, he regretted this connection, and acknowledged that "he had been entangled in an inextricable labyrinth." He settled finally at Amsterdam, where he died Oct. 15, 1671. His principal works are: *Theatrum divinum* (Prague, 1616): — *Labyrinth der Welt* (Prague, 1631; Berlin, 1787): — *Janua linguarum reserata* (Lissa, 1631), translated into many languages, and, among others, into Persian and Arabic, an elementary encyclopedia divided into 100 chapters and 1000 paragraphs: — *Opera didactica omnia* (Amst. 1657, fol.): — *Ratio disciplicae ordinisque eccl. in Unitate Fratrum Bohernorum* (Lissa, 1632; Amsterd. 1660; Halle, 1702; in German by Koppen; in English by Seifferth, *Ch. Const. of the Boh. Brethren* (Lond. 1867).

Comer, John

one of the early Baptist ministers in America, was born in Boston, Aug. 1, 1704. He was apprenticed to a glover, but at seventeen, by the influence of Increase Mather, he was released by his master, and soon entered Harvard College, whence he removed, after a few years, to Yale. In 1721 he joined the Congregationalist Church at Cambridge, but in 1725 became a Baptist,

connecting himself with Mr. Callender's church in Boston. In the same year he began preaching, and in 1726 he was ordained co-pastor at Newport. In 1729 a dispute about the "laying on of hands" in admitting baptized members into the Church led to his dismissal from his charge. In 1732 he became pastor at Old Rehoboth, about ten miles from Providence, where he died of consumption, May 23, 1734. He left a *Diary* in MS., which is of great interest for the early history of the Baptist Church in America. — Sprague, *Annals*, 6:42.

Comforter

SEE PARACLETE.

Coming

(παρουσία, *being present*) OF CHRIST, a phrase employed,

(1.) literally, in reference to our Lord's first appearance in the flesh (<620520>1 John 5:20; 2 John 7), or to his future appearance at the last day to fulfill his promises to raise the dead and judge the world in righteousness (<440111>Acts 1:11; 3:20, 21; <520415>1 Thessalonians 4:15; <550401>2 Timothy 4:1; <581028>Hebrews 9:28).

(2.) Metaphorically, Christ is said to come when his Gospel is introduced or preached in any place by his ministers (<431522>John 15:22; <490217>Ephesians 2:17); when his church or kingdom is visibly or powerfully established in the world (<401628>Matthew 16:28); when he bestows upon believers the influence of his spirit, and the peculiar tokens of his love (<431418>John 14:18, 23, 28); when he executes his judgment on wicked communities who reject or corrupt his Gospel (<520208>2 Thessalonians 2:8); and when his providence calls us away from the world by death, as preparatory to the judgment of the last day (<402442>Matthew 24:42). The basis of this metaphorical usage in regard to the coming of Christ is the same as in relation to the coming of God; that as he governs the world, every specific act of his providence and authority indicates his presence in a more striking manner to human conception, on the principle that no agent can act where he is not. See ESCHATOLOGY.

Commandery or Commandry

a kind of benefice belonging to a military order. There are also "commanderies" in the orders of Bernard and Anthony, and for the knights of Malta, accorded for distinguished services.

Commandment

SEE DECALOGUE.

Commandments, The Five,

or COMMANDMENTS OF THE CHURCH, certain rules of the Roman Catholic Church which, within the last three centuries, have been considered to be as obligatory on the laity as the commandments of the decalogue. These five commandments are generally stated as follows:

1. To keep holy the obligatory feast-days;

2. Devoutly to hear mass on Sundays and feast-days;

3. To observe the days of fast and abstinence;

4. To confess to the priest at least once a year (at Easter) (*Conc. Lat. IV, Can*. 21);

5. To partake of the sacrament at least once a year, towards Easter.

As these different rules have no common origin in the regulations of the Church, and are not even taken from the *Catechismus Romanus*, it is not to be wondered at that they have undergone several modifications. Among other variations, it has been a general practice to join the fourth and fifth commandments together, and to replace the fifth by "Not to marry at certain prohibited times." Others have made various alterations. Bellarmine includes the paying of tithes among the commandments of the Church, whilst some of the French catechisms, unable to include all the rules under the five heads, have added a sixth, yet without reaching their object. In the United States the "commandments" are enjoined in the following form:

1. The Catholic Church commands her children, on Sundays and holydays of obligation, to be present at the holy sacrifice of mass, to rest from servile works on those days, and to keep them holy.

2. She commands them to abstain from flesh on all days of fasting and abstinence, and on fast-days to eat but one meal.

3. She commands them to confess their sins to their pastor at least once a year.

4. She commands them to receive the blessed sacrament at least once a year, and that at Easter, or during the paschal time.

5. To contribute to the support of their pastor.

6. Not to marry within the fourth degree of kindred, nor privately without witnesses; nor to solemnize marriage at certain prohibited times.

We have said that these commandments are as obligatory for the Romanist layman as the commandments of God. The Council of Trent has dogmatically settled the point (*Sess. VI, De Justif. Can*. 20). The Protestant opposition to this great wrong was commenced by such writings as Luther's *De captivitate Babylonica* and Zwingle's *Von Erkiesen und Fryheit der Spysen*. *The Evangelical Confessions* express the same opposition, as, for instance, the *Augustana*, in the articles XV, XVII, XXVI, the *Helvetica* in 23, 24, and 27, *Tetrapol*. cap. 7, 8, 9, 10. The clearly-expressed protestation contained in these passages does in no way seek to overthrow the dutiful obedience commanded towards pastors and rulers (<58137>Hebrews 13:17), or towards decency and order (<46140>1 Corinthians 14:40), and the power of government held by the Church in the persons of its constituted organs. All this is entirely different from the commandments established by the Romish hierarchy in opposition to the Word of God, as expressed in <51016>Colossians 2:16, 18, 20-23; <40157>Matthew 15:17; <54001>1 Timothy 4:1-4; <46008>1 Corinthians 8:8; 7:6; 3:21; <41023>Mark 2:23; <48409>Galatians 4:9-11. The old plea constantly presented by the Romish apologists, that the doctrine of the commandments of the Church has its foundation in the power of the keys and in the commandments of God himself, is of no weight. — Herzog, *Real-Encyklop*. 4:644; Wetzer *u. Welte, Kirch.-Lex*. 4:344.

Commendam

When a vacant living is *commended* in the Church of England to the charge of a clergyman until it can be supplied with a pastor, the benefice is said to be supplied *in commendam*. Anciently the administration of vacant bishoprics belonged to the nearest bishop, thence called commnendatory.

This custom was at a very early period introduced into the Church. Athanasius says of himself, according to Nicephorus, that there had been given him, in commendam, another church beside that of Alexandria, of which he was the stated bishop. When a priest is made bishop, his parsonage becomes vacant, but he may still hold it in commendam. It has been the practice sometimes in England for the crown thus to annex to a bishopric of small value either the living which had been held by the newly made bishop, and of which, in virtue of such elevation of its incumbent, the patronage became at the disposal of the crown, or some other in its stead. — Eden, *Churchman's Dict.*; Farrar, *Eccl. Dict.*; Wetzer *u. Welte, Kirch.-Lex.* 2:705.

Commendone Giovanni Francesco,

a cardinal and papal legate in Germany, was born at Venice March 17, 1523. After studying law, he went (1550) to Rome, where he attracted the attention of Pope Julius III, and was employed as early as 1551 for a political mission. In 1552 he went as papal envoy to the Netherlands, and from there to England, where he had an important secret interview with Mary, the daughter of Henry VIII, who, on the death of her brother Edward, was to ascend the English throne. Mary gave him an autograph letter to the pope, and promised that the Roman Catholic religion should be re-established as the state Church. Commendone, having now gained the entire confidence of the pope, was at once employed for other important missions to Portugal, Spain, and France. Paul IV made him papal secretary and bishop of Zante. Pius IV sent him to Germany to invite the Protestant princes to send delegates to the Council of Trent. He addressed the Protestant convention at Naumburg (1561), and presented the papal bull of invitation and letters to the several princes, but met with no success, the letters being returned unopened and the invitation declined. Subsequent efforts to prevail upon the elector of Brandenburg and the kings of Denmark and Sweden to send deputies to the council remained likewise without effect. More successful was a mission to Poland in 1563. Whilst staying at the Polish:court he was appointed a cardinal. In 1566 and 1568 he was sent to the Emperor Maximilian, who was suspected of leaning toward Protestantism, in order to detain him from making concessions to the Protestants. Soon after he was again sent to Poland in order to secure the election of a French prince, who was known as a fanatical partisan of the Church of Rome, as king of Poland. He returned to Rome in 1573, and died in 1584. His life was written by A. Maria Gratiani, his secretary, and

subsequently bishop of Amelia. See Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* 1:707 sq.; Prisac, *Die papstlichen Legaten Commendone und Cappaccini in Berlin* (Neuss, 1846).

Commentary

(ὑπομνηματισμός, Lat. *commentarii*. 2 Maccabees 2:13), BIBLICAL (see Carpenter's GUIDE TO THE STUDY OF THE BIBLE, pt. 1, ch. 3. sec. 1-4; Davidson, in Horne's *Introd*. new ed. 2:377-385; M. Stuart in the *Am. Bib. Repos*. 3. 130 sq.). *SEE INTERPRETATION*.

I. *Definition*. — By *commentary*, in its theological application, is usually meant an exhibition of the meaning which the sacred writers intended to convey; or a development of the truths which the Holy Spirit willed to communicate to men for their saving enlightenment. This is usually effected by notes more or less extended — by a series of remarks, critical, philological, grammatical, or popular, whose purport is to bring out into view the exact sentiments which the inspired authors meant to express. It is true that this can only be imperfectly done, owing to the various causes by which every language is affected; but the substance of revelation may be adequately embodied in a great variety of garb.

(1.) The *characteristics* of commentary are:

(a.) An elucidation of the meaning belonging to the words, phrases, and idioms of the original. The signification of a term is generic or specific. A variety of significations also belongs to the same term, according to the position it occupies. Now a commentary points out the particular meaning belonging to a term in a particular place, together with the reason of its bearing such a sense. So with phraseso It should likewise explain the construction of sentences, the peculiarities of the diction employed, the difficulties belonging to certain combinations of words, and the mode in which they affect the general meaning.

(b.) Another characteristic of commentary is an exhibition of the writer's scope, or the end he has in view in a particular place. Every particle and word, every phrase and sentence, forms a link in the chain of reasoning drawn out by an inspired author — a step in the progress of his holy revelations. A commentary should thus exhibit the design of a writer in a certain connection-the arguments he employs to establish his positions,

their coherence with one another, their general harmony, and the degree of importance assigned to them.

(c.) In addition to this, the train of thought or reasoning pursued throughout an entire book or epistle, the various topics discussed, the great end of the whole, with the subordinate particulars it embraces, the digressions made by the writer — these, and other particulars of a like nature, should be pointed out by the true commentator. The connection of one argument with another, the consistency and ultimate bearing of all the statements advanced — in short, their various relations, as far as these are developed or intimated by the author, should be clearly apprehended and intelligently stated.

(d.) Another characteristic of commentary is, that it presents a comparison of the sentiments contained in one book, or one entire connected portion of Scripture, with those of another, and with the general tenor of revelation. A beautiful harmony pervades the Bible. Diversities, indeed, it exhibits, just as we should expect it *a priori* to do; it presents difficulties and mysteries which we cannot fathom, but with this variety there is a uniformity worthy of the wisdom of God. A commentator should therefore be able to account for diversities of sentiment, in reference to the same topic, that appear in the pages of books written at different periods, and addressed to individuals or communities whose circumstances, intellectual and physical, were dissimilar. Without it religious truth will be seen in disjointed fragments; no connected system, compact and harmonious in its parts, will meet the eye.

(2.) From what has been stated in regard to the constituents of commentary, it will also be seen that it differs from *translation*. The latter endeavors to find in another language equivalent terms expressive of the ideas which the words of the Hebrew and Greek languages were framed to convey. It is easy to see, however, that in many cases this cannot be done, and that in others it can be effected very imperfectly. There are and must be a thousand varieties of conception expressed in the original languages of Scripture, of which no other can afford an adequate representation. The inhabitants of the countries where the sacred books were written lived amid circumstances in many respects diverse from those of other people. These circumstances naturally gave a coloring to their language. They affected it in such a way as to create terms for which there are no equivalents in the languages of tribes who are conversant with different

objects, and live amid different relations. In such a case no expedient is left but circumlocution. By the help of several phrases we must try to approximate at least the sentiment or shade of thought which the inspired writers designed to express. *Commentary* is thus more diffuse than *translation*. Its object is not to find words in one language corresponding to those of the original languages of the Scriptures, or nearly resembling them in significance, but to set forth the meaning of the writers in notes and remarks of considerable length. *Paraphrase* occupies a middle place between translation and commentary, partaking of greater diffuseness than the former, but of less extent than the latter. It aims at finding equivalent terms to those which the sacred writers employ, accompanied with others that appear necessary to fill up the sense, or to spread it out before the mind of the reader in such a form as the authors themselves might be supposed to have employed in reference to the people to whom the paraphrast belongs. *Scholia* differ from commentary only in brevity. They are short notes on passages of Scripture. Sometimes difficult places alone are selected as their object; at other times they embrace continuously an entire book.

II. There are two kinds of commentary which we shall notice, viz. the *critical* and the *popular*.

1. The former contains grammatical and philological remarks, unfolds the general and special significations of words, points out idioms and peculiarities of the original languages, and always brings into view the Hebrew or Greek phraseology employed by the sacred writers. It dilates on the peculiarities and difficulties of construction which may present themselves, referring to various readings, and occasionally bringing into comparison the sentiments and diction of profane writers, where they resemble those of the Bible. In a word, it takes a wide range, while it states the processes which lead to results, and shrinks not from employing the technical language common to scholars. Extended dissertations are sometimes given, in which the language is made the direct subject of examination, and the aid of lexicons and grammars called in to support or confirm a certain interpretation.

2. Popular commentary states in perspicuous and untechnical phraseology the sentiments of the holy writers, usually without detailing the steps by which that meaning has been discovered. It leaves philological observations to those whose taste leads them to such studies. All scientific investigations

are avoided. Its great object is to present, in an attractive form, the thoughts of the sacred authors, so that they may vividly impress the mind and interest the heart. It avoids every thing that a reader unacquainted with Hebrew and Greek would not understand, and occupies itself solely with the theology of the inspired authors — that holy sense which enlightens and saves mankind. This, however, is rather what popular commentary should do, than what it has hitherto done.

The limits of critical and popular commentary are not so wide as to prevent a partial union of both. Their ultimate object is the same, viz. to present the exact meaning which the Holy Spirit intended to express. Both may state the import of words and phrases; both may investigate the course of thought pursued by prophets and apostles. They may develop processes of argumentation, the scope of the writers' remarks, the bearing of each particular on a certain purpose, and the connection between different portions of Scripture. Yet there is much difficulty in combining their respective qualities. In popularizing the critical, and in elevating the popular to the standard of intelligent interpretation, there is room for the exercise of great talent. The former is apt to degenerate into philological sterility, the latter into trite reflection. But by vivifying the one, and solidifying the other, a good degree of affinity would be effected. Critical and antiquarian knowledge should only be regarded as a means of arriving at the truth taught. Geographical, chronological, and historical remarks should solely subserve the educement or confirmation of Jehovah's will.

III. The prominent *defects* of existing commentaries. —

1. *Prolixity*. This defect chiefly applies to the older works; hence their great size. It is not uncommon to meet with a large folio volume of commentary on a book of Scripture of moderate extent. Thus Byfield, on the *Epistle to the Colossians*, fills a folio volume; and Venema, on *Jeremiah*, two quartos. Peter Martyr's "*most learned and fruitful commentaries upon the Epistle to the Romans*" occupy a folio, and his "*commentaries upon the book of Judges*" another tome of the same extent. But Venema on the Psalms, and Caryl on Job, are still more extravagant, the former extending to no less than six volumes quarto, the latter to two goodly folios. It is almost superfluous to remark that such writers wander away, without confining themselves to exposition. We do not deny that even their extraneous matter may be good and edifying to those who have the patience to wade through its labyrinths, but still it is not commentary. It

is very easy to write, *currente calamo*, any thing however remotely connected with a passage, or to note down the thoughts as they rise; but to think out the meaning of a place, to exercise independent mental effort upon it, to apply severe and rigid examination to each sentence and paragraph of the original, is quite a different process. To exhibit in a lucid and self-satisfying manner the results of deep thought and indomitable industry, is far from the intention of those prolix interpreters who, in their apparent anxiety to compose a *full* commentary, present the reader with a chaos of annotations, and bury the holy sense of the inspired writers beneath the rubbish of their prosaic musings.

2. Some commentators are fond of detailing various opinions without sifting them. They procure a number of former expositions, and write down out of each what is said upon a text. They tell what one and another learned annotator affirms, but do not search or scrutinize his affirmations. No doubt an array of names looks imposing; and the reader may stare with surprise at the extent of research displayed; but nothing is easier than to fill up pages with such patchwork, and to be as entirely ignorant of the nature of commentary as before. The intelligent reader will be inclined to say, What matters it to me what this rabbi has said, or that doctor has stated? I am anxious to know the true sense of the Scriptures, and not the varying opinions of men concerning them. It is a work of supererogation to collect a multitude of *Annotations* from various sources, most of which the industrious collector knows to be improbable or erroneous. It is folly to adduce and combat interpretations from which the common sense and simple piety of the unsophisticated reader turn away with instinctive aversion. If plausible views be stated, they should be thoroughly analyzed. But in all cases the right meaning ought to be a prominent thing with the commentator, and prominently should it be manifested, surrounded, if possible, with those hues which Heaven itself has given it, and qualified by such circumstances as the Bible may furnish.

3. Another defect consists in dwelling on *the easy* and evading *the dfficult* passages. This feature belongs especially to those English commentaries which are most current among us. By a series of appended remarks, plain statements are expanded; but wherever there is a real perplexity, it is glozed over with marvellous superficiality. It may be that much is said about it, but yet there is no penetration beneath the surface; and when the reader asks himself what is the true import, he finds himself in the same state of ignorance as when he first took up the Commentary in question.

Pious reflections and multitudinous inferences enter largely into our popular books of exposition. They spiritualize, but they do not expound. They sermonize upon a book, but they do not catch its spirit or comprehend its meaning. When a writer undertakes to educe and exhibit the true sense of the Bible, he should not give forth his own meditations, however just and proper in themselves. Put in the room of exposition, they are wholly out of place. The simple portions of the Bible are precisely those which require little to be said on them, while to the more difficult superlative attention should be paid. But the reverse order of procedure is followed by our popular commentators. They piously descant on what is well known, leaving the reader in darkness where he most needs assistance.

4. A very common fault with modern commentators is the attempt to go over too much ground of text, and thus do the whole work superficially. Many are ambitious of writing a commentary on the whole Bible, often with very inadequate preparations, or leisure, or research, and thus do but little else than rehearse the conclusions of others, with scarcely any original investigation themselves. The commentator should ‘come to his work only after a long and matured study’ of the Scriptures as a whole, and then, with great deliberation, and patient study and balancing of various views and conflicting opinions, proceed step by step with one book at a time; not hastily run over the entire volume, and produce the crude and first-caught materials that he has gathered suddenly and by onesided investigations. Hence those *Annotations* are almost always the best where a writer has confined himself to a single book or epistle, and has perhaps made it his life-long study, looking at it from every possible point of view, and verifying his conclusions by repeated comparisons and researches. Commentaries “written to order” have almost invariably been worthless. See *American Biblical Repository*, January, 1833, art. 4.

IV. We shall briefly *review* the principal works of this class on the Bible at large, with criticisms especially on the older commentaries and those best known in modern times.

1. Such as are most accessible by having been written in English or Latin, or translated into one of those languages. (See a select list of this kind, with criticisms, in the Supplem. to Jenks’s *Comprehensive Commentary*.)

(1.) J. Calvin (“*Commentarii*,” etc. in his *Opp.* , translated, Edinb. 1845-56, 52 vols. 8vo). — In all the higher qualifications of a commentator

Calvin is preeminent. His knowledge of the original languages was not so great as that of many later expositors, but in developing the meaning of the sacred writers he has few equals. It has been well remarked that he chiefly attended to the logic of commentary. He possessed singular acuteness, united to a deep acquaintance with the human heart, a comprehension of mind by which he was able to survey revelation in all its features, and an enlightened understanding competent to perceive sound exegetical principles, and resolute in adhering to them. He can never be consulted without advantage, although all his opinions should not be followed, especially those that result from his doctrinal prepossessions.

(2.) T. Beza (“*Test. Vet. c. schol.* Tremellii et Junii, Apocr. c. *notis* Junii, et N.T. c. *notis* Bezae,” fol. Genev. 1575-79, Lond. 1593, and often; “*Bible with Annotations,*” fol. Genesis 1561-2, and often). — Beza’s talents are seen to great advantage in expounding the argumentative parts of the Bible. He possessed many of the best exegetical qualities which characterized his great master. In tracing the connection of one part with another, and the successive steps of an argument, he displays much ability. His acuteness and learning were considerable. He was better acquainted with the theology than the criticism of the New Testament.

(3.) H. Hammond (“*Paraphrase and Annotations*” on the N.T., Lond. 1653, best ed. 1702; on the Psalms, in his *Works*, 4 vols. fol. 1674-84). — This learned annotator was well qualified for interpretation, and many good specimens of criticism are found in his notes. Yet he has not entered deeply into the spirit of the original, or developed with uniform success the meaning of the inspired writers. Many of the most difficult portions he has superficially examined or wholly mistaken.

(4.) M. Poole (“*Annotations*” on the whole Bible, Lond. 2 vols. fol. 1700 and before, best ed. Lond. 1840, 3 vols. 8vo). — Poole’s *Annotations* on the Holy Bible contain several valuable, judicious remarks. But their defects are numerous. The pious author had only a partial acquaintance with the original. He was remarkable neither for profundity nor acuteness. Yet he had piety and good sense, amazing industry, and an extensive knowledge of the older commentators.

Poli “*Synopsis Criticorum*” (fol. 4 vols. in 5, Lond. 1669-76, and several eds. since; best ed. by Leusden, Ultr. 1684). — In this large work, the *Annotations* of a great number of the older commentators are collected and condensed, many of them from the still more extensive collection known as

the *Critici Sacri* (q.v.), edited by Bp. Pearson and others (2d edit. with two supplemental vols. Frcft. a. M. 1696-1701, 9 vols. fol.). But they are seldom sifted and criticized, so that the reader is left to choose among them for himself.

(5.) H. Grotius ("*Annotationes*" on all the Bible and Apocr. in his *Opp.* also ed. Moody, Lond. 1727, 2 vols. 4to). — This very learned writer investigates the literal sense of the Scriptures with great diligence and success. He had considerable exegetical tact, and a large acquaintance with the heathen classics, from which he was accustomed to adduce parallels. His taste was good, and his mode of unfolding the meaning of a passage simple, direct, and brief. His judgment was sound, free from prejudice, and liberal beyond the age in which he lived. As a commentator he was distinguished for his uniformly good sense. It has been said without reason that he found Christ nowhere in the Old Testament. It is true that he opposed the Cocceian method, but in this he was often correct. His chief defect is in spiritual discernment. Hence he rests in the literal meaning in many cases, where there is a higher or ulterior reference.

(6.) J. Le Clerc ("V. T. c. *Paraphrasi, Commentario,*" etc. 4 vols. fol. Amst. 1710 sq.). — Excellent notes are interspersed throughout the commentaries of this author (his work by a similar title on the N.T. was based upon that of Hammond, 2 vols. in 1, fol. Amst. 1699). His judgment was good, and his mode of interpretation perspicuous. From his richly-stored mind he could easily draw *Illustration*s of the Bible both pertinent and just. Yet he was very defective in theological discrimination. Hence, in the prophetic and doctrinal books he is unsatisfactory. It has been thought, not without truth, that he had a rationalistic tendency. It is certain that he exalted his own judgment too highly, and pronounced dogmatically where he ought to have manifested a modest diffidence.

(7.) A. Calmet ("*Commentaire Litteral*" on the entire Bible and Apocr. Par. 1724, 8 vols. in 9, fol.; transl. into Latin, with the dissertations by J. D. Manse, 19 vols. 4to, Wirceb. 1789). — Calmet is perhaps the most distinguished commentator on the Bible belonging to the Roman Catholic Church. In the higher qualities of commentary his voluminous work is very deficient. It contains a good collection of historical materials, and presents the meaning of the original where it is already plain; but his historical apparatus needs to be purified of its irrelevant, erroneous statements, while on the difficult portions no new light is thrown.

(8.) Patrick, Lowth, Arnald, and Whitby (“*Critical Commentary*,” etc. on the O. and N.T. and Apocr. 6 vols. 4to, Lond. 1822; 4 vols. 8vo, Phila. and N. Y. 1845). — Bishop Patrick had many of the elements belonging to a good commentator. His learning was great when we consider the time at which he lived, his method brief and perspicuous. Lowth is inferior to Patrick. Whitby presents a remarkable compound of excellences and imperfections. In philosophy he was a master. In critical elucidations of the text he was at home. Nor was he wanting in acuteness or philosophical ability. His judgment was singularly clear, and his manner of annotating straightforward. Yet he had not much comprehensiveness of intellect, nor a deep insight into the spiritual nature of revelation.

(9.) M. Henry (“*Exposition of the O. and N. Test.*” Lond. 1704 sq., 5 vols. fol., and various eds. since, latest Lond. 1849, 6 vols. 4to, condensed with Scott’s *Notes* and Doddridge’s *Practical Observations*, besides additions from other sources, in Jenks’s *Comprehensive Commentary*, Brattleboro, Vt. 1836 sq., 5 vols. 8vo).The name of this good man is venerable, and will be held in everlasting remembrance. His commentary does not contain much exposition. It is full of sermonizing. It is surprising, however, to see how far his good sense and simple piety led him into the doctrine of the Bible, apart from many of the higher qualities belonging to a successful commentator. His prolixity is great. Practical preaching is the burden of his voluminous notes.

(10.) J. Gill (“*Exposition of the O. and N. Test.*” Lond. 1763, 9 vols. fol., and several times since). — The prominent characteristic of Gill’s commentary is heaviness. It lacks condensation and brevity. The meaning of the inspired authors is often undeveloped, and more frequently distorted. Gill’s chief merit was his Rabbinical learning.

(11.) P. Doddridge (“*Family Expositor of the N.T.*,” Lond. 1739, 6 vols. 4to, and often since; Amherst, Mass. 1837, 1 vol. 8vo). — The taste of this pious commentator was good, and his style remarkably pure. He had not much acumen or comprehension of mind; but he had an excellent judgment, and a calm candor of inquiry. His paraphrase leaves much unexplained, while it dilutes the strength of the original. The practical observations are excellent. The notes are few, and ordinarily correct.

(12.) T. Scott (“*Holy Bible with Notes*,” etc. Lond. 1796, and often since; Lond. 1841, 6 vols. 4to; Bost. 1827, 6 vols. 8vo). — The prevailing characteristic of Scott’s commentary is judiciousness in the opinions

advanced. The greater portion of it, however, is not proper exposition. The pious author preaches about and paraphrases the original. His simplicity of purpose generally preserved him from mistakes; but as a commentator he was neither acute nor learned. He wanted a competent acquaintance with the original, power of analysis, a mind unprepossessed by a doctrinal system, and penetration of spirit.

(13.) A. Clarke ("*Holy Bible, with Commentary*," etc. 8 vols. 4to, Lond. 1810-23, and often since; best ed. Lond. 1844, 6 vols. 8vo, N. Y. 1843). — In many of the higher qualities by which an interpreter should be distinguished, this man of much reading was wanting. His commentary, however, which was the chief literary labor of his life, is replete with profound and varied, though not always accurate, and often inapposite, learning. He is always thoroughly earnest and practically spiritual. Some of his notions are indeed extravagant, but they are never the errors of the heart. Many of the dissertations scattered through the work possess a permanent value for their diligent research. Its historical notes are the best. Its quotations from ancient and Oriental authors are abundant and usually apt. Its remarks in vindication of the truth and consistency of Scripture are also often worthy of consultation.

(14.) E. F. C. Rosenmüller. — The "*Scholia*" of this laborious writer extend over the greater part of the Old Testament (11 pts. in 23 vols. 8vo, Lpz. 1795 sq.; "in *Compendium* redacta," by Lechner, 5 vols. 8vo). — The last editions especially are unquestionably of high value. They bring together a mass of annotation such as is sufficient to satisfy the desires of most Biblical students. Yet the learned author undertook too much to perform it in a masterly style. Hence his materials are not properly sifted, the chaff from the wheat. He has not drunk deeply into the spirit of the inspired authors. He seems, indeed, not to have had a soul attuned to the spirituality of their utterances, or impregnated with the celestial fire that touched their hallowed lips,. His father, J. G. Rosenmüller, the author of the "Scholia" on the New Testament (5 vols 8vo, Nurnbg. 1785, and since), is a good word-explainer for students beginning to read the original. He has not produced a masterly specimen of commentary on any one book or epistle.

(15.) H. Olshausen ("*Biblisches Commentar*" on the N.T. continued by Ebrard and others, 7 vols. 8vo. Konigsb. 1837-56; tr. in Clarke's *Library*, Edinb. 1847 sq.; ed. by Kendrick, N. Y. 1856 sq., 6 vols. 8vo. have

hitherto appeared). — One of the best examples of commentary on the New Testament with which we are acquainted has been given by this; writer. The arrangement, however, being semi-historical, has some inconveniences, especially as the text is not given. The exposition is almost wholly free from the influence of German neology. Verbal criticism is but sparingly introduced, although even here the hand of a master is apparent. He is intent, however, on higher things. He investigates the thought, traces the connection, puts himself in the same position as the writers, and views with philosophic ability the holy revelations of Christ in their comprehensive tendencies. The critical and the popular are admirably mingled. The continuation of the work by other hands is scarcely equal in value.

(16.) A. Tholuck. — The commentaries of this eminent writer on various books of the New Testament, especially those on the Epistles to the Romans and Hebrews, exhibit the highest exegetical excellences. While he critically investigates phrases and idioms, he ascends into the pure region of the ideas, unfolding the sense with much skill and discernment. His commentary on John is of a more popular cast. His interpretation of the *Bergpredigt*, or Sermon on the Mount, is very valuable. That on the Psalms is less thorough. (For the editions, see each of these books in their place.)

(17.) E. W. Hengstenberg. — This writer is too fanciful in his exegesis, too arbitrary in his philology, and too extreme in his theology to be fully trustworthy as a commentator; yet his expositions of the Psalms, Ecclesiastes, Revelation, etc., may be consulted with advantage, if used with comparison of other authors.

(18.) E. Henderson. — This commentator’s translation and notes on the Minor Prophets, as well as Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel, are admirable specimens of sound learning, good judgment, and evangelical piety. Their only fault in the exposition is an excessive leaning to literalism.

(19.) A. Barnes. — This series of *Notes* on the New Test. (N. Y. 12 vols. 12mo; Lond. 1850-52), and portions of the Old (Job, Isaiah, Daniel), have had a popularity which shows their adaptation to an extensive want. They are simple, lucid, and practical, and written with the author’s happy flow of style, and are marked by genuine spirituality; but they are not characterized by critical or extensive learning.

(20.) J. A. Alexander. — The notes of this eminent scholar on Isaiah are a thorough and well-digested production. His commentaries on the Psalms and historical books of the N.T., however, are too popular to add anything to his reputation.

(21.) C. T. Kuinol. — The commentaries of this writer, especially on the Gospels and Acts (in Latin, best ed. London, 1835, 3 vols. 8vo), although strongly tinctured with rationalism, are among the best, critically and philologically considered, extant. Learning, acuteness, and candor are everywhere apparent.

(22.) G. Bush. — This author's *Annotations* on several of the first books of the O.T., although intended for popular use, are generally characterized by good sense, genuine learning, and pious sentiment; and are the more valuable as being nearly the only good commentary on these portions of Scripture available to the common reader.

(23.) M. Stuart. — His commentaries on Romans, Hebrews, Daniel, Revelation, Proverbs, and Ecclesiastes, albeit rather diffuse and grammatical, are yet of great value for their eminent candor, careful investigation, and general apprehension of the genius and scope of the writers. To the young student especially they are indispensable.

(24.) S. T. Bloomfield. — This author's critical *Digest* (8 vols. 8vo, Lond. 1826-8), as well as his *Commentary* (Lond. 1830 sq. 2 vols. 8vo; Phila. 1836) and its *Supplement* (London, 1840, 1 vol. 8vo), all on the N.T., give very much sound and judicious exposition, and have the advantage of placing before the reader the views of earlier interpreters. Without any great attempt at originality, there is generally a careful sifting of opinions and balancing of arguments that make his comments, on the whole, the best synopsis of simple exegesis yet produced.

(25.) H. Alford ("*Gr. Test.*" with critical apparatus and notes, Lond. 1853-61, 5 vols. 8vo; vol. 1, N. Y. 1859). — This scholarly edition of the Greek Test. contains a critically-revised text, a copious exhibit of various readings, valuable prolegomena, and a series of analytical, philological, and expository notes. There is not much strictly new in any of these departments, but a convenient assemblage of materials not usually accessible. The whole is wrought out with great care and learning, and presented in the most condensed form. A very serious drawback upon its value, however, is the latitudinarianism evident in the author's theological,

or, perhaps, rather hermeneutical principles, which leads him in very many difficult passages rather to array the sacred authors against one another than to reconcile their apparent discrepancies. Under arrogance of superior "honesty," he too often declines the prime task of an expositor by pronouncing difficulties insoluble. The critical apparatus is pervaded by the same subjective proclivity, insomuch that the writer has himself once or twice completely remodeled it.

(26.) F. J. V. D. Maurer ("*Commentarius in V. T.*" Lps. 1835-47, 4 vols. 8vo). — This is a series of brief *Annotations* on the Old Test., considerably full on the poetic portions, and characterized by great acumen, with much accuracy of scholarship, but little or no combination of the spiritual insight into Holy Writ. It is chiefly valuable to students for expounding the literal meaning.

(27.) J. C. Wolf ("*Curoe in N.T.*" 5 vols. 4to, Basil. 1741). — This author, although somewhat old, deserves especial notice for his valuable mass of sound annotations.

Besides the above, the following English commentaries on portions of Scripture are entitled to particular mention, including several German works presented in an English dress by the publishers Clark, of Edinburgh (valuable additions to our literature these last, but sadly in need, as a general thing, of judicious editing), and some reprinted in this country: Trench on the Miracles and Parables; Stier on the words of Christ; Kitto's *Pictorial Bible* and *Daily Bible Illustrations*; Conybeare and Howson's *Life and Epistles of St. Paul*; Watson on Matthew and some other parts of the N.T.; Bengel on the N.T.; Baumgarten on the Acts; Eadie on several of the Pauline epistles; Horsley on Hosea; Elliott on Revelation; Lowth on Isaiah; Wemyss and Fry on Job; Ellicott on the pastoral epistles; Good on the Psalms and Canticles; Steiger on 1st Peter; Umbreit on Job; Billroth on Corinthians; Tittmann on John; Lightfoot's *Horoe Hebraicoe*; Keil on Joshua and Kings; Auberlein on Daniel; Kalisch on Genesis and Exodus; Stanley on Corinthians; Jowett on several of Paul's epistles; Ginsburg on Song of Solomon and Ecclesiastes; Phillips and De Burgh on the Psalms; Maclean on Hebrews; Preston on Ecclesiastes, and many others which space does not permit us here to enumerate. There are commentaries on the entire Bible by Girdlestone, Wellbeloved, Wesley, Coke, Benson, Cobbin, Sutcliffe, and others; on the New Test. by Baxter, Burkitt, Gillies, Trollope, and others; on the Gospels by Quesnel, Campbell, Norton, Ryle,

and others; on the Epistles by Macknight, Pyle, and others. There are also serviceable *Annotations* on various parts of Scripture by several of the early Church fathers, especially Origen, Jerome, and Chrysostom, *SEE CATENA*, by the mediaeval theologians and reformers, especially Luther, and an almost innumerable series of later commentators more or less extensive, sufficiently complete lists of which are given under the appropriate heads in this *Cyclopaedia*. There also exist an immense number of academical dissertations of an exegetical character, chiefly by Germans, for certain collections of a few of which, well known on the Continent, see Walch, Bibl. Theolog. 4:920 sq. See also the several books and divisions of Scripture in their proper place in this work. For Hebrew commentaries on the whole Jewish Scriptures, *SEE RABBINIC BIBLES*.

2. The modern *Germans*, prolific as they are in theological works, have seldom ventured to undertake an exposition of the whole Bible. Each writer usually confines himself to the task of commenting on a few books. In this their wisdom is manifested. Yet they do not usually excel in good specimens of commentary, at least in the more sacred elements. They are *word-explainers*. In pointing out various readings, in grammatical, historical, and geographical annotations, as also in subtle speculations respecting the genius of the times in which the writers of the Bible lived, they are at home. In the lower criticism we willingly sit at their feet and learn. But with regard to the higher, in all that pertains to the logic of commentary, in development of the sense in its holy relations, the great majority of them are lamentably wanting. Refined notions usurp the place of practical piety in their minds; and the minutiae of verbal criticism furnish them nutriment apart from the rich repast of theological sentiment and sanctifying truth. But there are some noble exceptions, several of which are designated above.

One of the most complete and recent series of German commentaries (although somewhat meager in detail) is that published by Hirzel (Leipzig, 1841-57), consisting of a *Kurzgefasstes exegetisches Handbuch*, on the Old Test., by Hitzig, Hirzel, Thenius, Knobel, Bertheau, and J. Olshausen (in 16 vols. 8vo); on the New Test. by De Wette, with additions by Bruckner, Messner, and Licke (in 11 vols. 8vo); on the *Apocrypha* by Fritzsche and Grimm (in 5 vols. 8vo). A most copious and (in the German sense) valuable series is also the *Kritisch exegetischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament*, by Dr. H. A. W. Meyer and others (Gott. in 16 pts. lately completed, with new eds. of the earlier portions). Another is the

Exeg. Handb. zu den Briefen des Apostels Paulus, by A. Bisping (Miinster, 1858); and still more deserving of notice, *Die Heilige Schrift, m. Einleit. u. erkl. Anmerkungen*, by Otto von Gerlach (2d ed. Berl. 1858); to which may be added *Die potischen Bucher des alten Bundes erklart*, by H. Ewald (Gott. 1836-54, 4 vols. 8vo), together with his *Drei Erste Evangelien* (ibid. 1851, 8vo), *Sendschreiben des Paulus* (*ib.* 1857, 8vo), Das B. Ijob (*ib.* 1854, 8vo); *Die Propheten des alten Bundes erklart* (Stuttg. 1842, 2 vols. 8vo), and Coinment. in Apocalypsin (Lips. 1828, 8vo); likewise F. W. C. Umbreit's *Commentar ub. d. Propheten* (Hamb. 1842-6, 4 vols. 8vo), *Romer* (Gotha, 1856, 8vo), *Psalter* (*ib.* 1848, 8vo), SPRSICHE SALOMOS (*ib.* 1826, 8vo), *Kohelet* (*ib.* 1820, 8vo), and *Hiob*. (*ib.* 1832, 8vo); also the *Handb. d. Einleit. d. Apocryphen*, by G. Volkmar (T*ib.* 1860 sq.). A new series of critical and exegetical commentaries of great value, in German, on the books of the O.T., is also in progress by Delitzsch and Keil (Lpz. 1861 sq.), which will doubtless include the substance of those already published by these writers on several of the books (Genesis, Psalms, Canticles, Habakipuk, Joshua, Kings, Chronicles separately); it is in course of publication, in an English dress, by the Messrs. Clark of Edinburgh.

J. P. Lange, assisted by several evangelical scholars, is also issuing aseries of admirable homiletical commentaries on. the books of the O. and N.T., of which improved translations are in course of publication in this country, edited by Dr. Schaff (N. Y. 1864 sq.). Wetstein's *Novum Testamentum Graecum* (Amst. 1751, 2 vols. fol.), and Grinfield's *Hellenistic Editio and Scholia on the New Test.* (Lond. 1843, 1848, 4 vols. 8vo) afford much valuable philological elucidation of the text. Bunsen's Bibelwerk, now in progress of publication (Lpz. 1858 sq. 8vo), although eccentric in many respects, has also its valuable exegetical features, especially the new translation of the text.

In addition to these, Germany has produced many other specimens of commentary that occupy a high place in the estimation of competent judges, but still remain untranslated. Among these are Licke on John's writings, especially in the *third* edition; Gesenius on Isaiah; De Wette on the Psalms; Fritzsche on Matt., Mark, and Rom.; Bihr on Colossians; Philippi on Romans; Bleek on Hebrews; Hupfeld on the Psalms; Gramberg on Chronicles; Ruckert on Romans and Corinthians; Flatt on the Epistles; Lengerke on Daniel; Stier on Acts, Hebrews, James, and Jude; Havernick on Ezekiel and Daniel; Harless on Ephesians; Winer (in Latin) on

Galatians; Schultens (Lat.) on Job and Proverbs; and Tuch on Genesis; with numerous others, which possess much merit, accompanied, it is true, with some serious faults. Dr. Nast, of Cincinnati, is publishing in this country a commentary on the New Test. in German on an excellent plan, of which an edition in English is also issued.

3. To these may be added the *American* commentaries of Turner on Genesis, Romans, John, Ephesians, Galatians, and Hebrews; Hackett on Acts; Moore on Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi; the notes of Owen, Whedon, Ripley, Jacobus, Hodge, and others, on the Gospels, Epistles, etc.; and numerous other less important works that might be specified, but which are given more fully under the respective books of Scripture. We may also refer to the notes accompanying the revision of the Engl. Bible now in progress by the Am. Bible Union, as furnishing much exegetical elucidation. (See a convenient list of works most accessible and useful to American students, with prices attached, and judicious practical hints on the general subject of aids to Biblical knowledge, in the *Methodist Quar. Rev.* April, 1856, p. 288-297.) Notwithstanding the above somewhat copious statement, it must, however, be admitted that a convenient and satisfactory manual of exposition on the entire Bible, adapted to the wants of the public in this country, is still a de sideratum.

4. The following is a chronological conspectus of professed Commentaries on the whole canonical Scriptures (exclusive of merely improved versions or editions), as complete as we have been able to make it. For those covering the Old or the New Testament alone, see under those titles. The most important of those here enumerated are designated by an asterisk (*) prefixed: Origen, *Commentaria* (ed. Huetius, Rothmagi. 1668, 2 vols. fol.); Augustine, *Exegetica* (in *Opp.* 3-6), also his *Sermones* (*ib.* vii), and his *Quaestiones* (Lugd. 1561, 8vo); Paterius, *Expositio* (from Gregory, in the latter's *Opp.* IV, ii); Hugo de S. Caro, *Postilloe* (6 vols. fol.,Ven. et Basil. 1487, Basil. 1498, 1504, Par. 1508, Colon. 1621; 8 vols. fol., Lugd. 1645, 1669); *Walafridus Strabo, *Glossa*, etc. (a sort of Catena, including extracts from Rabanus Maurus, and the *Postilloe* of De Lyra, 6 vols. fol., Nuremb. 1494; also more complete, Duaci. 1617, and Antw. 1634); Nezen, *Operationes Biblicoe* [from Luther's expositions] (Jen. 1510-11, 2 vols. 4to); Dionysius Carthusianus, *Commentarius* (Colon. 1532 sq., 12 vols. fol.); *Pellican, *Commentarii* [except Jonah, Zechariah and Revelation] (Tiguri. 1532 sq., 7 vols. fol.; with Meyer's notes on the Apocalypse, Tigur. 1542, 10 vols. fol.); Bp. Clario, *Annotationes* [those

on the O.T. are chiefly from Seb. Munster] (Venice, 1542, 1557, 1564, fol.; also in the *Critici Sacri*); Gastius, *Commentarii* [from Augustine] (Basil. 1542, 2 vols. 4to); Vatablus, *Scholia* [from his lectures] (in Stephens's *Latin Bible*, Paris, 1545, 1551; also separately, Salamanca, 1584, 2 vols. fol.; and in the *Critici Sacri*, and since); Bruccioli, *Commento* (Venice, 1546, 7 pts. fol.); Castalio, *Biblia Sacra* , etc. (Basil. 1551, fol.; later with various additions, especially Francfort, 1697, fol.; also in the *Critici Sacri*); Marloratus, *Commentarii* [on many portions of Scripture] (various places and forms, 1562-85, etc.); Strigelius, *Scholia* (on the books of the O.T. separately, Lips. etc. 1566 sq., 18 vols. 8vo) and *Hiypomnemata* (on the N.T., Lips. 1565, 8vo, and later); L. Osiander, *Annotationes* (Tub. 1573-84, 8 vols., 1587, 1 vol. 4to, 158992, 1597, Franc. 1609, 3 vols. fol.; also in German, Stuttg. 1600, and often); Tremellius and Beza, *Scholia et Noteo* [chiefly notes by Tremellius and Junius] (Genesis 1575-9, Lond. 1593, fol., and later); Brentz, *Commentarii* [sermons] (in his *Opp.* i-vii, Ti*ib.* 1576-90); *Calvin, *Commentarii* [except Judges, Ruth, 2 Sam., Kings, Chronicles, Esther, Nehemiah, Ezra, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Song of Solomon, and Revelation] (at various times in different languages; together in Latin, in his *Opera*, Geneva, 1578, 12 vois. 1617, 7 vols., Amst. 1671, 9 vols. fol.; in English [except 1 Samuel and Job], Edinb. 1845-56, 52 vols. 8vo); *Lucas Brugensis, *Notationes* (Antw. 1580, 4to; also in the *Critici Sacri*); also his and Molanus's and others' notes in the *Biblia Lovanensis* (Antw. 1580, 1582 sq.; 1590, fol.; also in the *Critici Sacri*); Chytraeus, *Commentarii* [on most of the books of Scripture] (in *Opp. Exeg. Vitemb*. 1590-2, Lips. 1598-9, 2 vols. fol.); *Sa, *Notationes* (4to, Antw. 1598, 1610, Lugd. 1609, 1647, Colon. 1610, 1620; fol. Lugd. 1641; also in *Mariana's Scholia*, Antw. 1624, fol., and in De la Haye's *Biblia, Par*. 1643, fol.); Piscator, *Commentarii* (Herb. 1601 sq., 24 vols. 8vo; 1643-5,4 vols. fol., N.T. also separate); Diodati, *Annotationes* (Genev. 1607, fol.; in English, Lond. 1608, enlarged 1651, fol.); Cramer, *Auslegung* (Argent. 1619, 3 vols. 4to; without the text, 1727, 4to; F. ad M. 1780, 2 vols. 4to); *Mariana, *Scholia* (Madrid. 1619, Paris, 1620, Antw. 1624, fol.); *Estius, *Annotationes* (Antw. 1621, fol.; Colon. 1622, 4to; enlarged by Nemius, Duaci. 1628, Antw. 1653, Par. 1663, 1683, Mogunt. 1668, fol., and in De la Haye; also with the author's excellent notes on the Epistles, Antw. 1699, fol.); Pareus, *Commentaria* [on most of the books of the Bible] (at different times, also collected Franefort, 1628, 1641, 1648, Genesis 1642, fol.; and in *Opp.* Exeg. Franc. 1647, 3 vols. fol.); Haraeus, *Expositiones* [Patristic and mystical] (Antw.

1630, fol.); *Menochius, *Expositio* (fol. Colon. 1630, 3 vols.; Antw. 1679, Lugd. 1683,1695, 1 vol.; with important additions by Tourremine, Par. 1719, 2 vols., Ven. 1722, 1 vol.; also in De la Haye, etc.); *Tirinus, *Commentarius* [chiefly compiled, especially from A Lapide] (fol. Antw. 1632, 3 vols.; 1645, 1656, 1668, 1688, 1719, Lugd. 1664, 1678, 1690, 1697, 1702, Venice, 1688, 1704, 1709, 1724, Aug. Vind. 1704, 2 vols.; also in De la Haye's *Biblia* and Poole's *Synopsis*); Strabo Fuldensis [ed. Leander], *Glossa* [with Lyra's *Postilla*] (Antw. 1634, 6 vols. fol.); Haak, *Dutch Annotations of Syn. of Dort* (Lond. 1637, 1657, 2 vols. fol.); Gordon, *Commentaria* (Par. 1636, 3 vols. fol.); Card. Cajetan, *Commentarii* (Lugd. 1639, 5 vols. fol.); the Nuremberg (otherwise Vinarian or Ernestian, *Erklarung* [by various authors, edited by Gerhard, Major, and other Jena professors] (Nurnb. 1640-2, and often afterwards, fol.); Quistorp, *Annotationes* (Rost. 1643, 2 vols. 4to); *De la Haye, *Biblia Magna* [a collection of the comments of Gagnaeus, Este, Sa, Menoch, and Tirinus] (Par. 1643, 5 vols. fol.) also his *Biblia Maxima* [an enlarged but less correct edition of the preceding, with some omissions, and the addition of De Lyra's and some original comments] (Par. 1660, 19 vols. fol.); Bp. Hall, *Contemplations* (in *Works*, i, ii, Lond. 1647; also often since separately); Friedlib, *Observationes* (Stral. 1649-50, 2 vols. fol.; enlarged, F. ad M. 1650); the Westminster Assembly's (q.v.) *Annotations* [by various divines] (Lond. 1650-7, 2 vols.; 3d ed. 1657, 3 vols. fol.); Escobar and Mendoza, *Commentarii* (Lugd. 1652-67, 9 vols. fol.); Mayer, *Commentary* [chiefly compiled] (Lond. 1653, 6 vols. fol., and I vol. in 4to, etc.); Trapp, *Commentary* [quaint] (Lond. 1654, 5 vols. fol.; 1867 sq., 8vo); *Grotius, *Annotationes* (O.T., Par. 1654, 3 vols. fol.; Venice, 1663, fol.; N.T., Par. 1644, 1646, 1649, fol., etc.; together, Lond. 1660, fol.; also in *Opera*, i, ii; and the *Critici Sacri*, vii, abridged by Moody, Lond. 1727, 2 vols. 4to); the *Critici Sacri* (q.v.), ed. by Bp. Pearson and others [an immense collection of exegetical treatises by various eminent scholars] (Lond. 1660, 9 vols. fol.; with the 2 additional vols. called *Supplementum*, F. ad M. 1696-1701, 9 vols. fol.; and with 4 more vols. called *Thesaurus Theologico-philologicus et Thesaurus Novus*, Amst. 1698-1732, 13 vols. fol.; condensed by Poole in his Synopsis); Pruckner, *Commentarium* (F. ad. M. 1663, 2 vols. folo); F. de Carribres, *Commentaria* (Lugd. 1663, folo); Brenius, *Annotationes* [Socinian] (ed. Cuper, Amst. 1664, fol,); A Lapide, *Commentaria* [except Job and the Psalms] (Antwo 1664, 1671, 1681, 1694, 1705, Venice, 1708, 1780, 10 vols fol.); Heinlin, Rebstock, Zeller, Jager, Pfaff, and Hochstetter, *Summarien* [by order of the duke of

Wirtemberg] (Stuttgart, 1667, Lpz. 1709, Rudest. 1721, 4to, Lpz. 1721, fol. in 6 vols.); S. and H. Marestus, *Bibel* (Amst. 1669, fol.); *Poole, *Synopsis* [in large part a condensation of the *Critici Sacri*, De la Haye's *Biblia*, and similar works] (Lond. 1690-1676, 4 vols. in 5, fol.; Franc. 1679, 5 vols. fol.; Ultraj. 1685, 5 vols. fol.; Franc. 1694, 5 vols. 4to; 1712, 5 vols. fol.); a different work is his original *Annotations* [completed by others] (London, 1683-5, also 1700, 2 vols. fol.; Edinb. 1803, 4 vols. 4to; Lond. 1840, 3 vols. 8vo); De Sacy, *Sainte Bible*, etc. [chiefly Patristic] (Par. 1672, 30 vols. 8vo; Leyd. 1696, 32 vols. 12mo; Bruxelles, 1723, 3 vols. 4to; Lyons, 1702, 3 vols. fol., and other eds.); Calovius, *Biblia illustrata* [in opposition to Grotius] (F. ad M. 16726, Dresd. 1719, 4 vols. fol.); Cocceius, *Commentarii* [on many portions of Scripture] (at various times, separately; also in *Opera*, i-v, Amst. 1675, fol. and later); Olearius, Erklisr. (Lips. 1618-81, 5 vols. fol.); *Patrick, Lowth, Arnold, Whitby, and Lowman, *Commentary* [originally in separate portions by each author on the successive books, Lond. 1679 sq.] (Lond. 1738 sq., 7 vols. fol.; ed. Pitman, Lond. 1821, 6 vols. 4to; Phila. 1844, Lond. 1853, 4 vols. 8vo); *Schmid, *Commentarii* [on most of the books of Scripture] (at various places, separately, 1680-1704, 18 vols. 4to); Allix, *Reflections* (Lond. 1688, 2 vols. in 1, 8vo; 1809, 8vo; Oxf. 1822, 8vo; also in Bishop Watson's *Theol. Tracts*; also in French, Lond. 1687-9, 8vo; Amst. 1689, 2 'vols. 8vo); S. Clarke, *Annotations*, etc. (Lond. 1690, 1760, Glasg. 1765, fol.); Ness, *Hist.* and *Mystery* (Lond. 1690-96, 4 vols. fol.); L. de Carrieres, *Commentaire* (Paris, 170116, 24 vols. 12mo); Haase, *Anmerk.* etc. (Lpz. 1704, 1710, 1733, 8vo; 1707, fol.; also in Dutch, Amst. 1725, 4to); Du Hamel, *Annotationes*, etc. (Par. 1706, 2 vols. fol.); Martin, Bible expliquee (Amst. 1707, 2 vols. fol.); *Henry, *Exposition*, etc. [completed from Acts by others] (London, 1707-15, 5 vols. fol.; 4th ed. complete, London, 1737, 5 vols. fol., and often since; new ed. Lond. 1849, 6 vols. 4to; condensed in Jenks's Comr prehensive *Commentary*) *Calmet, *Commentaire* (Par. 1707-16, 23 vols., 1713, 26 vols. 4to; 1724, 8 vols. in 9, fol.; the *Dissertations*, etc., separately, Par. 1715, 5 vols. 8vo, 1720, 3 vols. 4to; the last in Latin by Manse, Lucca, 1729, 2 vols. fol., and the whole by the same, Wirceb. 1789-93, 19 vols. 4to.; also in German by Mosheim, Brem. 1738-47, 6 vols. 8vo; abridged in French, Par. 1721, 8vo; many of its notes were inserted in the *Abbe Vence's Bible*, Paris, 1767-73, 17 vols. 4to, and later); Wells, *Paraphrase*, etc. (in parts, Oxf. 170827, 7 vols. 4to and 8vo): Raphelius, *Annotationes* [*Illustration*s from Xenophon, etc.] (first separately on the O.T. and N.T., Hamb. 1709-15, 2

vols. 8vo; together, Lunenb. 1731, 8vo; enlarged, L. Bat. 1747, 2 vols. 8vo); Horche, *Erklarung* [mystical — Song of Solomon and Revelation omitted] (Marb. 1712, 4to); Mdme. Guyon, *Explications* [mystical] (*Colossians et Amst*. 1713-5, 20 vols. 12mo); Osterwald, *Observations*, etc. [tr. from his French Bible, Amst. 1714, fol.] (by Chamberlayne, Lond. 1722, 8vo; 5th edition enlarged, Lond. 1779, 2 vols. 8vo); Anon. Bibel, etc. (Stuttg. 1716, fol.); Parker, *Commentary* [in large part compiled] (Oxf. 1717-25, 4to); Anon. Bibel, etc. (Lemgo, 1720, fol.); the Berleburg (q.v.) *Bibel* [pietistical], by various anonymous editors (Berleburg, 1726-9, 7 vols. fol.); Pitschman, *Anmerk.* (Zitt, 1728, 4to); *Gill, *Exposition* [largely from Rabbinical sources] (originally in separate works, Lond. 1728-67, 9 vols. fol.; together, Lond. 1810, 9 vols. 4to; 1854, 6 vols. 8vo); Pfaffand Klemm, *Anmerk.* (Tub. 1729, fol.); *Lang, *Erklar*. [in part by Adler] (in separate works, Hal. 1729-37, 7 vols. fol.); also substantially condensed in his *Biblia parenthetica* [in German — an elliptical or paraphrastic elucidation] (Lpz. 1743, 2 vols. fol.); Zeltner, Erkldrung (Alt. 1730, 8vo; 1740, 4to); Wall, *Notes* (London, 1730-39, 3 vols. 8vo); Willisch, *Selbst-Erklar*. [completed by Haymann] (Fre*ib.* 173q fol.); Schmidt, *Erklar*. (Erf. 1740, 4to); Starck, Auslegungen (0. Test., Lpz. and Hal. 1741-7, 4 vols., N.T., Lpz. 1733-7, 3 vols. [and at other times in parts], 4to); **Chais* [completed by Maclaine], *Commentaire*, etc.[from the best English interpreters] (Hague, 1743-90, 7 vols. 4to; the former part also in German, Lips. 174962, 4 vols. 4to); Luca ed. [by order of the pope], Commentarii, etc. [from various authors] (Ven. 1745, 4to); also [by the same authority] ed. Cartier, *Commentarii* [a more extensive work, with a Germ. version, for the use of the monastery of Ettenheim] (Constantine, 1751, fol.); Edwards, *Notes* (in Works, 2:676); Koke, *Anmerk.* (Hild. 1750, 4to); Slezina, *Commentarius* (Prague, 1757-60, 1770, 4 vols. 4to); Goadby, *Illustration* [Arian] (London, 1759-70, 3 vols. fol., and later); Rider, Family Bible (Lond. 1763, 3 vols. fol.); Wesley, *Notes* [those on the N.T. are short, but valuable] (London, 1764, 4 vols. 4to; also in Works); — Allen, *Exposition* [Antinomian] (London, 1765, 2 vols. fol., and later); Liebich ed., *Anmerk.* (Hirschberg, 1765, 3 vols. 8vo); *Dodd, *Commentary*, etc. [in part extracts from MSS.] (in numbers, Lond. 1765; complete, 1770, 3 vols. fol.); Hawies, *Expositor* (London, 1765-66 [also published in America], 2 vols. fol.); J. S. Braun, Erklarung (Erf. 1768, 3 vols. fol.); Michaelis, *Anmerk.* (Gott. and Gotha, 1769-83, and 1790-2, 17 vols. 4to; also in Dutch, Utrecht, 1780-86, 8vo; and Erinnerungen on the same by Schulz, Halle, 1790-4, 6 vols. 4to); Korner,

Anmerk. (Lpz. 1770-3, 3 vols. 4to); Moldenhauer, Erlaut. (Quedlint. 1774-87, 10 vols. 4to and 2 vols. fol.); Weitenauer [Romans Cath.], *Anmerk.* (Augsb. 1777-82, 14 vols. 8vo); Hezel, *Anmerk.* (Lemgo, 1780-91, 10 vols. 8vo; condensed by Schenk, Lemgo, 1787, 8vo; with the author's partial enlargement, Halle,. 1786-90, 9 vols. 8vo; and this again annotated by Roos, Tubing. 1788, fol.); Bp. Wilson, *Notes*, etc. (Lond. 1785, 3 vols. 4to); H. Braun, *Anmerk.* (Nurnb. 1786, 8vo; ed. by Feder, 1803, 3 vols.; by Allioli. 1830-2, 6 vols.); also his [patristic] *Bemerk.* (Augsb. 1788-1805, 13 vols. 8vo; with a *Lexikon*, 1806, 2 vols. fol.); Yonge, *Commentary* (Lond. 1787, 4to); *Scott, *Notes*, etc. (in parts, Lond. 1788 sq., 4 vols. 4to; 5th ed. Lond. 1822, 6 vols. 4to; new ed. Lond. 1841, 6 vols. 4to; often reprinted in England and America; also condensed in Jenks's *Comprehensive Commentary*);, *Rosenmüller and Son, *Scholia* [on all the books except Samuel — Ezra] (O.T. by the son, Lips. 1788-1817, etc., 22 vols. 8vo; also abridged, by Lechler, Lips. 1828-36, 6 vols. 8vo; the N.T. by the father, Norimb. 1777, 6th ed. enlarged by the son, 1815-31, 5 vols 8vo); Brentano, *Erklar*. (Frkft. 1797-9, 13 vols. 8vo); Horst, Rullmann, Scherer, and others, '*Commentar* (Altenb. 1799-1809, 7 vols. 8vo); Alber, *Interpretatio* (Pesth, 1801-4, 16 vols. 8vo); Bulkley, *Notes* [chiefly *Illustration*s from the ancients] (ed. by Toulmin, Lond. 1802, 3 vols. 8vo); Priestley, *Notes* .(Northumb. 1803, 4 vols. 8vo); Coke, *Commentary* [mostly a reprint of Dodd] (Lond. 1806, 6 vols. 4to); Webster, [Rev. T.], *Notes* [chiefly from the Genevan Bible and Beza] (London, 1810, 4to); *A. Clarke, *Commentary* (Lond. 1810-26, 8 vols. 4to; N. Y. 1811-25, 6 vols. 4to; new ed. Lond. and N.Y. 1832, 6 vols. 8vo; Lond. 1844, 6 vols. 4to and 8vo); Hewlett, *Notes* (London, 1811, 3 vols. 4to); Fawcett, *Devotional Bible* (London, 1811, 2 vols. 4to); Benson, *Commentary* [largely after Poole] (Lond. 1811-18, 5 vols. 4to; 6th ed. 1848, 6 vols. 8vo; N. Y. 1839, 5 vols. 8vo); Hawker, *Commentary* (Lond. 1816-22, 10 vols. 12mo, and later); Mrs. Cornwallis, *Observations* (London, 1817, 4 vols. 8vo); D'Oyly and Miant, *Notes* [chiefly compiled] (Oxf. 1817, 3 vols. 4to, and often since; N. Y. 1818-20, 2 vols. 4to; London, 1856,1861, 3 vols. 8vo); Von Meyer, *Anmerkungen* (F. ad M. 1819, 1822, 3 vols. 8vo); Anon. Erlaut. (Quedlinb. 1819-21, 5 vols. 8vo); the Richters' *Hausbibel* (Barm. 1820, 8vo); Mrs. Stevens, *Comments* (Knaresb. 1823-31, 20 vols. 8vo); Boothroyd, *Version*, etc. (Huddersf. 1824, 3 vols. 4to; Lond. 1853, 8vo); Williams, *Cottage Bible* (Lond. 1825-27, 3 vols. 8vo); Greenfield, *Comprehensive Bible* (Lond. 1827, 4to) —; Plumptre, Ser. mons (London, 1827, 2 vols. 8vo); Stokes, *Commentary* [chiefly from Scott] (London,

1835-36, 6 vols. 8vo and 12mo); Abbe Glaire, *Notes*, etc. [from various authors] (Par. 1835-38, 3 vols. 4to); Jenks, *Comprehensive Commentary* [chiefly an assemblage of Henry, Scott, and Doddridge] (Brattleb. 1835-38, 5 vols. 8ro); Girdle. stone, Lectures (Lond. 1835-42, 8 vols. 8vo); Davidson, Pocket *Commentary* (Edinb. 1836, 3 vols. 24mo); Wellbeloved, *Notes*, etc. [Unitarian] (London, 1838, 2 vols. 8vo); *Kitto, *Pictorial Bible*, etc. [valuable for *Illustration*s of Oriental customs] (Lond. 1838-39, 4 vols. 4to; 1855, 4 vols. 8vo; also without the text, as Illustrated *Commentary*, Lond. 1840, 5 vols. 8vo); Cobbin, *Condensed Commentary* (2d ed. Lond. 1839, 8vo); also *Portable Commentary* (Lond. 1846, 12mo); Abbe MIigne, *Commentarius* [chiefly compiled] (Paris, 1839-43, 27 vols. 8vo); *Simeon, *Discourses* [mostly practical] (Lond. 1840, 21 vols. 8vo); Sutcliffe, *Commentary* (5th ed. Lond. 1850, 2 vols. 8vo; 1854, 1 vol. 8vo); Bunsen, *Bibelwerk* [intended as a popular elucidation — learned and ingenious, but extravagant] (Lpz. 1858 sq., 9 vols. [18 half vols.] 8vo [pt. i, translation; ii, exposition; iii, history, with suppl. Atlas]); Lange, *Bibelwerk* [mostly theological and homiletical] (Bielefeld, 1864 sq., 8vo [a large part of the N.T. has been issued, and several books of the O.T., in successive volumes, a considerable number of which have been translated in Clark's *Foreign Theol.* Lib., Edinb., and some of them in N.Y., greatly enlarged and improved under the editorship of Dr. Schaff]); Wordsworth, *Notes* (Lond. 1865 sq., 8vo); Jamieson, etc., *Commentary* (Lond. 1868 sq., 8vo).

Commerce

a word that does not occur in the Auth. Vers., which uses the term "trade" or "traffic;" but the idea is designated by two *Heb.* words:

1. hLkw] *rekullah'* (Gesenius, *Thes. Heb.* p. 1289); Sept. in <26662>Ezekiel 26:12, τὰ ὑπάρχοντα, Vulg. *negotiationes*; in 27:5, 16, 18, ἐμπορία, *negotiatio*; from lkr; *rakal'*, to travel (on foot);

2. hrjs] *sechorah'* (Gesen. *ib.* p. 946), Sept. ἐμπορία, Vulg. *negotiatio*, <26715>Ezekiel 27:15; from r2j2s, *sachar'*, to *travel* (migrate). *SEE TRADE*.

1. Commerce, in its usual acceptation, means the exchange of one thing for another — the exchange of what we have to spare for what we want, in whatever country it is produced. The origin of commerce must have been

nearly coeval with the world. As pasturage and agriculture were the only employments of the first inhabitants, so cattle, flocks, and the fruits of the earth were the only objects of the first commerce, or that species of it called barter. It would appear that some progress had been made in manufactures in the ages before the flood. The building of a city or village by Cain, however insignificant the houses may have been, supposes the existence of some mechanical knowledge. The musical instruments, such as harps and organs, the works in brass and in iron exhibited by the succeeding generations, confirm the belief that the arts were considerably advanced. The construction of Noah's ark, a ship of three decks, covered over with pitch, and much larger than any modern effort of architecture, proves that many separate trades were at that period carried on. There must have been parties who supplied Noah and his three sons with the great quantity and variety of materials which they required, and this they would do in exchange for other commodities, and perhaps money. That enormous pile of building, the tower of Babel, was constructed of bricks, the process of making which appears to have been well understood. Some learned astronomers are of opinion that the celestial observations of the Chinese reach back to 2249 years before the Christian era; and the celestial observations made at Babylon, contained in a calendar of above nineteen centuries, transmitted to Greece by Alexander, reach back to within fifteen years of those ascribed to the Chinese. The Indians appear to have had observations quite as early as the Babylonians. *SEE ANTEDILUVIANS*.

Such of the descendants of Noah as lived near the water may be presumed to have made use of vessels built in imitation of the ark — if, as some think, that was the first floating vessel ever seen in the world — but on a smaller scale, for the purpose of crossing rivers. In the course of time the descendants of his son Japheth settled in "the isles of the Gentiles," by which are understood the islands at the east end of the Mediterranean Sea, and those between Asia Minor and Greece, whence their colonies spread into Greece, Italy, and other Western lands. *SEE ETHNOLOGY*.

In short, from the time that men began to live in cities, trade, in some shape, must have been carried on to supply the town-dwellers with necessaries (see Heeren, Afr. Nat. 1:469); but it is also clear that international trade must have existed and affected to some extent even the pastoral nomade races, for we find that Abraham was rich, not only in cattle, but in silver, gold, and gold and silver plate and ornaments (comp. Genesis 13:2; 24:22, 53); and further, that gold and silver in a

manufactured state, and silver, not improbably in coin, were in use both among the settled inhabitants of Palestine, and the pastoral tribes of Syria at that date (<01216>Genesis 20:16; 23:16; 38:18; <18421>Job 42:11), to whom those metals must in all probability have been imported from other countries (Hussey, *Anc. Weights*, c. 12:3, p. 193; Kitto, *Phys. Hist. of Pal.* p. 109, 110; see Herod. 1:215). *SEE CITY*.

2. Among trading nations mentioned in Scripture, Egypt holds in very early times a prominent position (see Hubbard, *Commerce of Ancient Egypt*, in the *Biblical Repository*, April, 1836), though her external trade was carried on, not by her own citizens, but by foreigners, chiefly of the nomade races (Heeren, *Afr. Nat.* 1:468; 2:371, 372). It was an Ishmaelite caravan, laden with spices, which carried Joseph into Egypt, and the account shows that slaves formed sometimes a part of the merchandise imported (<01725>Genesis 37:25; 39:1; <18669>Job 6:19). From Egypt it is likely that at all times, but especially in times of general scarcity, corn would be exported, which was paid for by the non-exporting nations in silver, which was always weighed (<01457>Genesis 41:57; 42:3, 25, 35; 43:11, 12, 21). These caravans also brought the precious stones as well as the spices of India into Egypt (<02518>Exodus 25:3, 7; Wilkinson, Anc. Eg. 2:235, 237). Intercourse with Tyre does not appear to have taken place till a later period, and thus, though it cannot be determined whether the purple in which the Egyptian woolen and linen cloths were dyed was brought by land from Phoenicia, it is evident that colored cloths had long been made and dyed in Egypt, and the use, at least, of them adopted by the Hebrews for the tabernacle as early as the time of Moses (<02504>Exodus 25:4, 5; comp. Heeren, Asiat. Nat. 1:352; see Herod. 1:1). The pasture-ground of Shechem appears from the story of Joseph to have lain in the way of these caravan journeys (<01714>Genesis 37:14, 25), probably a thoroughfare from Damascus. *SEE CARAVAN*.

At the same period it is clear that trade was carried on between Babylon and the Syrian cities (see Hubbard, *Commerce of Anc. Bab. in the Biblical Repos*. July, 1837), and also that gold and silver ornaments were common among the Syrian and Arabian races; a trade which was obviously carried on by land-carriage (<04150>Numbers 31:50; <06021>Joshua 7:21; <07050>Judges 5:30; 8:24; <18669>Job 6:19). *SEE BABYLON*.

Sidon, which afterwards became so celebrated for the wonderful mercantile exertions of its inhabitants, was founded about 2200 years before the

Christian aera. The neighboring mountains, being covered with excellent cedar-trees, furnished the best and most durable timber for ship-building. The inhabitants of Sidon accordingly built numerous ships, and exported the produce of the adjoining country, and the various articles of their own manufacture, such as fine linen, embroidery, tapestry, metals, glass, both colored and figured, cut, or carved, and even mirrors. They were unrivaled by the inhabitants of the Mediterranean coasts in works of taste, elegance, and luxury. Their great and universally acknowledged pre-eminence in the arts procured for the Phoenicians, whose principal seaport was Sidon, the honor of being esteemed, among the Greeks and other nations, as the inventors of commerce, ship-building, navigation, the application of astronomy to nautical purposes, and particularly as the discoverers of several stars nearer to the north pole than any that were known to other nations; of naval war, writing, arithmetic, book-keeping, measures and weights-to which, it is probable, they might have added money. *SEE SIDON*.

The earliest accounts of bargain and sale reach no higher than the time of Abraham, and his transaction with Ephron. He is said to have weighed unto him "400 shekels of silver, current money with the merchant" (01216Genesis 23:16). The word merchant implies that the standard of money was fixed by usage among merchants, who comprised a numerous and respectable class of the community. Manufactures were by this time so far advanced that not only those more immediately connected with agriculture, such as flour ground from corn, wine, oil, butter, and also the most necessary articles of clothing and furniture, but even those of luxury and magnificence, were much in use, as appears by the ear-rings, bracelets of gold and of silver, and other precious things presented by Abraham's steward to Rebecca (01222Genesis 24:22, 53.) *SEE BARGAIN*.

In the book of Job, whose author, in the opinion of the most learned commentators, resided in Arabia, and was nearly contemporary with Abraham, much light is thrown upon the commerce, manufactures, and science of the age and country in which he lived. There is mention of gold, iron, brass, lead, crystal, jewels, the art of weaving, merchants, gold brought from Ophir, which implies commerce with a remote country, and topazes from Ethiopia; ship-building, so far improved that some ships were distinguished for the velocity of their motion; writing in a book, and engraving letters or writing on plates of lead and on stone with iron pens, and also seal-engraving; fishing with hooks, and nets, and spears; musical

instruments, the harp and organ; astronomy, and names given to particular stars. These notices tend to prove that, although the patriarchal system of making pasturage the chief object of attention was still maintained by many of the greatest inhabitants where the author of the book of Job resided, the sciences were actively cultivated, the useful and ornamental arts in an advanced state, and commerce prosecuted with diligence and success; and this at a period when, if the chronology of Job is correctly settled, the arts and sciences were scarcely so far advanced in Egypt, from whence, and from the other countries bordering upon the eastern part of the Mediterranean Sea, they afterwards gradually found their way into Greece. *SEE JOB*.

The inhabitants of Arabia appear to have availed themselves at a very early period of their advantageous situation between the two fertile and opulent countries of India and Egypt, and to have obtained the exclusive monopoly of a very profitable carrying trade between those countries. They were a class of people who gave their whole attention to merchandise as a regular and established profession, and traveled with caravans between Arabia and Egypt, carrying upon the backs of camels the spiceries of India, the balm of Canaan, and the myrrh produced in their own country, or of a superior quality from the opposite coast of Abyssinia-all of which were in great demand among the Egyptians for embalming the dead, in their religious ceremonies, and for ministering to the pleasures of that superstitious and luxurious people. The merchants of one of these caravans bought Joseph from his brothers for twenty pieces of silver, and carried him into Egypt. The southern Arabs were eminent traders, and enjoyed a large proportion, and in general the entire monopoly, of the trade between India and the western world from the earliest ages, until the system of that important commerce was totally overturned when the inhabitants of Europe discovered a direct route to India by the Cape of Good Hope. *SEE ARABIA*.

At the period when Joseph’s brethren visited Egypt, inns were established for the accommodation of travelers in that country and in the northern parts of Arabia. The more civilized southern parts of the peninsula would no doubt be furnished with caravanserais still more commodious. *SEE CARAVANSERAI*.

During the residence of the Israelites in Egypt manufactures of almost every description were carried to great perfection. Flax, fine linen,

garments of cotton, rings and jewels of gold and silver, works in all kinds of materials, chariots for pleasure, and chariots for war, are all mentioned by Moses. They had extensive manufactories of brick. Literature was in a flourishing state; and, in order to give an enlarged idea of the accomplishments of Moses, it is said he was "learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians" (<441222>Acts 12:22). *SEE EGYPT*.

The expulsion of the Canaanites from a great part of their territories by the Israelites under Joshua led to the gradual establishment of colonies in Cyprus, Rhodes, and several islands in the *A*Egean Sea; they penetrated into the Euxine or Black Sea, and, spreading along the shores of Sicily, Sardinia, Gaul, Spain, and Africa, established numerous trading places, which gradually rose into more or less importance. At this period mention is first made of Tyre as a strong or fortified city, whilst Sidon is dignified with the title of Great. *SEE CANAANITE*.

The rising prosperity of Tyre soon eclipsed the ancient and long-flourishing commercial city of Sidon. About 600 years before Christ her commercial splendor appears to have been at its height, and is graphically described by Ezekiel (<262701>). The imports into Tyre were fine linen from Egypt; blue and purple from the isles of Elishah; silver, iron, tin, and lead from Tarshish-the south part of Spain; slaves and brazen vessels from Javan or Greece, Tubal, and Meshech; horses, slaves bred to horsemanship, and mules from Togarmah; emeralds, purple, embroidery, fine linen, corals, and agates from Syria; corn, balm, honey, oil, and gum from the Israelites; wine and wool from Damascus; polished ironware, precious oils, and cinnamon from Dan, Javan, and Uzal; magnificent carpets from Dedan; sheep and goats from the pastoral tribes of Arabia; costly spices, some the produce of India, precious stones, and gold from the' merchants of Sheba or Sabaea, and Ramah or Regma, countries in the south part of Arabia; blue cloths, embroidered works, rich apparel in corded cedar-chests, supposed to be original India packages, and other goods from Sheba, Ashur, and Chilmad, and from Haran, Canneh, and Eden, trading ports on the south coast of Arabia. The vast wealth that thus flowed into Tyre from all quarters brought with it its too general concomitants-extravagance, dissipation, and relaxation of morals. *SEE TYRE*.

The subjection of Tyre, "the renowned city which was strong in the sea, whose merchants were princes, whose traffickers were the honorable of the earth," by Cyrus, and its subsequent overthrow by Alexander, after a

determined and most formidable resistance, terminated alike the grandeur of that city and the history of ancient commerce, as far as they are alluded to in Scripture. (See Anderson's *History of Commerce*, Lond. 1764, and latest 1801; Vincent's *Commerce and Navigation of the Indian Ocean*, Lond. 1807; Heeren's *Researches*; Barnes on the *Ancient Commerce of Western Asia*, in the *Biblical Repository*, Oct. 1840, Jan. 1841; Gilbert, *Lects. on Anc. Commerce*, Lond. 1847.) *SEE ALEXANDER*.

3. Until the time of Solomon the Hebrew nation may be said to have had no foreign trade (see Tychsen, *De Comm. et Nav. Hebreorum*, in the *Con. Soc. Gott*. 1808, p. 150-79). Foreign trade was indeed contemplated by the Law, and strict rules for morality in commercial dealings were laid down by it (Deuteronomy 28:12; 25:13-16; Leviticus 19:35, 36), and the tribes near the sea and the Phoenician territory appear to have engaged to some extent in maritime affairs (Genesis 49:13; Deuteronomy 33:18; Judges 5:17); but the spirit of the Law was more in favor of agriculture and against foreign trade (Deuteronomy 17:16, 17; Leviticus 25; see Josephus, Apion, 1:12). *SEE ALLIANCE*.

During the reign of David, king of Israel, that powerful monarch disposed of a part of the wealth obtained by his conquests in purchasing cedar-timber from Hiram, king of Tyre, with whom he kept up a friendly correspondence while he lived. He also hired Tyrian masons and carpenters for carrying on his works. *SEE DAVID*. Solomon, however, organized an extensive trade with foreign countries, but chiefly, at least so far as the more distant nations were concerned, of an import character. He imported linen yarn, horses, and chariots from Egypt. Of the horses, some appear to have been resold to Syrian and Canaanitish princes. For all these he paid gold, which was imported by sea from India and Arabia by his fleets in conjunction with the Phoenicians (1 Kings 10:22-29; see Gesenius, *Thes. Heb.* p. 1202; comp. Heeren, *As. Nat*. 1:334). It was by Phoenicians also that the cedar and other timber for his great architectural works was brought by sea to Joppa, whilst Solomon found the provisions necessary for the workmen in Mount Lebanon (1 Kings 5:6, 9; 2 Chronicles 2:16). The united fleets used to sail into the Indian Ocean every three years from Elath and Eziongebler, ports on the *A*Elanitic gulf of the Red Sea, which David had probably gained from Edom; and they brought back gold, silver, ivory, sandal-wood, ebony, precious stones, apes, and peacocks. Some of these may have come from India and Ceylon, and some from the coasts of the Persian Gulf and the east coast of Africa (2 Samuel 8:14;

<1096>1 Kings 9:26; 10:11, 22; <1487>2 Chronicles 8:17; see Herod. 3:114; comp. Livingstone, Travels, p. 637, 662). *SEE OPHIR*.

But the trade which Solomon took so much pains to encourage was not a maritime trade only. He built; or more probably fortified, Baalbek and Palmyra; the latter at least expressly as a caravan station for the land-commerce with eastern and south-eastern Asia (<1098>1 Kings 9:18). *SEE SOLOMON*.

After his death the maritime trade declined, and an attempt made by Jehoshaphat to revive it proved unsuccessful (<1248>1 Kings 22:48, 49). *SEE TARSHISH*. We know, however, that Phoenicia was supplied from Judaea with wheat, honey, oil, and balm (<1051>1 Kings 5:11; <2717>Ezekiel 27:17; <4120>Acts 12:20; see Josephus, *War*, 2:21, 2; *Life*, 13), whilst Tyrian dealers brought fish and other merchandise to Jerusalem at the time of the return from captivity (<1636>Nehemiah 13:16), as well as timber for the rebuilding of the Temple, which then, as in Solomon's time, was brought by sea to Joppa (<1507>Ezra 3:7). Oil was exported to Egypt (<2801>Hosea 12:1), and fine linen and ornamental girdles of domestic manufacture were sold to the merchants (<2124>Proverbs 31:24). The successive invasions to which Palestine was subjected, involving both large abstraction of treasure by invaders, — and heavy imposts on the inhabitants to purchase immunity or to satisfy demands for tribute must have impoverished the country from time to time (under Rehoboam, <1146>1 Kings 14:26; Asa 15; 18; Joash, 2 Kings, 12:18; Amaziah, 14:13; Ahaz, 16:8; Hezekiah, 18:15-16; Jehoahaz and Jehoiakim, 23:33, 35: Jehoiachin, 24:13); but it is also clear, as the denunciations of the prophets bear witness, that much wealth must somewhere have existed in the country, and much foreign merchandise have been imported; so much so that, in the language of Ezekiel, Jerusalem appears as the rival of Tyre, and through its port, Joppa, to have carried on trade with foreign countries (<2306>Isaiah 2:6, 16; 3:11, 23; <2807>Hosea 12:7; <2602>Ezekiel 26:2; Jonah, 1:3; comp. Heeren, *As. Nat*. i, p. 328). *SEE PHOENICIA*.

Under the Maccabees Joppa was fortified (1 Maccabees 14:34), and later still Caesarea was built and made a port by Herod (Joseph. *Ant.* 15:9, 6; <4702>Acts 27:2). Joppa became afterwards a haunt for pirates, and was taken by Cestius; afterwards by Vespasian, and destroyed by him (Strab. 16, p. 759; Josephus, *War*, 2:18,10; 3:9, 1). *SEE PALESTINE*.

4. The internal trade of the Jews, as well as the external, was much promoted, as was the case also in Egypt, by the festivals, which brought large numbers of persons to Jerusalem, and caused great outlay in victims for sacrifices and in incense (1 Kings 8:63; comp. Heeren, *As. Nat*. 2:363). *SEE FESTIVAL*.

The places of public market were, then as now, chiefly the open spaces near the gates, to which goods were brought for sale by those who came from the outside (Nehemiah 13:15, 16; Zephaniah 1:10). *SEE GATE*.

The traders in later times were allowed to intrude into the Temple, in the outer courts of which victims were publicly sold for the sacrifices (Zechariah 14:21; Matthew 21:12; John 2:14). *SEE TEMPLE*.

In the matter of buying and selling great stress is laid by the Law on fairness in dealing. Just weights and balances are stringently ordered (Leviticus 19:35, 36; Deuteronomy 25:13-16). Kidnapping slaves is forbidden under the severest penalty (Exodus 21:16; Deuteronomy 24:7). Trade in swine was forbidden by the Jewish doctors (see Surenhusius, *Mischna, de danme*. c. 7, vol. 4:60; Lightfoot, *Flor. Heb. on Matth*. 8:33; Saalschutz, *Arch. Hehr*. c. 15, 16). *SEE MERCHANT*.

Commination

an office in the Liturgy of the Church of England, which contains God's threatenings against impenitent sinners. It is directed to be used on the first day of Lent, and at other times, as the ordinary shall appoint. It is called Comrnination from the opening Exhortation to Repentance, in which the curses of God against sin are recited. The office for "A Commination, or denouncing of God's anger and judgments against sinners," was left out of the American Prayer-book, but the three concluding prayers of that office were introduced into the service for Ash Wednesday, immediately after the Collect for that day. See Procter on *Common Prayer*, 429; Hook, *Church Dictionary*, s.v.; Eden, *Churchman's Dictionary*, s.v.

Commissary

1. In the Church of England, an officer who fills the bishop's place in exercising ecclesiastical jurisdiction, in places so far distant from the chief city that the chancellor cannot call the people to the bishop's principal

consistory court without great trouble to them. — Eden, *Churchman's Dictionary*, s.v.

2. In the Church of Rome, archbishops, bishops, or other dignitaries are deputed as *Papal Commissaries* for the exercise of functions properly belonging to the pope; and in the same manner bishops may depute episcopal commissaries. If they are deputed for one particular act they are temporary commissaries (*commissarii temporarii*). If several individuals are conjointly deputed for such a function they are called a commissions. If persons are clothed by the pope, or by a bishop, with power to exercise regularly functions belonging to them, they are called perpetual commissaries (*commissarii perpetui*). See Wetzer und Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* 2:714.

Commission

1. tD; *dath* (a mandate, Ezra 8:36; elsewhere "decree," etc.); 2. ἐπιτροπή) (full *charge*, Acts 26:12).

Commission, Ecclesiastical

SEE COMMISSARY.

Commissioner

a gloss rendering (1 Maccabees 2:25) for ἀνήρ, *man*, i.e. officer.

Commodianus

a Christian historian, supposed to have been born in Africa in the second half of the 3d century, and to have been converted from heathenism. He wrote; in a sort of acrostic verse, LXXX instructiones adv. gentium deos, which ridicules heathenism and exhorts the Christians to lead a pure life. It also contains Chiliastic notions, and gives out the idea that Nero was the Antichrist. It is one of the oldest monuments of Christian history. It was published by Rigalt (1650); by Priorius, together with the works of Cyprian (Paris, 1666); by Schurzfleisch (Wittenb. 1704, 4to); and by Davisius (Cambridge, 1711). See Clarke, Succession of Sac. Lit. 1:171; Wetzer u. Welte, Kirch-Lex. 2:715.

Commodus Lucius AElius Aurelius,

a Roman emperor, was born A.D. 161, and succeeded his father, Mark Aurelius, as emperor in 180. From early youth he was noted for weakness of character, licentiousness, and cruelty. His father was the first emperor who issued a decree of persecution against the Christians. On the accession to the throne of Commodus the persecution ceased, owing, it was said, to the influence of his concubine, Marcia. According to Irenaeus, Christians were found during the reign of Commodus even in the palace, and in the service of the emperor. But, though Commodus did not decree to persecute the Christians, there were laws according to which Christians who were informed against were to be tried. Thus the learned senator Apollonius, who was informed against by one of his slaves, was condemned to death. Partial persecutions during the reign of Commodus are mentioned by Tertullian, and Irenaeus likewise speaks of martyrs of this time. But, as Commodus was supposed to be favorably disposed toward the Christians, the governors of the provinces felt no inclination to carry out the laws against the Christians. — Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirch.-Lex.* 2:717.

Common

(κοινός). The Greek term properly signifies *what belongs to all* (as in Wisdom of Solomon 6:3, κοινὸς ἀήρ), but the Hellenists applied it (like the Hebrew חל) to what was profane, i.e. *not holy*, and therefore of common or promiscuous use (<44104>Acts 10:14). They also applied the term to what was inpure, whether naturally or legally (as in <41702>Mark 7:2, compared with 1 Maccabees 1:47, 62). Finally, it was used of meats forbidden, or such as had been partaken of by idolaters, and which, as they rendered the partakers thereof impure, were themselves called κοινά (*common*), and ἀκάθαρτα (*unclean*) (see Kuinil on <44104>Acts 10:14). *SEE CLEAN*.

Common-house

A room in a monastery where a fire is constantly kept for the monks to warm themselves.

Common Life

SEE BRETHREN OF THE COMMON LIFE.

Common Lot Brothers Of The.

SEE BRETHREN OF THE COMMON LIFE.

Common Prayer

the service-book of the Church of England and of the Protestant Episcopal Church. It is so called because it contains the prayers which the members of those churches use in *common*, as distinguished from their devotions as private individuals. In the view of those churches, the devotions of separate families or persons may be conducted in any mode which best suits the circumstances of each; but joint worship, common prayer, must be in forms on which all are previously agreed, because these alone can equally express common wants (see Canons 4, 38, and 98, Church of England, on the obligation to use the *Book of Common Prayer*. Eden, *Churchman's Dictionary*, s.v.). As to the question of the value of such forms, *SEE FORMS OF PRAYER*. On liturgies proper (i.e. *communion service*), *SEE LITURGY*. We give here a brief sketch of the history of English and American Prayer-books.

I. *The English Prayer-book.* — The "Common Prayer" contains, in one volume, the articles of faith, and all the rites, ceremonies, and prescribed forms of the Church of England; and it is thus not only a Prayerbook, but a Ritual and Confession of Faith. Before the Reformation, the Missals, Breviaries, etc., of the Church of Rome were in use in England. In 1537 the Convocation put forth, in English, "*The godly and pious Institution of a Christian Man*," containing the Lord's Prayer, the Creed, the Commandments, and the Ave Maria. In 1547, the first of Edward VI, a committee was appointed to draw up a liturgy in English, free from Popish errors. Cranmer, Ridley, and other eminent reformers were of this committee, and their book was confirmed in Parliament in 1548. This is known as the first Prayer-book of Edward VI. Great part of it was taken from the old services used in England before the Reformation; but the labors of Melancthon and Bucer helped to give the book its Protestant form. "About the end of the year 1550 exceptions were taken against some parts of this book, and archbishop Cranmer proposed a new review. The principal alterations occasioned by this second review were the addition of the *Sentences, Exhortation, Confession, and Absolution*, at the beginning of the morning and evening services, which in the first Common Prayer-book began with the Lord's Prayer; the addition of the Commandments at

the beginning of the communion office; the removing of some rites and ceremonies retained in the former book, such as the use of oil in confirmation, the unction of the sick, prayers for the departed souls, the invocation of the Holy Ghost at the consecration of the eucharist, and the prayer of oblation that used to follow it; the omitting the rubric that ordered water to be mixed with the wine, with several other less material variations. The habits, likewise, which were prescribed in the former book were in this laid aside; and, lastly, a rubric was added at the end of the communion office to explain the reason of kneeling at the sacrament" (Hook). The liturgy, thus revised and altered, was again confirmed by Parliament A.D. 1551; This is cited as *the second Prayer-book of Edward VI*. See Cardwell, *Two Books of Common Prayer set forth under Edward VI compared* (Lond. 1838, 8vo); Ketley, *The two Liturgies, A.D. 1549 and 1552* (edited for the Parker Society, 8vo, 1844). *SEE CRANMER*.

Queen Mary, on her accession, repealed the acts of Edward, and restored the Romanist prayer-book. "On the accession of Elizabeth, however, this repeal was reversed, and the second book of Edward VI, with several alterations, was re-established. This liturgy continued in use during the long reign of Elizabeth, and received further additions and improvements. An accurate edition of it, and of the Latin translation of it made by Alexander Ales, was published for the Parker Society by the Rev. W. K. Clay, B.D. It is entitled *Liturgies and occasional Forms of Prayer set forth in the Reign of Queen Elizabeth* (Cambridge University Press, 1847, 8vo). Early in the reign of James I it was again revised. At this revision a collect in the daily morning and evening service, and a particular intercession in the litany, were appointed for the royal family; the forms of thanksgiving upon several occasions were then added; the questions and answers concerning the sacraments were subjoined to the catechism; and the administration of baptism was by the rubric expressly confined to the lawful minister. These and some other additions and improvements were made by the authority of James I, though they were not ratified l)y Parliament. In 1661, the year after the restoration of Charles II, the commissioners, both Episcopal and Presbyterian, who had met at the Savoy to revise the liturgy, having come to no agreement, *SEE SAVOY CONFERENCE*, the Convocation agreed to the following alterations and additions, viz. several lessons in the calendar were changed for others more proper for the days; the prayers upon particular occasions were disjoined from the litany; several of the collects were altered; the epistles and gospels

were taken out of the last translation of the Bible, published in 1611, instead of being read from the old version. Further, the prayer for the Parliament, that for all conditions of men, the general thanksgiving, the office of baptism for those of riper years, the forms of prayer to be used at sea, for the anniversary of the martyrdom of Charles I, and for the restoration of the royal family, were added; and throughout the whole liturgy ambiguities were removed, and various improvements made. The whole book, being finished, passed both houses of Convocation; it was subscribed by the bishops and clergy, and was ratified by act of Parliament, and received the royal assent May 19, 1662. This was the last revisal of the *Book of Common Prayer* in which any alteration was made by public authority. (Wheatly's *Illust. of the Common Prayer*, appendix to introduction; Nicholl's Pref. To his *Comment. On the Book of Common Prayer*; Tomline's *Christ. Theol.* 2:20-29; Dr. Cardwell's *History of Conferences and other Proceedings connected with the Revision of the Book of Common Prayer*, from the year 1558 to the year 1690, Oxford, 1840, 8vo). Hanmon l'Estrange's *Alliance of Divine Offices* (Lond. 1659, fol.; reprinted at Oxford in 1844 in 8vo), exhibits all the liturgies of the Church of England since the Reformation, as also the service book introduced into the Church of Scotland in 1637: it is illustrated with ample annotations. The *Liturgicae Britanicae*, published by the Rev. William Keeling, B.D., at London in 18,12, exhibits the several editions of the *Book of Common Prayer of the Church of England* from its first compilation to its last revision in 1662, together with the liturgy set forth for the use of the Episcopal Church in Scotland. The Rev. W. K. Clay's *Book of Common Prayer Illustrated* (Lond. 1841, 8vo) most commodiously shows its various modifications, the date of its several parts, and the authority on which they rest. An appendix, containing various important ecclesiastical documents, concludes the volume. To those who can procure more expensive publications, the complete collection of the authentic editions of the *Book of Common Prayer*, published at London in 1848, in six large folio volumes, will doubtless be preferred. The collection, which is uniformly printed in black letter, like the original editions, comprises the liturgies of king Edward VI, 1549 and 1552; the first Prayer-book of queen Elizabeth, 1550; king James the First's Prayer-book, as settled at the Hampton Court Conference in 1604; the Scotch book of king Charles I; and Charles the Second's book, as settled at the Savoy Conference in 1662. By the Act of Uniformity, 13 and 14 Car. II, c. 4, sec. 28, it was enacted that true and perfect copies of that act, and of the *Book of*

Common Prayer, 1662, should be delivered into the respective courts, and into the Tower of London, to be preserved among the records thereof in all time to come. These copies are usually termed 'the Sealed Books,' from their being exemplified under the great seal of England. From the copy in the Tower of London the folio fac-simile edition of 1848 was chiefly printed. In 1849-50 Mr. A. J. Stephens published an edition of the *Book of Common Prayer* in three octavo volumes, with notes legal and historical. The text of this edition is taken from the 'Sealed Book' of the Court of Chancery, collated with the copies preserved in the courts of Queen's Bench and Exchequer, and also with the copies in the Tower of London; in the library of St. Paul's Cathedral, London; of Christ Church, Oxford; at Ely; and with the manuscript *Book of Common Prayer* originally annexed to the Irish statute 17 and 18 Car. II, c. 6, now preserved in the Rolls Office at Dublin. In 1849-55 Mr. Stephens also published (3 vols. 8vo) the text of the *Book of Common Prayer* for the use of the Church of Ireland, from the same manuscript, with an introduction and notes" (Eadie, *Eccles. Encyclopaedia*, s.v.).

Several attempts have been made to revise the book since 1662 without success. The first was in the reign of William III, furthered by Tillotson and Stillingfleet, who in 1668 had united with Bates, Manton, and Baxter in preparing a bill for the "comprehension of Dissenters." Failing then and in 1681, the scheme was resumed after the Revolution, and in 1689 a commission was formed to revise the Prayer-book. A number of alterations were suggested, in order, if possible, to gratify the Dissenters (see the Revised Liturgy of 1689, a blue-book, 1855). Nothing came of the proposition. A full account of this and other proposed revisions is given by Procter, *Hist. of the Book of Common Prayer* (Camb. 1856, 2d edit.). There is now a Liturgical Revision Society in England, which in its Declaration of Principles and Objects proposes the following changes:

"**1.** The Rubric: the word priest to be changed;

2. The Ordination Service: words abused to the purposes of sacerdotal assumption to be altered.

3. The Visitation of the Sick: the absolution to be omitted or qualified.

4. The Baptismal Offices: words asserting the spiritual regeneration of each recipient to be altered.

5. The Catechism to be revised.

6. The Burial Service: general language to be employed in expressing hope for the departed.

7. The Athanasian Creed: the damnatory clauses to be omitted.

8. The Apocryphal Lessons to be replaced by Scripture.

A careful examination of the changes here specified will illustrate the chief aim of this society, which is to bring the *Book of Common Prayer* into closer conformity with the written word of God and the principles of the Reformation, by excluding all those expressions which have been assumed to countenance Romanizing doctrine or practice. It is believed this object will be greatly advanced by the combination of numbers, and the abandonment of desultory for systematic action. All, therefore, who are friendly to the cause of Protestantism in our Church — all who would gladly see the letter of our formularies, which have been altered for the worse more than once since the Reformation, brought again into harmony with the spirit of that glorious epoch — are invited to cooperate in this work, and to aid the society with their contributions, their influence, and, above all, their prayers." Four hundred and sixty English clergymen signed a petition in 1860, presented by Lord Ebury, asking for a commission to revise the *Book of Common Prayer*. On the other hand, the clerical declaration against the proposed revision received between six and seven thousand signatures. See also Fisher, *Liturgical Purity our Rightful Inheritance* (Lond. 1857, 12mo).

The *Nonjurors* (q.v.), whose quasi-separation from the Church of England lasted from 1688 to 1779, generally used the authorized Prayer-book, except in the prayer for the king. "Dr. Hicks, whose example was probably followed by Jeremy Collier, used the communion office in the first book of king Edward VI, which he regarded as more conformable to the ancient practice; but most others continued to use the English Prayer-book until the year 1718 (Lathbury's *History of the Nonjurors*). The following are the principal liturgies of the Nonjurors:

(1.) *A Communion Office, taken partly from the Primitive Liturgies, and partly from the first English Reformed Common Prayer-book: together with Offices for Confirmation and the Visitation of the Sick* (London, 1718, 8vo. Reprinted in the fifth volume of Hall's Fragmenta

Liturgica, in 1848, 12mo). From the publication of these offices the Nonjurors were divided into two parties — those who adopted the new, and those who retained the old offices. The obsolete, not to say superstitious ceremonies, revived in this new communion office, were four, viz. mixing water with the wine, prayer for the dead, prayer for the descent of the Holy Spirit on the elements, and the prayer of oblation. These were called the usages, and those who practiced them were called usagers. Three other ceremonies, apart from.these usages, are frequently reckoned among them, viz. trine immersion at baptism; chrism, or consecrated oil in confirmation; and unction at the visitation of the sick (ibid. vol. 1, p. 38).

(2.) *A Compleat Collection of Devotions*, taken from the *Apostolical Constitutions, the Ancient Liturgies, and the Common Prayer-book of the Church of England. Part I comprehending the Publick Offices of the Church. . . . . Part II a Method of Private Prayer* (London, 1734, 8vo). Part I is reprinted in Hall's *Fragmenta Liturgica* (Eadie, s.v.).

2. *Common Prayer-books of Dissenters from the Church of England. —*

(1.) *"The earliest of these is A Booke of the Forme of Common Prayers, Administration of the Sacraments, etc., agreeable to God's Worde and the use of the Reformed Churches*. This liturgy was printed by Waldegrave at London, without date, and at Middleburg, in Holland, in 1586,1587, and 1602. The text of Waldegrave's edition is reprinted in Hall's *Fragmenta Liturgica*, vol. 1; and that of the Middleburg edition, 1586, in his *Reliquicae Liturgicae*, vol. 1.

(2.) At the conference held in the Savoy in 1661 between the royal commissioners for reviewing the liturgy and the Nonconformists, the office of drawing up certain additional forms was assigned to Baxter, who presented a new form of prayer of his own composition, entitled, *The Reformation of the Liturgy* as it was presented to the Right Reverend the Bishops, by the Divines appointed by his Majesties Commission to treat with them about the alteration of it. This form of prayers is now more generally known as the *Savoy Liturgy*. It has been repeatedly reprinted, and will be found in the fourth volume of Hall's *Reliquiae Liturgicae*. A new edition of *The Book of Common Prayer*, as amended by the Westminster Divines in 1661, edited by the Rev. Dr. C.W. Shields, was published in Philadelphia (1865). The *Savoy Liturgy* comprises forms of prayer for 'the ordinary public worship of the Lord's day; the order of celebrating the

sacrament of the body and blood of Christ, and the celebration of the sacrament of baptism; a short discourse of catechizing, and the approbation of those who are to be admitted to the Lord's Supper; the celebration of matrimony; directions for the visitation of the sick, and their communion,' with prayers; 'the order for the burial of the dead, prayer and thanksgiving for particular members of the Church;' a discourse 'of pastoral discipline,' with forms of 'public confession, absolution, and excusion from the holy communion of the Church.'

(3.) William Whiston (q.v.) was deprived of his professorship as an Arian, and being for a time suspended from communion with the Church by an act of convocation, he formed a religious society at his house in London for public worship. There he employed *The Liturgy of the Church of England reduced nearer to the primitive standard, humbly propos'd to publick consideration*. This liturgy was first published at London in 1713. Whiston believed the *pseudo-Apostolical Constitutions* to be the genuine work of the apostles, and has made use of them in the composition of some of his prayers.

(4.) *The Book of Common Prayer, Reformed according to the Plan of the late Dr. Samuel Clarke*; or, as it is designated in the prefatory advertisement, *The Liturgy of the Church of England, with the Amendments of Dr. Clarke, and such further Alterations as were judged necessary to render it Unexceptionable with respect to the Object of Religious Worship*, was first published in 1774 by the Rev. Theophilus Lindsay, M.A., who Socinianized the Arian alterations proposed by Dr. Samuel Clarke, rector of St. James's, Westminster. This Prayer-book has subsequently passed through numerous editions. It contains almost all the offices in the *Book of Common Prayer*, except the order of baptism for persons of riper years and the commination. The great object of the whole is to address the entire worship to God the Father, to the utter exclusion of God the Son and God the Holy Spirit. This liturgy is the basis of *A Liturgy collected principally from the Book of Common Prayer*, for the Use of the First Episcopal Chapel in Boston [Massachusetts], together with the *Psalter or Psalms of David* (Boston, 1785, 8vo). This was reprinted in 1811, and again in 1838, with further alterations.

(5.) *The Book of Common Prayer, compiled for the Use of the English Church at Dunkirk, together with a Collection of Psalms*, was printed at Dunkirk in 1791. The anonymous compiler states that he followed

throughout the plan proposed by Dr. Clarke. This book deviates less from the liturgy of the Church of England than the Socinian liturgy above noticed" (Eadie, s.v.).

(6.) *The Sunday Service of the Methodists* was originally prepared by John Wesley. On comparing a copy of the edition of *The Sunday Service of the Methodists, with other Occasional Services* (reprinted in 1826), with the *Book of Common Prayer*, we find that the first lessons for Sundays are retained; but for the second lessons in the morning, a chapter out of the four *Gospels or the Acts of the Apostles* is to be read, and in the evening a chapter out of the epistles in regular rotation. Many verbal expressions, which have been excepted against, are here corrected. Select psalms are appointed to be read, while others are abridged. The only creed read is that of the apostles. The offices for the baptism of infants, or of persons of riper years, the celebration of matrimony, the communion of the sick, and the burial of the dead, are shortened. The offices for the ordination of priests and deacons, and for the consecration of bishops, are altered into forms for the ordination of deacons, elders, and superintendents; and the Thirty-nine Articles are reduced to twenty-five. The Nicene and Athanasian Creeds, and the apocryphal books of the Old Testament, are omitted. Some obsolete words are replaced by others which are more easily understood. An edition of this book was prepared, with the necessary modifications, for the use of the American Methodist Church, by Mr. Wesley, in 1784; a second edition, slightly modified, in 1786. This Prayer-book was used for some time in the American Methodist Church; but it gradually dropped out of use, without any prohibition, however, on the part of the General Conference. A modified form of it appears in *The Sunday Service of the Methodist Episcopal Church South*, edited by T. O. Summers, D.D. (Nashville, 1867).

(7.) *The Liturgy of the New Church, signified by the New Jerusalem in the Revelation, prepared by Order of the General Conference*, was published in 1828, and superseded all the liturgies which had previously been used by the Swedenborgians, or followers of Emanuel Swedenborg.

3. *Scottish Common Prayer-books*. —

> "**1.** *Ancient Liturgy of the Kirk of Scotland*. — At the commencement of the Reformation in Scotland the Protestant nobles and barons, assembled at Edinburgh in December, 1557, agreed that they would rest satisfied for the present with the reading of the prayers and lessons

in English, according to the order of the *Book of Common Prayer*, that is, the liturgy of king Edward VI, in every parish on Sundays and other festival days! This regulation, however, continued in force only a short time; for in 1562 the Book of Common Order, commonly termed '*Knox's Liturgy*,' was partially introduced; and by an act of the General Assembly, passed December 26, 1564, its use was authoritatively ordained in all the churches in Scotland. This liturgy was taken from the order or liturgy used by the English church at Geneva. It contains forms for morning and evening prayer, the celebration of baptism, the Lord's Supper, and marriage; and for the election of superintendents or presbyters who were invested with episcopal functions; the order of ecclesiastical discipline, of excommunication, and of public repentance; a treatise on fasting; and forms of prayer for domestic and private use. A new edition of *The Liturgy of the Church of Scotland; or, John Knox's Book of Common Order*, was published by the Rev. Dr. Cumming, at London, in 1840, in 18mo. *The New Booke of Common Prayer, according to the Forme of the Kirke of Scotland, our Brethren in Faith and Covenant*, printed in 1644, is a very brief abstract of Calvin's *Genevan Prayer-book*, or rather of Knox's *Book of Common Order*. It is reprinted in the first volume of Hall's *Fragmenta Liturgica*. *SEE DIRECTORY*.

"**2.** *Liturgy of the Episcopal Church in Scotland*.The liturgy of the Episcopal Church in Scotland is at present nearly the same as that of the Church of England. Charles I, in 1637, made an unsuccessful attempt to introduce into Scotland a *Book of Common Prayer*, copied, with some alterations, from that of England, which produced the Solemn League and Covenant. That liturgy was prepared by archbishop Spottiswoode, of St. Andrew's, and Lindsay of Glasgow, assisted by Wedderburn, dean of the Chapel Royal at Edinburgh, and by bishops Guthrie, Maxwell, and Whitford. On its being sent to London, Charles I referred it to the examination of archbishop Laud, and of Wren, bishop of Ely. It was published at Edinburgh in folio, and entitled *The Booke of Common Prayer and Administration of the Sacraments and other parts of Divine Service, for the Use of the Church of Scotland*. This liturgy is reprinted in the second volume of Hall's *Reliquio Liturgica*; a copious bibliographical and historical account of it will be found in vol. i, p. 13-35. From 1645 until after the restoration in 1660, the *Westminster Directory* was adopted, but by no means strictly

adhered to, in various instances (as in that of praying for the civil government); and when episcopacy was restored together with monarchy, it was not thought advisable to renew the attempt to introduce a public liturgy; so that, except at ordinations, when the English forms were used, as far as local circumstances would admit, no regular form of prayer was in general use, while episcopacy continued to be the form of ministry in the Established Church. Many, indeed, of the episcopal clergy compiled forms to be used by themselves in their particular congregations, with some petitions and collects taken out of the English book, and all of them uniformly concluded their prayers with the Lord's Prayer, and their singing with the doxology. *Prayers for the Morning and Evening Service of the Cathedral Church of Aberdeen*, composed by the Rev. Henry Scougal, professor of theology in the King's College, continued in use until the Revolution, when the Presbyterians would no longer tolerate a written prayer. At length, in 1712, the *English Book of Common Prayer* was universally adopted by the Scottish Episcopal Church with little variation, except in the celebration of the Eucharist. In that service the order for the administration of the Lord's Supper is substantially that in the liturgy authorized by Charles I, but with alterations made to make it more conformable to the first and comparatively imperfectly reformed liturgy of king Edward VI. By the twenty-first canon of *The Code of Canons of the Episcopal Church in Scotland, as revised, amended, and enacted, by an ecclesiastical synod, holden for that purpose at Edinburgh, from August 20 till September 6, 1838* (Edinburgh, 1838, 8vo), after ratifying and confirming the permission formerly granted by the bishops 'to all those who profess to be of the episcopal persuasion in Scotland .... to retain the use of the English office in all congregations where the said office had previously been in use,' it is enacted, "That in the use of either the Scotch or English office no amalgamation, alteration, or interpolation whatever shall take place, nor shall any substitution of the one for the other be admitted, unless it shall be approved by the bishop. From respect, however, for the authority which originally sanctioned the Scotch liturgy, and for other sufficient reasons, it is hereby enacted, that the Scotch communion office continue to be held of primary authority in this Church, and that it shall be used in all consecrations of bishops, but also at the opening of all general synods' — p. 29, 30. Although the Scotch communion office is thus established, it is worthy of notice that this canon does not

prescribe what specific edition is to be used, almost every single bishop, in the lapse of years, having made additions, and even some changes, according to their own judgment or preference In point of doctrine, the difference between the English and Scotch offices is clear and unequivocal the English offices being exclusively commemorative, and the Scottish most distinctly sacrificial. Besides which, the following usages are practiced, not one of which is adopted in the English offices, viz. 1. The mixing of water with the wine in the Eucharist; 2. Commemorating the faithful departed at the altar; 3. Consecrating the elements by an express invocation; 4. Using the oblatory prayer before distribution" (Eadie, s.v.). *SEE COMMUNION SERVICE*.

4. *The American Prayer-book.* — After the American Revolution the "Protestant Episcopal Church" was established as an organization separate from the Church of England in 1784. In 1786 a committee was appointed to adapt the English liturgy to use in this country, and they prepared a book which, however, never went into general use (*The Proposed Book*, 1786; reprinted in Hall, *Reliquiae Liturgicae*, Lond. 1847).

"At the General Convention in October, 1789, the whole subject of the liturgy was thrown open by appointing committees on the different portions of the Prayer-book, whose several reports, with the action of the two houses thereupon, were consolidated in the *Book of Common Prayer*, etc., as it is now in use, the whole book being ratified and set forth by a vote of the Convention on the 16th of October, 1789, its use being prescribed from and after the 1st day of October, 1790. The American liturgy retains all that is excellent in the English service, omits several of its really objectionable features, brings some of the offices (the communion, for example) nearer to the primitive pattern, modifies others to suit our peculiar institutions, and, on the whole, is a noble monument to the wisdom, prudence, piety, and churchmanship of the fathers of the American Church. By the 45th canon of 1832, it is required that every minister shall, before all sermons and lectures, and all other occasions of public worship, use the *Book of Common Prayer*, as the same is or may be established by the authority of the General Convention of this Church. And in performing said service, no other prayers shall be used than those prescribed by the said book" (Hook, *Church Dictionary*, Am. ed. s.v.).

There seems to be a widely-diffused conviction, both in England and America, quite apart from doctrinal considerations, that the forms of

morning service, which are composed of what were formerly several distinct services, are too long for use. Bennett, in his *Paraphrase with Annotations on the Book of Common Prayer* (Lond. 1709, 8vo), observes that the using of the morning prayer, the litany, and communion service at one and the same time, in one continued order, is contrary to the first intention and practice of the Church. On this subject the Church of England Quarterly (London, 1855, p. 20) remarks, "That our services are too long is generally, although not universally conceded. There is, no one will deny, much repetition in them as they are at present conducted; and the recitation of the Lord's Prayer six times on a sacrament morning may be taken as an instance. We recognize our liturgy as deservedly endeared to our people; and neither would we recommend, nor would they suffer, any alterations in it which would tend to lower its tone. A few verbal changes, the omission of a few rubrics, a new arrangement of the morning lessons, and we might go on without detriment for another three centuries. Much, too, must at all times be left to the discretion of the clergy." On this and other questions as to needed changes, see the *Memorial Papers*, containing the *Circular and Questions of an Episcopal Commission ordered by the General Convention of the P. E. Church in 1853*, edited by Bp. A. Potter (Phila. 1857, 12mo); Powys, *Reconstruction of the Liturgy* (Lond. 1854).

"A writer in the London *Daily News* (1867) relates the discovery, in the library of the House of Lords, of the copy of the *Act of Uniformity*, 14 Charles II, 1662, with the roll affixed containing the words of the *Book of Common Prayer*, which had been detached and lost from the copy deposited with the House of Commons. Technically and practically, therefore, the writer remarks, the two rolls form one engrossed act, and 'nothing can be so distinct a proof that the prayers, psalms, rubrics, etc., are the law of the land'" (Nation, Sept. 19, 1867).

The most important works on the Common Prayer, besides those cited in the course of this article, are Wheatly, Rational *Illustration of the Common Prayer* (London, 1720, fol.; new ed. 1842, 8vo; also in Bohn's *Standard Library*, 12mo); Comber, *Companion to the Temple* (new ed. Oxf. 1841, 7 vols. 8vo); Sparrow, *Rationale upon the Book of Common Prayer* (new ed. Oxf. 1839, sm. 8vo); Bailey, *The Liturgy compared with the Bible* (Lond. 1833, 2 vols. 8vo); Palmer, *Origines Liturgicae* (Oxf. 1832, 2 vols. 8vo); Berens, *Lectures on Catechism and Offices* (Oxf. 1823); Procter, History of the *Book of Common Prayer* (Lond. 1856, 2d ed. 8vo); Cardwell, *The two Liturgies of Edward VI compared* (Oxf. 1838, 8vo);

Maskell, *Monumenta Ritualia Ecclesiae Anglicanae* (Lond. 1846, 3 vols. 8vo); Freeman, *Principles of Divine Service* (Lond. 1855, 8vo); *Christian Remembrancer*, Oct. 1855, art. vii; Lathbury, *History of the Book of Common Prayer from the Reformation* (1858, 2d ed. 8vo); Cardwell, *History of Conferences for revision of the Common Prayer from 1558 to 1690* (Oxf. 1849, 3d ed. 8vo); Humphrey, *Historical and Explanatory Treatise on the Common Prayer* (Lond. 2d ed. 1856, 8vo); Stoddart, *The History of the Prayerbook, and of its Formation from previous Liturgies, with a Draft showing how our present Liturgy might, with some alterations, be advantageously revised and rearranged in more varied services* (Lond. 1864, crown 8vo); *The Annotated Book of Common Prayer, being an Historical, Ritual, and Theological Commentary on the Devotional System of the Church of England*, edited by John Henry Blunt (Lond. 1866, imp. 8vo). On the American book, see Brownell, *Family Prayer-book* (N. Y. 1855, royal 8vo); Butler, *Common Prayer interpreted by its History* (Boston, 1845, 12mo); *Am. Church Review*, Jan. 1858, art. 1. *SEE FORMS OF PRAYER*; *SEE LITANY*; *SEE LITURGY*.

Commune, or Communicate

a term made use of to denote the act of receiving the Lord's Supper. *SEE LORD'S SUPPER*.

Communicants

(1.) a sect of Anabaptists (q.v.);

(2.) a term used to designate church-members who partake of the Lord's Supper (q.v.).

Communicatio Idiomatum

a doctrine of the Lutheran Church as to the person of Christ. In the ancient Church the question arose if a real personal unity of the divine and the human elements in the person of Christ could be effected without destroying the distinction of natures. The ancient Church maintained the *reality* of the personal unity of the two elements by condemning the Nestorian, Monophysite, and Monotheletic doctrines. The Lutheran theology undertook to show the *possibility* of this union. Luther laid the foundation of the doctrine by the assertion that Christ, according to his humanity, fills all things, and is ubiquitous. He did not use, however, the

expression *communicatio idiomatum,* which was first employed in the *Formula Concordiae* (q.v.). Three classes of Scriptural passages were adduced by the old Lutheran writers in behalf of this doctrine: 1, those in which qualities belonging to one nature only are attributed to the whole person; 2, those which predicate of one nature an activity which belongs to the work of redemption, consequently to the whole person; 3, those which transfer divine attributes to Christ's human nature. The *Formula Concordiae,* however, expressly rejects a restriction of the divine nature, in consequence of its union with the human. Zwingle, with whom, on the whole, the theologians of the Reformed Church agreed, rejected the doctrine of a real *communicatio idiomatum* (peculiar qualities of the two natures), and explained the passages adduced by the Lutherans as figures of speech (ἀλλοίωσις). The Supranaturalistic school of the later German theology does not expressly reject the doctrine, but explains it away. The Rationalistic, *A*Esthetic, and Speculative schools of Germany either reject it entirely, or partly put upon it an ethical or speculative construction. The revived Lutheran orthodoxy of the 19th century partly restricts itself to a mere revival of the old doctrine, and partly attempts to complete it by asserting a self-restriction of the divine nature in Christ, in consequence of his union with the human. According to this doctrine, which was in particular developed by Sartorius (*Dorpater Beitrage zu den theologischen Wissenschaften*, Hamburg, 1832) and Thomasius (*Beitrage zur kirchlichen Christologie*, Erlangen, 1845). the Lagos, from the moment of his incarnation, renounced his divine self-consciousness in order to develop himself in a merely human form. See, besides the works already mentioned, Dorner, History of the Person of Christ, Edinb. translation, vol. ii; Hase, *Evangelische Dogmatik,* p. 221 sq.; Gieseler, *Church History,* edited by Smith, vol. iv, § 37; Hagenbach, *History of Doctrines* (Smith's), § 266, 267; Pearson *On the Creed,* art. ii; and the article CHRISTOLOGY, p. 281.

Communicative Life

Ecclesiastical writers, in describing the habits of monks, distinguish between *vita communicativa* and *vita renunciativa*. The usual plan was for candidates to take a solemn vow of poverty, and consequently to renounce the world by disposing of their estates to charitable uses, before they entered into a community, where they were to have all things in common. Others kept their estates in their own hands, and yet enjoyed no more of them than if they had passed over to others; for they distributed their whole yearly revenue to the poor, and to such uses as the daily necessities of men

required. The latter was called the communicative life. — Farrar, *Eccl. Dictionary*, s.v.; Bingham, *Orig. Eccl.* 7:3, 9.

Communio Laica

in the language of the Church of Rome, means properly the rank of the laity, but is more commonly used to signify the status of a clergyman transferred from the privileged class of the clergy to the lay community. Only the clergy of the lower grades, *SEE CLERGY*, could voluntarily go back to the rank of the laity; those who had received one of the higher orders (upwards from the diaconate) could be transferred back to the laity only by legal dispensation granted by the pope, or by degradation. Clergymen of the lower grades can, according to the canon law, contract a valid marriage, but thereby lose their benefices and the privileges of the clergy. The Council of Trent allowed that in exceptional cases the lower orders be conferred upon married men (in case they had not been married oftener than once), and, on condition of their wearing the tonsure and the clerical habit, granted to them the *privilegia canonis et fori*, *SEE CLERGY*. Papal dispensation for members of the higher clergy to re-enter the rank of the laity (in particular, for the purpose of marrying) has only been given in rare instances. The transfer of a clergyman to the rank of the laity, as a punishment, took place, according to the ancient canonical law, in connection with deposition, but, according to the later law, only in consequence of degradation (q.v.). See Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* 2:718; Bingham, *Orig. Eccl.* 17:2; Farrar, *Eccl. Dict.* s.v.

Communio Peregrina

In the early Church the term communio denoted not only a participation of the Eucharist, but also a right of partaking of the bounty of the Church. When travelers or strangers came to any church without bringing letters testimonial, by which they might be ascertained to be members of some Christian church, they were liable to the suspicion that they were under the censure of the Church to which they had belonged. Until they could thus clear themselves from imputation, they were not admitted to the Lord’s table, but were allowed to derive their means of temporal maintenance from the Church fund. In this way delinquent clergymen were sometimes treated in their own churches, and this was called communio peregrina. They were not permitted to officiate or to be present at the celebration of

the Lord's Supper until they had given satisfaction to the Church. — Farrar, *Eccl. Dict.* s.v.; Bingham, *Orig. Eccl.* 17:3,1.

Communion

(κοινωνία, *a sharing*), in ordinary terms, an association or agreement when several persons join and partake together of one thing; hence its application to the celebration of the Lord's Supper as an act of fellowship among Christians (<46I016>1 Corinthians 10:16); and it is to this act of participation or fellowship that the word "communion," in the religious sense, is now chiefly applied in the English language. In <470614>2 Corinthians 6:14, it takes the derived sense of *concord*. The "communion of the Holy Ghost" (<471314>2 Corinthians 13:14) signifies that spiritual intercourse with the divine Spirit which the child of God maintains by faith and prayer. The Greek term has also a secondary meaning of *bestowal* in charity, in other passages, where it is rendered "contribution," "distribution," or "communication" [which see]. The word is elsewhere translated simply "fellowship" (q.v.). For a large number of treatises on this subject, see Volbeding, *Index Dissertationum*, p. 147 sq.

(1.) *Communion* (κοινωνία) therefore "properly means the sharing something in common with another. Hence, in the Christian sense, it signifies the sharing divine converse or intercourse (<620103>1 John 1:3); and as this takes place, sacramentally, in the Lord's Supper, the word, in a third stage, signifies a joint participation in a spiritual sense of the body and blood of Christ, i.e. of his Spirit (<430663>John 6:63) in that sacrament (<461016>1 Corinthians 10:16). Some explain the κοινωνία in the Lord's Supper to be a communication of the 'body and blood of Christ,' as though these were given by the Church to the receiver, but the above account of the order in which the senses of the word have grown out of one another shows that such an interpretation is untenable. The Church has not, nor pretends to give, anything as from herself in that ordinance, but Christians come together to hold 'communion' with each other, and with their (once-sacrificed) Lord, of the benefits of whose death, sacramentally exhibited, they are in a special, though only spiritual, manner then partakers. 'Communion' (κοινωνία) is that which is sought and spiritually partaken of by the receiver, not that which is actually conveyed by any person as the giver. Of the several names by which the Supper of the Lord has been at different times distinguished, that of the 'Holy Communion' is the one which the Church of England has adopted for her members. The Rubrics,

Articles, and Canons almost invariably employ this designation." *SEE EUCHARIST*; *SEE LORDS SUPPER*.

(2.) In a historical sense, communion denotes participation in the mysteries of the Christian religion, and, of course, Church fellowship, with all its rights and privileges. Hence the term "excommunication." In this sense the word is used also with reference to the admission of persons to the Lord's Supper. This is said to be open when all are admitted who apply; to be strict when confined to the members of a single society, or at least to members of the same denomination; and it is mixed when persons are admitted from societies of different denominations, on the profession of their faith and evidence of their piety, as is the case in Protestant churches generally. The principal difficulty on this point arises between the strict Baptists and Paedo-baptists.

Close Communion

Question of. — Among the Baptists there is a controversy on the subject, in which the two parties (called *Free* and *Strict* Communionists) may be represented respectively by Robert Hall and by J. G. Fuller. The following statement, embracing the substance of the controversy, represents the opposite sides of the subject.

(a) "The opinion of Mr. Hall that baptism is not a prerequisite to the participation of the Eucharist runs through all his reasonings in favor of unrestricted communion, and is the real foundation on which they rest. His positions are the following:

1. The baptism of John was a separate institution from that appointed by Christ after his resurrection; from which it follows that the Lord's Supper was anterior to Christian baptism, and that the original communicants consisted entirely of such as had not received that ordinance.

2. That there is no such connection, either in the nature of things or by the divine institution, between baptism and the Eucharist as renders it, under all circumstances, indispensable that the former should precede the latter.

3. That admitting this to be the prescribed order, and to be sanctioned by the uniform practice of the apostles, the case of pious Paedo-baptists is a new case, calling for some peculiar treatment, in which we ought to regard rather the *spirit* than the *letter* of apostolic precedent.

4. That a schismr in the Church, the mystical body of Christ, is deprecated in the New Testament as the greatest evil.

5. That a reception to Church fellowship of all such as God has received, notwithstanding a diversity of opinion and practice in matters not essential to salvation, is expressly enjoined in the New Testament (<45 14 15>Romans 14:15; 15:1, 5-7).

6. That to withhold the Lord's Supper from those with whom we unite in other acts of Christian worship is a palpable inconsistency. And, lastly, that it is as impolitic as it is illiberal, being calculated to awaken a powerful prejudice, and place beyond the reach of conviction our Paedo-baptist brethren, and to engender among the Baptists themselves a narrow and sectarian feeling, wholly opposed to the enlarged spirit of the present age (*Complete Works of Robert Hall*, 2:207-230; also 1:283-504).

(b) "The positions urged on the opposite side by Mr. J. G. Fuller are these:

1. That all the arguments which are used to destroy the identity of baptism as practiced by John and the apostles before the death of Christ, with that practiced afterwards, amount only to proof of a circumstantial, not an essential difference, and cannot, therefore, warrant the inferences of Mr. Hall in any one point.

2. That the commission of our Lord (<40 28 19>Matthew 28:19, 20) furnishes the same evidence that baptism is an indispensable prerequisite to external Church fellowship as that faith is an indispensable prerequisite to baptism.

3. That the uniform examples of the apostles is an inspired explanation of the commission under which they acted, and a pattern intended for the instruction of the Church in all succeeding ages.

4. That strict conformity to the commission of Christ, thus explained, is not schism, but the only possible mode of restoring and perpetuating Christian union.

5. That the mutual forbearance enjoined on Christians in the New Testament related to matters of real indifference, not involving the surrender of any positive institution of Christ, and is therefore inapplicable to the present case.

6. That to unite with Paedo-Baptist brethren in all such acts of worship and benevolent effort as do not imply an abandonment of the commission is not

an inconsistency, but the dictate of Christian charity. And, lastly, that to whatever imputations a strict adherence to the commission of Christ may subject the Baptist churches, it is better to suffer them than to sin; and that a deviation in deference to modern error, however conscientiously maintained, is neither charity nor Christian wisdom, since "whatever is right is wise." Christians may cordially unite in the evangelization of the world, but they do not, nor can they, without a change of sentiments, unite in the constitution of their churches (*Conversations on Strict and Mixed Communion*, by J. G. Fuller)."

It is said that most of the English Baptists favor free communion; those of the United States are mostly close communionists, except the Free-will Baptists, who are, as a body, open communionists. See Curtis Communion, *A Review of the Arguments of Hall and Noel* (Phila. 1850, 12mo), for a full argument for close communion; also *Christian Review*, 16:210, and an able article by Dr. Hovey, *Bibliotheca Sacra*, Jan. 1862, art. v. See also the same Journal, July, 1864, art. i, and July, 1867, art. in. *SEE BAPTISTS*.

II. A similar controversy has been going on in the Lutheran Church, in which the High-Church party refuses the admission of members of the Reformed and all non-Lutheran churches to communion. *SEE LUTHERANS*.

III. The Reformed Presbyterians (Covenanters) in Scotland and the United States, and the United Presbyterians in the United States, are also believers in the doctrine of close communion; but in all these churches there is a party which strongly contends against this doctrine, and in favor of open communion. At the United Presbyterian General Assembly of 1867 the subject of close communion was the chief topic of discussion. The Rev. W. C. McCune, the author of a book against close communion, was censured by a large majority. See W. C. McCune, *Close Communion, or Church Fellowship*, by Rev. J. T. Pressly, D.D., of the United Presbyterian Theological Seminary at Allheghany, Penn. (Cincinnati, William Scott, 1866, p. 147); also W. Annan (O. S. Presbyterian), *The Doctrine of Close Communion tested by Scripture and Reason* (Pittsburg, 1867). Mr. Annan endeavors to establish that the views entertained and defended by the leading men at present in that Church are not those which were held by the fathers of the Associate Reformed Church. In discussing the subject, Mr. Annan presents the views of Drs. Mason, Smith, and Annan, father of the author, and others, down to 1867, in support of his positions.

Communion In Both Kinds.

"The communion was universally administered in both kinds (bread and wine), to both clergy and laity, until about the twelfth century, when the cup began to be gradually withdrawn from the laity in the Western Church, on account (as was affirmed) of the disorders to which the use of it had given rise. Communion in one kind is intimately connected with the doctrine of transubstantiation. Romanists profess to believe that Christ, whole and entire — soul, body, and divinity — is contained in either species, and in the smallest particle of each. Hence they infer that, whether the communicant receives the bread or the wine, he enjoys the full benefit of the sacrament. Thus, to support this absurd and monstrous dogma, a Christian ordinance is divided; transubstantiation justifies communion in one kind, and communion in one kind proves the truth of transubstantiation. This is the principal reason assigned in the Catechism of the Council of Trent. After alleging many frivolous reasons, such as that there is danger of spilling the wine in a crowded assembly, and thus inflicting an indignity on the blood of Christ; that many cannot bear the smell or taste of wine; that it may become vapid; that it is extremely scarce in some places, and would involve great expense to procure it — it says, 'A circumstance which principally influenced the Church in establishing this practice was, that means were to be devised to crush the heresy which denied that Christ, whole and entire, is contained under either species, and asserted that the body is contained under the species of bread without the blood, and the blood under the species of wine without the body. This object was attained by communion under the species of bread alone, which places, as it were sensibly before our eyes, the truth of the Catholic faith.' Protestants believe that without the cup there can be no sacrament at all, and therefore the Eucharist is not celebrated in the Romish Church." For the history of this question, *SEE LORDS SUPPER*. — Bingham, *Orig. Eccl.* 15:5; Farrar, *Eccles. Dict.* s.v.

Communion Of Saints

one of the points of a Christian's faith according to the Apostles' Creed.

1. According to the *Roman Catholic* definition, it is the "union between the Church triumphant (in heaven), the Church militant (on earth), and the Church suffering (in purgatory). These three form the one body, of which Christ is the invisible head, and of which the pope, Christ's vicar, is the

visible head. Its members are united by a mutual communication of intercessions and prayers" (Bergier). This definition, it will be seen, prepares the way for the Roman superstitions of the invocation of saints and prayers for the dead. The saints in heaven are to be venerated and invoked by the Church militant, and the members of the latter are to be supported by the intercessions of the former. The Church militant is to support by her prayers the Church suffering; and the members of the Church militant may also offer prayers for each other. See Wetzer und Welte, *Kirchen-Lexikon*, 4:929 sq.

2. The *Protestant* definitions vary somewhat.

(a) The *Westminster Confession* says: "All saints that are united to Jesus Christ, their head, by his Spirit and by faith, have fellowship with him in his graces, sufferings, death, resurrection, and glory. And being united to one another in love, they have communion in each others' gifts and graces, and are obliged to the performance of such duties, public and private, as do conduce to their mutual good, both in the inward and outward man. Saints by profession are bound to maintain a holy fellowship and communion in the worship of God, and in performing such other spiritual services as tend to their mutual edification, as also in relieving each other in outward things, according to their several abilities and necessities'; which communion, as God offereth opportunity, is to be ex-tended unto all those who in every place call upon the name of the Lord Jesus. This communion which the saints have with Christ doth not make them in anywise partakers of the substance of his Godhead, or to be equal with Christ in any respect; either of which to affirm is impious and blasphemous."

(b) Pearson and Leighton agree, substantially, in stating that 'Christians have communion or fellowship with the Father, from whom cometh every good and perfect gift (<620103>1 John 1:3; <610104>2 Peter 1:4), with his son Jesus Christ, through whom forgiveness and mercy are conveyed to us (<620103>1 John 1:3; <431720>John 17:20, 23), and with the Holy Ghost, whose sanctifying graces are conferred on those whose hearts are duly prepared for their reception (<500201>Philippians 2:1; <471314>2 Corinthians 13:14); that Christians have also communion with the holy angels, who are ministering spirits sent forth to minister for them who shall be heirs of salvation (<580114>Hebrews 1:14; <421510>Luke 15:10; <401810>Matthew 18:10); that, besides the external fellowship which they have in the word and sacraments of the Church, they have an intimate union and conjunction with all the saints on earth, as the living

members of Christ (<400107>John 1:7; <510219>Colossians 2:19); and that Christians have communion not only with the saints on earth, but are of one city and one family with all those who have ever died in the true faith and fear of God, and now enjoy the presence of the Father, and who, in their state of glory, still sympathize with the faithful below, assisting, comforting, and praying for them (<581222>Hebrews 12:22, 23). The belief of this communion of saints should excite and encourage us to holiness of life. If 'we walk in the light, as God is in the light, we have fellowship one with another;' but 'if we say that we have fellowship with him, and walk in darkness, we lie, and do not the truth' (<620106>1 John 1:6, 7). It should induce us to wish well to all mankind, and to render them every good in our power. To those who have obtained the like precious faith with ourselves, we are still more nearly related, as being in a peculiar sense children of the same Father, disciples of the same Master, animated by the same spirit, and members of the same body" (Seeker, *On Catechism, lect. xiv*; Pearson, *On the Creed* (ed. 1710, p. 759); Leighton, *On the Creed* (*Works*, 2:412).

(c) Another view is given by Wilson, who remarks that, while the Romish view is unscriptural, that of Pearson and others is vague. His work aims to show that the bond of union among Christians (denoted by the communion of saints) is not to be sought (1) in identity of doctrinal beliefs, or (2) in identity of religious feeling or experience, as feeling, or (3) in identity of forms of Church government in worship, but in moral unity, founded in the action of the grace of God not merely in the hearts, but in the activities of Christians. See Wilson, *Bampton Lectures* (Oxford, 1851, 8vo).

Communion Of The Sick

SEE LORDS SUPPER.

Communion Service

the office for the administration of the Eucharist, or sacrament of the Lord's Supper. *SEE LITURGY*.

Communion-Table

a table on which the sacramental bread and wine are placed for the communion in Protestant churches. At the Reformation, stone altars were rejected, as likely to support the notion of a material sacrifice, against, which the Reformers protested. *SEE ALTAR*; *SEE LORDS SUPPER*.

a theory of “community of property,” often attempted to be realized in practice.

I. *Communistic Ideas in the religious and philosophical Systems of ancient Paganism*. — The most ancient form of communism known to us is found in the monasteries of Buddhism, in attempts to reach an ideal of sanctity by renouncing marriage and property. In the history of Greece, a form of society based upon community of goods is ascribed to the order of Pythagoreans. But by far the most important representative of communistic ideas in pagan antiquity is Plato, whose work on the ideal state still ranks among the best that has ever been written in favor of communism. Plato regards the possession of private property as the source of every evil for the state of avarice, of egotism, of a low character. He therefore allows only the lowest of the three classes, into which, according to him, the state is divided, and which he excludes from a participation in the government of the state, to possess private property. The two ruling classes, the *archontes* and the *warriors*, are subjected by Plato to compulsory communism in the widest sense of the word. As both classes were to live exclusively for the state, and any private possession appeared to Plato as productive of egotism, he not only demanded for these two classes community of property, but, under certain restrictions, to be regulated by law, community of women. After the establishment of Christianity, the Neo-Platonic philosopher Plotinus was a prominent representative of communistic ideas, and applied to the Roman Emperor Gallienus for permission to establish a state according to the Platonic ideal, upon the ruins of a destroyed city of Calabria.

II. *Communism among the Jews*. — Among the Jews, the sects of the Therapeutae and the Essenes, whose fundamental principle was the dualism of the Eastern religions, formed, like the Buddhists, communistic societies, the former on Lake Moeris in Egypt, the latter in the deserts near the Dead Sea. *SEE ESSENES, THERAPEUTAE*.

III. *Monastic Communism and Socialism in the ancient Christian Church*. — The infant Christian Church at Jerusalem has been held up as at once an example of communism and an argument for it (Acts 2:42, 44, 46). But the passage in Acts does not imply either an absolute, total, or compulsory community of goods. There is no trace in the New Testament

of Jewish Essenism or of modern communism. Christianity carefully guards the individuality of each member, and considers love as the only law by which Christians are bound. It is true, however, on the other hand, that a communistic tendency existed in the Church, which developed itself in the 4th century in the establishment of the communities of anachorets and monks. *SEE MONACHISM*. The reformation of the monastic orders, began principally through the efforts of Bernard de Clairvaux in the 12th century, gave a new socialistic and communistic impulse to the laity, and led to the formation of religious bodies, united by vows of life-long poverty and asceticism. Such were the *Humiliates* (q.v.), who made vows of voluntary poverty, chastity, and fasting, but were not distinguished from the people in dress, though living together as a religious community; the *Beghards* (q.v.), a society of unmarried men, who lived in community under a master, and devoted themselves to manual labor and devotions; and a similar female association, formed as early as the 11th century, under the name of *Beguines* (q. v). These lay associations differed from the clerical communities by considering poverty and continence as essential rules, and bore more of a socialistic than a communistic character. In the 13th century, the *Mendicant orders* (q.v.) united the socialistic organization to the clerical character, and cast the lay brotherhoods in the shade. Another sort of communistic union was that of the *Fratres et sorores liberi sptritus*, *SEE BRETHREN OF THE FREE SPIRIT*, (13th century), who held that the original state anterior to the Fall should be restored, and that the distinctions created by the law, of Church, state, society, should be abolished. In their secret assemblies (paradises) the principles of the community of goods and of women was advocated by naked preachers before naked audiences of both sexes. This sect extended under different names through France, Italy, and Germany. A similar sect, under the name of *Adamites* (q.v.), advocating the community of women, arose during the Hussite wars, but was put down by the Hussite general Ziska.

IV. *Communistic and Socialistic Associations of the Times of the Reformation*. — A socialistic impulse, tending to a universal division of property, lay at the foundation of the peasant war of Germany in the early days of the Reformation. The twelve articles of the peasants, however, demanded only the abolition of feudal privileges, not a total subversion of society. *The Heavenly Prophets*, instituted by Nicholas Storch in 1521, went further; they advocated the community of goods, the substitution of

polygamy for monogamy, and the abolition of all civil and ecclesiastical authority. Munzer (q.v.) went still further; his doctrine of the absolute community of all possessions was pure communism. These doctrines were admitted to the fullest extent by the *Anabaptists* (q.v.) of Munster. Some isolated followers of Anabaptism in the Netherlands disseminated these doctrines afterwards in France and the north of Germany. Following in the same road we find the *Libertines* of Geneva, whom Calvin strenuously opposed, and the *Familists* of Holland and England, about 1545. The communistic element is also apparent in a pure form in the organization of the *Herrnhuters* (Moravians), and in some communities of Auvergne, which are unions of families under one head, by whom work is divided according to different individual capacities.

V. *Modern Communism and Socialism*. — By the side of the above religious communistic doctrines arose the modern communism, taking its source in the new antagonism to the institutions of the Middle Ages, which recognized two classes of people — the rulers, nobles and clerks, and the ruled, civilians and peasants. All the privileges belonged to the former, all the burdens to the latter. For the old divisions of society — nobles and peasants — were substituted gradually two new classes, a *moneyed* aristocracy and a *proletariat*. The recognition of the principle of equality tended to overthrow all conventional authority and privileges.

In Great Britain the germs of communism are to be found in Roger Bacon's *New Atlantis*; in More's *De optima republicae statu* (1516); and in Harrington's *Oceana* (1656); but no practical form of socialism appeared till the 18th century, when the *Buchanites* (q.v.) of Scotland formed a religious communistic association, which lasted fully for half a century. In the 19th century, Robert Owen (q.v.) attempted to better the condition of the cotton-weavers of New Lanark. He published his system (*A new View of Society*, 1813), in which, starting from the principle that all men are born equal, he maintains that they become good or bad through the influence of outward circumstances. But his political radicalism obliged him to leave England, and he came to the United States, where he founded the colony of New Harmony. The experiment was successful so long as money lasted, but this failing, it was abandoned in 1826. *SEE OWEN*. In the mean time, the Owenites had founded another colony at Orbiston, near Edinburgh, Scotland, under the guidance of Abram Combe, but it was dissolved after his death in 1827. Owen, having returned to England, became the founder and director of the National Labor Equitable

Exchange, and the Community Friendly Society of Manchester. These Owenite working associations brought forth the *Chartists*, who aimed at the suppression of the powers of the clergy, the land-owners, the large capitalists, and all privileged classes.

In France, the *Declaration of the Rights of Man*, in 1789, laid down the principle of equality as the foundation of the state organization. The Constitution of 1791 acknowledged the right of property, but recognized also the corresponding right of employment for those destitute of property. The Constitution of 1793 aimed to establish greater material equality, and Marat often expressed the idea that real equality could only be established on the basis of equality of rights and equality of tastes. Under Napoleon and the Restoration these ideas were for a time forgotten, until the Revolution of July, 1830, showed again their existence and power among the proletariat. The Socialists before the Revolution, whose way had been prepared by other Utopists, such as Fenelon (*Republique de Salente, Voyage dans l'ile des plaisirs*, etc.), are but few in number, if considered as distinct from the advocates of equality. Among their works the most remarkable are *La Basiliade*, a novel by Morelli (Paris, 1753); *Le Code de la Nature* (1755), presenting the idea of systematizing labor. The materialist and atheistic works of Holbach, Helvetius, Diderot, Voltaire, Rousseau, Reynal, full of Utopian theories, greatly damaged the authority of existing institutions. Communism did not practically take its modern form until after the end of the Reign of Terror; but after the Constitution of 1795 had made the franchise of voting to depend on property, the remaining terrorists joined the disfranchised classes in their opposition to all right of individual property. They aimed at bringing back society to the state of nature, claiming that in a true state of society there should be neither rich nor poor; that a common education would make all equal in their attainments. The heads of the party were Babeuf and his followers. After the fall of Babeuf, and under the military rule of Napoleon, arose the socialistic doctrines of St. Simon and Fourier. The former explained his views in *Le Catechisme des Industriels and Le nouveau Christianisme*, in the formed of which he proposed to establish an industrial system on the basis of perfect equality; while in the latter he attempts to demonstrate that this equality is a result of the divine commandment to love one another as brethren. In order practically to arrive at the object of St. Simon, Bazard proposed that after the teatn of a person, the community at large, instead of his family, should inherit his estate. Fourier expounded his system in *La*

Theorie des quatre Mouvements, and *Le Traite de I'Association Domestique Agricole* (1822, 2d edit. 1841). He aims at the practical perfection of mankind, and considers happiness as the aim of all living creatures. Wealth is to be increased and disseminated, and this is to be accomplished by dividing the common property and by regulating labor, uniting persons to work in groups, industrial series, and phalanges, according to their capacity for labor; the result of the joint labor to be divided among the producers in proportion to their capital, labor, and talent. Fourier succeeded in gaining the public ear after the fall of St. Simonism, and was greatly helped by Victor Considerant. He published a newspaper, *Le Phalanstere*, in 1832, and in 1836 another, *La Phalange*, *Journal de la Science Sociale*, to disseminate his ideas.

St. Simonism and Fourierism gave rise to an immense number of publications in France. Among the most eminent writers are found, among the Socialists, Lamennais, who, in his *Essais sur Indifference* (1827), attempts to bring the socialistic idea into unison with religious dogmas, while in his pamphlet *D'avenir* he calls the people back to union with the Church of Rome on the ground that it upholds the doctrine of equality before God, from which social equality will follow. For this he was put under the ban by the pope. Stung by this treatment, he published the *Paroles d'un Croyant; Politique a I' Usage du Peuple; Pays et Gouvernement*, which are among the most radical works extant. Of a more abstract and speculative character are the works of Pierre Leroux, *Essais sur 'Egalite (1837), and De l'Humanite* (1840), wherein he considers the principle of equality as a dogma, and recognizes no distinctions of country, family, or property. The latter point is the foundation of Proudhon's doctrine; he attempts to prove that the right of property is unnatural in his work *Qu'est-ce que la Proprite*? (1840), to which question he returns the significant answer, *La Propriete c'est le Vol*. This work was followed by *De la Creation de l' Ordre dans l'Humanite* (1843), and the *Philosophy of Misery* (1846). As the advocate of socialism among the newspapers, Louis Blanc stands first. His principal object is the organization of labor, to be accomplished by using state competition to destroy private competition; the state acting as capitalist, and rewarding each worker according to his deserts. Buonarotti's († 1837) *History of the Conspiracy of Babeuf* (*La Conspiration de Babeuf*) (Paris, 1828), gave fresh circulation to Babeuf's theories, which found organs in *Le Moniteur Republicain*, 1837-38, and *L'homme libre*, after August, 1839. A practical application of these

principles was prevented by the insurrection of the Societe des Saisons, May 12th, 1839, led by Blanqui and Barb's. The failure of that enterprise damped the communistic spirit, and for a while there were only a few solitary attempts made, such as Quenisset's (1841). Still, secret societies continued to be organized, such as the Societe des Travailleurs Egalitaires, composed of the remaining followers of Barbes, who pushed the communistic principles to extremes, and considered materialism as the immutable law of nature. Opposed to them were the Reformistes, comprising the greater part of the workingmen, who aimed at community of labor; a newspaper advocating their principles, L'Atelier, appeared in 1840. The Icarian Communists, headed by (Cabet, strove to realize an ideal system of communism, depicted by the latter in his Voyage en Icarie (1840) The state, in this system, has no property, money, o distinct function; there are no distinctions of classo or ranks, and yet the state is immensely rich, as every thing belongs to it; the integrity of the family is preserved, and marriage held sacred, but the women are employed in the general workshops; all affairs are to be settled by the Comitd, from whose decisions there is no appeal. These ideas were further disseminated in Cabet's newspaper, *Le Populaire*. An extreme sect of these communists was established in 1843 by Dezamy who, bringing everything back to the individual, arrived at the fundamental maxim, We must do as we can; consequently, one may take all he requires for the time being. In this system no God is necessary, and man satisfies himself with what he finds in nature.

VI. *Communism and Socialism since the Revolution of February*, 1848. — This revolution gave at first a new impulse to socialism. The words Liberte, Egalite, Fraternite, posted on all the walls and appended to all the decrees of the republic, seemed to contain all that Socialists could wish for. The government itself was composed in part of Socialists. The result was the organization of the national work-shops, which only served to prove again the impracticability of these theories. But communism began to lift its head by the side of socialism, and made great progress with the lower classes. Both united in the insurrection of June, 1848. The putting down of the movement by General Cavaignac dispersed the leaders, some of whom took refuge in England; but their doctrines, nevertheless, continued to gain adherents among the lower classes of France. In 1850 a secret socialistic society was discovered, whose ramifications, from its center at Beziers, extended almost through the whole of southern France, and which had

completed a plan of general insurrection. This also led to the discovery, in Paris, of the secret society La Nemesis, whose members, at their initiation, swore to defend the inalienable rights of man to liberty, equality, and fraternity.

The Socialism and Communism of Switzerland and Germany present no particularly new features, being mostly based on French theories. After the failure of the Revolution of 1849, the leaders fled from Germany to England, from whence they continued to direct the operations of the Communist Association of Labor, divided in circuits and communities, and strongly organized in Germany. But the alliance of the governments in 1850, the lack of energy among the confederates, and the publication of the aims of the society in June, 1851, by a tailor's apprentice, Peter Nothjung, at Leipsig, materially injured the organization. In Belgium French communistic ideas also obtained to some extent, and were upheld in several newspapers. In 1845 Considerant went to Brussels to advocate the Fourierite theories, but found no opportunity of carrying them into practice. These ideas, however, took a firmer hold among the lower classes of Italy; Pius IX, in a letter to the Italian bishops and archbishops, December 9th, 1849, recommended them to use all efforts to prevent the propagation of socialism. That the existence of these communistic societies depends on the personality of their founders, and not on their own excellence, has been demonstrated. After the death of the leading spirits, the organizations invariably degenerate, if they do not entirely disperse. In the United States a number of attempts have been made to establish communistic colonies, partly upon a merely humanitarian, and partly upon a religious basis. Among the former belong the communistic colony established by Cabet at Nauvoo, several colonies established by the German communist Weitling and his adherents, and several phalanges established by the admirers and followers of Fourier. They have all perished. Among the second class of communistic associations belong the Shakers (q.v.) and the German Seventh-day Baptists (q.v.), who enjoin universal celibacy, the colonies Economy and Zoar, established by Separatists from Wurtemberg, and the Oneida Community (q.v.), which teaches a community of women as well as of property. — Pierer, *Universal-Lexikon*, s.v.; Herzog, *Real-Encyklopidie*, iii, 21; Romang, *Bedeutung des Communismus aus den Gesichtspunct des Christenthums* (Bern, 1847); Reybaud, *Etudes sur les Reformateurs on Socialistes Modernes* (2 tom. Paris, 1843); Sudre, *Hist. du Communisme* (4th edit.

Paris, 1850); L. Stein, *Der Socialismus u. C. d. heutigen Franicreichs* (Lpz. 1842; 2d ed. 1848); *Gesch. d. socialen Bewegung in Frankreich v.* 1789 b. a. *unsere Tage* (Lpz. 1850, 3 vols.); Karl Grun, *Die sociale Bewegung in Frankreich u. Belgien* (1845); Th. Mundt, *Die Gesch. d. Gesellschaft in ihren neueren Entwickelungen u. Problemen* (1844); Williams, *The Harmony Society at Economy, Pennsylvania* (New Haven, 1867). *SEE SOCIALISM*.

Community of Goods

(1.) From the fact "that the early Christians 'had all things common' (Acts 2:44), some have supposed that to renounce all property, and to share one's goods with fellow-Christians, is the perpetual duty of Christians. But it is to be observed that no precept is given in Scripture to this effect; we have only the fact recorded that the early disciples were indifferent to property, unselfish, and 'willing to communicate.' And, if history is to be our help in this matter, it seems never to have been a part of Church discipline that goods should be common. It is usually supposed that the renunciation of private property, and the system of community of goods, was, for a time at least, adopted by the whole of the infant Church of Jerusalem. That the system, if ever so adopted, was soon discontinued, is perfectly evident. Those 'who were rich in this world' were exhorted to be 'ready to give, and glad to distribute,' which implies both that there were rich men in the churches, and that they were not required to sell all that they had, and cease to possess property, which would have left them, for the future, nothing to give. And the same may be learned from all that we read about the collections made in Greece for the poor Christians of Judaea, and from many other circumstances in the sacred history.

(2.) "But it has been contended that even in the infancy of the Church of Jerusalem, the community of goods was in reality confined to those engaged in the ministry, including the female catechists, or deaconesses, who were called 'widows.' Just at first, this description may have included all the believers; that is, those who were the first to embrace the Gospel may all have been employed in some department of the ministry. That Ananias and Sapphira thus offered themselves for the ministry is (doubtless) both a correct supposition, and one which will make the whole of the transaction recorded in Acts 5 intelligible" (Eden, *Churchman's Dictionary*, s.v.). This view is taken by Hinds, Early Christianity (pt. 2, ch.

2), who refers to Eusebius (lib. 3, c. 137) for confirmation of the suggestion.

(3.) Mosheim treats the subject largely in his treatise *De Vera Natura Communionis bonorum in eccl. Hierosol.* (*Dies. ad Eccl. Hist. pertin.* vol. i), and seeks to show that the passages in <44244>Acts 2:44; 4:32, imply a communion merely of the use, not the possession of property, and that only for a temporary purpose. But the more likely view is that the infant Church of Jerusalem "went so far in the ardor of their first love as to abolish the external distinction of rich and poor," perhaps as "a prophetic anticipation of the state of things in the perfected kingdom of God." The offering was entirely voluntary, and not the fruit of any command. On the contrary, the N.T. abounds in precepts for the right use of property, implying its separate and proper possession. See Hinds (*l. c.*); Schaff, *Apost. Ch. Hist.* § 114; Killen, *Ancient Church*, p. 52; Neander, *Planting and Training* (Bohn's ed.), 1:253; 2:64.

Commutation OF Penance

in the Roman Catholic Church.

SEE PENANCE.

Compass

(usually בּבִיב; κυκλόω, to *surround*) is used as a noun by the A. V., especially in the phrase "fetch a compass" בּבִיב; <04615>Numbers 34:5; <06558>Joshua 15:3; <10523>2 Samuel 5:23; <12201>2 Kings 3:9; περιέρχομαι, <44283>Acts 28:13), i.e. *go around*.

Compel

in <40541>Matthew 5:41; 27:32; <41521>Mark 15:21, is the rendering of the A. V. for the technical term ἀγγαρεύω, to *impress* into public service, *SEE ANGAREUO*; in <42423>Luke 14:23 (ἀναλκάζω, often to "constrain"), it has a milder sense, i.e. *urge*, rather than the full meaning of *coercion* (as elsewhere).

Compiegne Synods of

(*Conventus Compendienses; Concilium Compendiense*). The synods held in Compiegne began first in the middle of the 8th and ended in the 14th

century. The Diet held by Pepin the Little, A.D. 757, at Compiegne, is counted among the synods, because the privileges of the archbishop Chrodegang were ratified and signed before the assembled bishops (Mansi, *Conciliorum nova et ampl. Collectio*, 7:653 sq., Florent. 1766). Whether the few church laws which were issued under Charlemagne in the year 775 as capitularies, which related partly to church government, partly to ecclesiastical revenues, and partly to monastic discipline, were established at a synod in Compiegne is very doubtful, because in the record of the capitulary there is only mention made of a synodalis conventus (see Harduinus, *Acta Conciliorum*, iii, 2056, Paris, 1714). A synod held there in 823, at which the bishops spoke of the usurpations practiced by laymen in church matters, may indeed be regarded as a diet (Mansi. *l. c.* 14:410, Venet. 1769). The synod held in Compiegne in 833 was of real importance in the development of the Church. In the year 829, a Council at Paris, in a letter to the kings Louis and Lothaire, referring to an explanation which it was said the Emperor Constantine had given, set up the opinion that the bishops were the judges of kings, but that the bishops themselves could not be judged by men. This thesis first found a practical application at the above-mentioned synod in Compiegne, as the sons of Louis desired their father to be sentenced to a public penance by the bishops, and thus declared unfit to reign (Harduinus, *l. c.* iv, 1378, Par. 1714; Mansi. *l. c.* 14:647). The synod of 1095 declared a nobleman, Hugo de Juiaco, under the, ban; that of 1236 established several regulations which aimed at securing ecclesiastical liberties; and that of 1270 declared against the unlawful possession of ecclesiastical benefices, which was regarded as sacrilege (see Harduinus, *l. c.* 7:654, Par. 1714; Mansi. *l. c.* 24:13, Venet. 1782). More important was the synod in 1301, as it made several decisions concerning ecclesiastical jurisdiction (Harduinus, *l. c.*, p. 1247; Mansi. *l. c.* 25:87, Venet. 1782). The last synod in Compiegne issued only some decrees for the maintenance of Church discipline (see Harduinus, *l. c.* p. 1263; Mansi. *l. c.* p. 117). — Herzog, *Real-Encyklopadie, Supplemented*. 1:345.

Competentes

a class of catechumens in the early Church.

SEE CATECHUMENS.

Completorium, Completinum, or Compline

(from Lat. *complere*, to fill up), the last service in the evening; the bed-time service. According to the canonical hours, fixed hours for public prayer were introduced into the Church with the institutions of the monastic life. In the Western Church the practice of praying seven times a day was adopted in the 5th or 6th century, and the completorium was the last or finishing canonical hour. See Procter, *Hist. of the Common Prayer*, p. 11; Freeman, *Principles of Divine Service*, p. 83. *SEE CANONICAL HOURS*; *SEE BREVIARY*.

Complutensian Polyglot

SEE POLYGLOTS.

Compostella

Picture for Compostella

MILITARY ORDER OF ST. JAMES OF. "St. James the Elder was adopted as the patron saint of Spain after the victory of Clavijo, and his relics were preserved at Compostella. The marvels supposed to be performed by these relics drew vast numbers of pilgrims, for whose support hospitals were established by the canons of St. Eloi. The vicinity of the Moors having rendered the roads unsafe, thirteen noblemen united for the protection of the pilgrims, and with the canons resolved to found an order of the same kind as that of the Hospitallers or Templars. The pope granted his assent in a bull, dated 5th July, 1175, accompanied with the statutes of the order. Whatever conquests were made from the infidel were declared the property of the order, and a council of thirteen knights was vested with authority to elect and depose a grand master. The knights made vows of poverty, obedience, and celibacy, and professed their belief in the immaculate conception. To protect Christians and convert infidels they vowed to be the only object in their wars with the Saracens. In most of the great battles between Christian and Moor the red cress of the order was conspicuous. The conquests of the order itself, combined with the grateful munificence of the nation, speedily increased its wealth and power beyond those of any of the other orders of knighthood. In addition to the three large commanderies of Leon, Castile, and Montalvan, it possessed nearly 200 minor commanderies, comprising, it is said, more than 200 priories, with many fiefs, cloisters, hospitals, castles, boroughs, two towns, and 178

villages, exclusive of its possessions in Portugal. This enormous wealth and power of the order excited the jealousy of the crown, in which, in 1522, the grand mastership was permanently vested by the pope. Having thus become merely honorary and dependent on the crown, the order rapidly decreased in importance."

Compostella Santiago de,

a town in Spain, and one of the three most famous places of pilgrimage in the Church of Rome, the two others being Rome and Jerusalem. The place was formerly called *ad Sanctum Jacobum Apostolum* or *Giacomo Postolo*, whence by abbreviation Compostella was formed. According to a Spanish tradition, the apostle James the Elder came to the Pyrenaean peninsula, and is buried at Compostella. The legend of the apostle having preached in Spain is first mentioned in the ninth century, and has generally been repudiated by the Roman Catholic writers, although it was defended by the Bollandists (*Acta Sanct*. tom. vi, *Julii*, *Appendix; and tom. i, Aprilis*, *Diatribe*), and by the Protestant J. A. Fabricius (*Salutaris Lux Evangeli*, c. 16, § 2). The claim of Compostella to the body of the apostle has found more advocates among the Roman Catholic writers, although the church of St. Saturnine at Toulouse prefers the same claim. The rival claims have been compromised by assuming that each church had one half, as a division of famous relics, it is alleged, frequently occurred in the Middle Ages. Compostella was made a bishopric in the beginning of the 9th century, and in 1120 an archbishopric. — *Wetzer u. Welte, Kirchen-Lex.* 2:736.

Comprehension

in English history, "the scheme first proposed by Sir Orlando Bridgman in 1688 for relaxing the terms of conformity to the Established Church of England, and admitting Protestant dissenters into its communion. In 1674, Tillotson and Stillingfleet renewed the attempt, and the terms were settled to the satisfaction of the nonconformists; but, the bishops unanimously refusing their consent, the project fell to the ground. Immediately after the Revolution, the scheme was renewed at the instance of William III, but after two attempts the design of union was abandoned, and the Act of Toleration passed in its stead." See Macaulay, *History of England*, iii, 63,' 380; art. ENGLAND, CHURCH OF; Eden, *Churchman's Dictionary*, s.v.

Compton Henry,

bishop of London, son of the second Earl of Northampton, was born at Compton in 1632, and was educated at Queen's College, Oxford, which he left in 1652. After some years spent in travel on the Continent, he returned to England on the restoration of Charles II. For a short time he was a cornet in the army; then went to Cambridge, passed M.A., took orders, and was made canon of Christ Church, Oxford, in 1666. After various preferments, he was made bishop of Oxford in 1674, and was translated to the see of London in 1675 or 1676. He became tutor to the princesses Mary and Anne, and imbued them with his own earnestly Protestant sentiments. On the accession of James II he was dismissed from the council and from his deanery of the Royal Chapel on account of his vigorous opposition to popery. In 1686 he was tried before the lords commissioners (the notorious Jeffries presiding) on a charge of disobedience to the king's mandate (for the suspension of Dr. Sharp), and was suspended from his episcopal functions. He was restored in 1688, and on the accession of William he recovered all the offices from which he had been expelled. Bishop Compton sought to conciliate Dissenters, and to find means of reuniting them to the Church of England. His so-called "*ultra-Protestantism*" made him unpopular with High-churchmen. He died July 7, 1713. He published *A Treatise of the Holy Communion* (Tondon, 1677); a number of episcopal letters and charges, etc.

Comstock, Grover S.,

a Baptist missionary, was born at Ulysses, N.Y., March 24, 1809. He graduated at Hamilton College in 1827, studied law, afterwards, and was admitted to the bar in 1880. Under the ministry of the Rev. C. G. Finney he was converted, and then studied theology at the Madison University. Deciding to devote his life to missions, he entered the service of the Baptist Foreign Missionary Board, and sailed from Boston for Burmah on July 2, 1834. He remained some time at Amherst and Maulmain studying the language, and then chose Arracan for his field of labor. In 1837 he organized a native church at Kyouk Phyou; and he remained, in spite of a deadly climate, to which his wife and two children fell victims in 1843, unremitting in labor until the illness which ended in his death, April 25, 1844. — *American Missionary Memorial*, p. 155.

Comte Auguste,

founder of the so-called Positivism, was born at Montpellier Jan. 12,1798, and died at Paris Sept. 5, 1857. He was the propounder of an elaborate system of philosophy, to which he gave the name of Positive, to denote its scientific and practical character, and to distinguish it from all schemes of metaphysical speculation.

He sprung from a family eminently Roman Catholic in religion and Royalist in politics, and these influences affected the development of his theories, notwithstanding the fever of innovation which always possessed him. He was educated in Paris at the Polytechnic school, in which he became a subordinate instructor in 1832. His first dreams of philosophic reform are ascribed by him to his fourteenth year, perhaps in rivalry of the precocity attributed to Bacon. In 1816 he contemplated emigration to the United States, and the transplanting of his nascent philosophical career to America. In August, 1817, he became acquainted with the notorious St. Simon — half seer; half charlatan — and was so strongly impressed with: his visionary raptures as to be considered his most hopeful disciple, and the successor upon whom that strange sage desired his mantle to fall, though recognizing Comte's fatal want of religious susceptibility. This connection was always acknowledged by Comte, though mentioned in later years with increasing bitterness and disgust. He disclaimed all obligations to St. Simon, and fumed and fretted whenever the traces of St. Simonism were recognized in his own philosophy. In April, 1826, he opened a course of gratuitous prelections on the new scheme, which had been reduced to a somewhat determinate form by several essays previously published. The course was interrupted by brain fever, terminating in insanity. In consequence of this attack, which he designates une arise cerebrale, he was for some time confined in a lunatic asylum.

In 1829 he commenced the immense structure of his Positive Philosophy. It was completed in six heavy volumes, containing nearly 5000 pages. The first volume appeared in 1830, its 750 pages having been composed in the space of three months. M. Comte rarely revised, and never recopied his manuscript. As it came from his brain it passed to the press, and from the press to the public. The Revolution of July delayed the prosecution of his labors for five years, but with the return of more tranquil times he resumed them, and achieved the sixth and last volume in 1842. This is the work on which M. Comte's reputation as a philosopher almost exclusively rests. It

is the only one of his works accepted by the majority of his disciples, or regarded by those who follow his guidance without attaching themselves to his banner. It contains the body and substance of Positivism, and was justly rebaptized *Systeime de Philosophie Positive*. In his later philosophical development Comte endeavored to infuse the vital breath of a moral and religious spirit into the cadaverous Pyrrhonism of his earlier views. But this attempt, which was flagrantly unsuccessful, offended alike his sect and his distant admirers, who hailed and honored his labors rather for their systematic infidelity than for their recognized truth.

On the completion of his scheme of philosophy Comte proceeded to apply its principles to the rectification of society. It was nine years: however, before the first volume of his *Systeme de Politique Positive* appeared. They were years of annoyance, anguish, misfortune, and strange adventure. He had supported himself and his family by the scanty fruits of his vocation as a public and a private teacher of mathematics. To this vocation we are indebted for his *Treatise of Analytical Geometry*, published in 1843. He relieved the dull routine of duty by lectures to the Parisian community on topics connected with science, or with the promulgation of his philosophy. One of these courses is perpetuated in his *Philosophical Treatise on Popular Astronomy* (1845). His heretical opinions, and, still more, his arrogant and irritable disposition, provoked opposition, and excited ill-will among his colleagues. His position in the Polytechnic School was rendered precarious, and he was finally deprived of it. At a later period his public lectures were for a short time closed by the interference of the government. This is the long personal persecution of which he complains with habitual acrimony in his later works. He was married, but had been separated from his wife. While his heart was wrung and parched by many sorrows, a new fascination consoled him, and opened unsuspected fountains in a dry and thirsty soil. In 1845 Comte became violently attached to an accomplished lady, Madame Clotilde de Vaux, who was separated from her husband, as he was from his wife. Their association was purely Platonic, and terminated in a year by the death of the siren on April 5, 1846. The Positive Politics is animated throughout by her inspiration, and is dedicated to her, with a commemoration of her virtues, in language which would sound extravagant in Dante or Petrarch. Brief as the intimacy had been, it revolutionized Comte’s whole nature and the entire spirit of his speculations.

This strange transmutation of doctrine exhibited itself in the *Discourse on the general Character of Positivism*, which belonged to the midsummer of

1848, and was employed as an introduction to the *System of Positive Politics*. The rigidity and sterility of the cold and heartless rationalism of the Positive Philosophy was evidently unsuited to act upon society and to regenerate it; and the application of the Positive doctrine to practical ends almost necessitated the admission of the moral element, which had been previously disregarded. Men are not controlled by their reason; they are stimulated by their imagination, and impelled by their affections. To discipline the heart, an authority, and not arguments, is required. But no practical morals are possible, as an obligatory rule of action, which do not result from the decrees of a supreme will. Thus the first step towards a systematic plan of political authority, or of sociological interpretation, must be the recognition of a Divine Legislator and the acceptation of an incontestable creed. M. Comte was thus driven, by the extension of his theories to their practical applications, to introduce ethics into the circle of the sciences, to institute a divinity, to recognize or to invent a religion. His perception of the need was quickened, if his susceptibilities were not awakened, by the resuscitation of his natural affections, and the glow of sentiment was kindled by his preposterous passion. The long interval which separated the completion of the *Philosophie Positive* from the commencement of the *Poltique Positive* may have been, in reality, due less to the personal persecution of which he complains, and to the revolutionary anarchy of 1848, than to the time and thought requisite to systematize his new views, and to produce some appearance of harmony between the philosophic doctrine and its efflorescence in a theocratic dream. The whole plan was, however, arranged in his own mind when he entered upon the composition of his sociological treatise. Nothing is more admirable thaw the rapidity and completeness, the methodical regularity, and the preordained precision with which each successive year brought forward at the appointed time a new volume of the *Politique Positive*, till the whole was accomplished. Each volume appeared in its season, like the blossoms of the returning summer. The first was published in July, 1851; the second in May, 1852; the third in August, 1853; and the fourth in August, 1854. The second volume of the *Positive Politics* was preceded in the same month by the publication of the *Calender of Positivism* — that singular and elaborate rebaptism of the months of the year and the days of the week which substitutes the notabilities of human progress for the Sundays and saints' days of the Catholic Church, and the months of imperial Rome. In the October of the same year was published *the Catechism of Positivism*, designed to diffuse a knowledge of the new philosophy and the new creed

among the masses of the people. At the close of the *Politique Positive* M. Comte marks out the ulterior projects which he designed to achieve before advancing years should demand repose. Seven vears were to be devoted to the enlargement and rectification of his theory; and then, on the attainment of his grand climacteric, he would sing his *Dimittas*. *A System of Positive Logic, or the Philosophy of Mathematics*, was promised for 1856; *A System of Positive Morals*, or *Treatise on Universal Education*, for 1859; and *A System of Positive Industry*, or *Treatise on the Action of Humanity on its terrestrial Abode*, for 1861. The first volume of the first of these works was published, according to announcement, in 1856, but before the second was ready Comte died, in 1857. Various pamphlets had been issued by M. Comte at different periods of his career, in order to give immediate consistency to his views on special points, or to popularize his doctrine. These it is needless to specify. More interesting in themselves, as more important for an appreciation of the man, are the annual circulars issued to those who participated in the subscription for his support.

The System of Positivism, in accordance with what has already been observed, requires to be considered under two distinct, though connected aspects — the scientific theory as originally expounded in M. Comte's earlier work, and the practical application of that theory as presented in his latest complete treatise.

(1.) The Positive Philosophy. — This is the development and coordination of all the materialistic tendencies of science in the age of the Encyclopaedia and the Revolution. It is not itself materialistic, because it proceeds beyond materialism in the same direction, and is attenuated into a pure sensuous phenomenalism. It contemplates merely "the shows of things," and it coordinates them according to their concomitances and sequences, recognizing no actual bond of connection between them, nor any power on which they depend. The function of philosophy is simply to introduce order and coherence into observed phenomena. Positivism is, accordingly, a habit or intellectual temperament rather than a philosophy, a method rather than a doctrine. Hence the most characteristic peculiarity of this work, as of the whole intellectual evolution of its author, is his arrangement of the sciences, with the principles on which that arrangement proceeds. The treatise becomes, in consequence, an orderly exposition of the sciences and of their reciprocal dependencies, embracing the statement of the results and processes of science, with an indication of deficiencies, excrescences, and aberrations in their present constitution. It is more profound in its

execution than in its conception — in its details than in its general spirit. The solitary principle on which the whole elaboration of Positivism reposes is the doctrine of the Three States. To this may be referred Comte's classification of the sciences — his rule for their evolution, composition, and rank — his exposition of their significance and disciplinary value — his history of society, and his theory of humanity. This cardinal position is, that the whole human family, as well as each individual mind, passes through three successive and incompatible conditions: 1. *The Theological State*, which ascribes all phenomena to divine agency; 2. *The Metaphysical State*, which questions the divine action, and attributes all changes to influences, entities, occult causes, laws of nature, etc.; and, 3. *The Positive State*, which accepts the phenomena without reference to their origination, and arranges them under general laws, which merely state "the invariable relations of succession and resemblance." This principle of the Three States has been assailed by both admirers and opponents; but it is rather Imperfect and misapplied than false. The succession of these states is explained by the confusion and multiplicity of apparently disconnected facts, which perplex the untutored mind, and suggest the arbitrary will of superior existences. As order reveals itself in the midst of disorder, an arbitrary government of the universe is repudiated, and law maintained by the operation of natural forces is more or less extensively accepted as the solution of the enigmas of creation. Thus metaphysics is the crucible in which theology and faith are gradually evaporated. As the regularity of phenomena is more generally apprehended, the jurisdiction of metaphysics is by degrees restricted, and is finally denied. No knowledge is admitted which does not promise to become science, no science which is not phenomenal only, no phenomena which suggest any other principle than uniform harmony and consecution of facts. In the process of speculative disentanglement by which the Positive habit is attained, those subjects are naturally the first to assume a scientific form:which are characterized by the greatest simplicity in them. selves, and are, according to the Baconian expression, "least immersed in matter." Hence the relations of number and space are the earliest to exhibit an orderly coherence; and mathematics is not merely the disciplinary introduction to the sciences, but the eldest — by birth. Increasing complexity and specialty characterize the sciences as they successively detach themselves from the general mass of unsystematized knowledge. The principle on which the classification of the sciences proceeds is thus from greater to less simplicity, from the more general to the more special, from the more abstract to the more concrete. By the application of this rule

M. Comte organizes the whole hierarchy of the sciences. Six only are recognized in the *Politique Positive*:

I. Mathematics;
II. Astronomy;
III. Natural Philosophy, or Physics;
IV. Chemistry;
V. Biology;
VI. Sociology; to which was afterwards added,
VII. Morals.

Having thus arranged the several sciences, M. Comte proceeds to the exhibition of their functions, their constitution, their conquests, and their condition. He thus furnishes an abstract of all scientific knowledge. This immense elaboration culminates in his creation of the new science of sociology. That science is roughly sketched rather than definitely constituted in the *Philosophie Positive*. It is divided into two parts, Statics and Dynamics. Social Statics treats of the formal conditions of the existence of societies; social Dynamics of society in its vital state of incessant transformation. Having ascertained ail that had been accomplished, and all that legitimately sought accomplishment, Comte considered that a solid foundation had been laid for a scientific theory of political action adequate to the regeneration of society.

(2.) *Positive Politics*. — It has been shown how M. Comte was reduced to the necessity of discovering or imagining a God, and of reconstructing a theology, a ceremonial, and a religious organization. The new divinity — *le Nouveau Etre Supreme* — is humanity. The units of the living race are separately united by death to this great spirit, and become atomic constituents of the immortal essence. It is a complete deification of man, a complete resolution of divinity into humanity. It is a strange counterpart to Pantheism which is produced in this scheme of thorough-going Panhumanism. The new divinity was to be adored, to be approached with prayer, to be honored with an appropriate ceremonial, worshipped with due rites, and served by a numerous army of priests. Of this priesthood M. Comte was to be the living head. Science and religion were at length reconciled by their union, and identification; the priest was the scientific instructor; the priesthood consisted of the consecrated devotees of science; the high-priest was the supreme director of the intellectual, moral,

industrial, and social development of society. In the midst of these wild imaginations, it is startling to find a sedate and sober estimation of the whole order of society and of each of its separate parts. The sanctity of the family, the consecration of marriage and its indissolubility, the domestic culture of infancy, the relation and subordination of the sexes, the general inviolability of property, the duties of capital and industry, the distribution and retribution of service are all maintained in a manner utterly antagonistic to the current doctrines of communism and agrarianism. The most original and instructive part of this treatise is to be found in the consideration of the reciprocal influences of external nature upon man, and of man upon external nature. By this inquiry, brief as it is, the first permanent foundation is laid for a scientific exposition of the transformation of societies.

From the rapidity with which Comte's works were composed, from the absence of all revision, from general inattention to the arts of composition and disposition, his treatises are swelled and deformed by continual repetitions and by want of perspicuous arrangement. 'They are vast and rambling essays rather than systematic expositions of philosophic doctrine. The blemishes which he was careless of avoiding have now ceased to be important. The impulse communicated by Comte remains, but few will ever again dream of reading the ten thick volumes in which his whole vast project was originally set forth. The direct effect of his career has been very slight, its indirect effect very great. He has linked his name with no enlargement of science or philosophy except in sociology — with no practical reform in society. His principles have found of late numerous followers in England, and a small number of them adopt "the religion of humanity" as well as the Positive philosophy. One of the chief of these is Mr. Thomas Congreve, who has taken steps (1867) to found a church, with a building and regular services. Mr. Congreve has announced that a church will shortly be built, and regular services instituted, for promoting the new creed which is to regenerate humanity.

Literature. — All Comte's important works have been enumerated in this notice. For his biography reference may be made to the autobiographical statements scattered through his prefaces, circulars, etc.; to Robinet, *Notice sur l' Euuvre et sur la Vie d' Auguste Comte* (Paris, 1860), and to Littre, Auguste *Comte et la Philosophie Positive* (Paris, 1863). For a fuller account of his philosophy than has been given here, recourse may be had to the last-named work; to *Littre, Conservation, Revolution, et Positivisme* (Paris, 1852)'; Lewes, Comae's *Philosophy of the Sciences* (Lond. 1853);

Harriet Martineau, *The Positive Philosophy of Auguste Comte* (Lond. 1853); 2 vols. 8vo); Lewes, *History of Philosophy* (3d ed. 1867, Lond. 2 vols. 8vo); Celestin de Bligniires, *Exposition Abregee de la Philosophie et de la Religion Positives* (Paris, 1857); Herbert Spencer, *The Classification of the Sciences, etc*. (New York, 1864); J. S. Mill, Comte's *Philosophy* (Lond. 1866); also to Sir David Brewster's notice or the first two volumes of the *Positive Philosophy* in the *Edinburgh Review*, July, 1838, and to the *Essays on Comte and his Philosophy* in the *Methodist Quarterly Review*, New York, January, 1852; April, 1852; July, 1853; October, 1853; and July, 1854; and in the North 'British *Review*, May, 1854. *SEE POSITIVISM*.

Conani'ah

(*Heb.* in the text *Kaonanya'hu*, Whyn]/K; i.e. *Konanya'hu*, Whyn]/K, but as read in the Masoretic margin, *Kananya'hu*, Whyn]K; settled by Jehovah; Sept. Χωνενίας v. r. Χωχενίας, Vulg. *Chonenias*), the name of two chief Levites.

1. A person appointed (with his brother Shimei) as "ruler" (dygn;) by Hezekiah, to superintend the disposal of the sacred utensils of the Temple (<143112>2 Chronicles 31:12, 13, where the Auth. Vers. Anglicizes the name "Cononiah"). B.C. 726.

2. A person who, with several of his kindred, made large offerings for the Paschal sacrifices as renewed by Josiah (<143509>2 Chronicles 35:9). B.C. 628.

Conception of Christ

(1.) This was supernatural, by the agency of the Holy Spirit (<420135>Luke 1:35; <400120>Matthew 1:20).

(2.) It was without the communication of original depravity (<580726>Hebrews 7:26; 4:15, etc.). For some of the literature of the subject, see Volbeding, *Index Dissert*. p. 9; Meyer, *Kommentar*, 1:54 sq. *SEE CHRIST, PERSON OF*.

Conception of the Virgin Mary.

1. The Immaculate Conception of the Virgin Mary, a doctrine of the Church of Rome. *SEE IMMACULATE CONCEPTION*.

2. *Monastic Institutions of the Conception of Mary.*

(1.) *Order of Knights of the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin*. In 1617 three Italian noblemen of the family De Petrignan announced their intention to establish a military order under the above name, whose object was to be to fight against all infidels and heretics. The plan was not executed, but in 1618 an order under the same name was established in Vienna. According to some writers the first impulse came from one of the brothers De Petrignan; but the bull by which pope Urban VIII, in 1623, confirmed the order, mentions only Ferdinand, duke of Mantua, Charles, duke of Nevers, and Adolphus, count of Athlan, as founders. The order did not exist long. — Helyot, *Dict. des Ordres Relig*. 1:1077 sq.

(2.) *Nuns of the Immaculate Conception of Mary*, also called Conceptionists. An order under this name was in 1484 founded by Beatrix de Sylva at Toledo, in Spain. It was sanctioned in 1489 by pope Innocent VIII. Cardinal Ximenes united this order with that of the Clarisses, the rule of which they adopted with some modifications. Pope Julius II, in 1511, gave to the Conceptionists a special rule, but they continued to be a part of the order of the Clarisses.

(3.) *Congregation of the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin* was the name of congregations of lay-women which were established in connection with the convents of the congregation of Notre Dame, founded by Peter Fourier (q. v,.).

Concha

(Gr. κόγχη, a shell), the plain round or polygonal semi-dome that covers the apsis (q.v.) of a church. *SEE CHURCH EDIFICES*.

Concilia

SEE COUNCILS.

Conciliabule

a term applied by Roman writers to synods and councils held by “heretics and schismatics.”

Concision

(κατατομή, *a cutting down*, i.e. entire mutilation of the parts), a contemptuous term used by Paul in Philippians 3:2, to denote the zealots for circumcision. In classical writers the Greek word denotes a groove or channel, etc. (see Liddell and Scott, s.v.), but the apostle parodies the term previously employed, for the purpose of indicating more pointedly the real character of the sectaries in question; instead of saying "beware of the *circumcision*" (περιτομήν), namely, the party who pressed the necessity of still observing that ordinance, he says "beware of the concision" (κατατομήν); as much as to say they no longer deserve the old and venerable name; what they stickle for is a mere concision, a flesh-cutting. He then goes on to state the reason, "for we are the circumcision "the reality has now passed over into us, who believe in Christ and are renewed in the spirit of our minds. (See Sommel, *Obss. Philol.* on this passage, Lond. 1793.) Similarly in Galatians 5:12, he says even more pointedly, "I would they [the same class of Judaizing teachers] were even *cut off*" (ἀποκόψονται, *would for themselves cut off* wholly the organ circumcised, and not be content with a mere scarification of it), i.e. make themselves outright eunuchs (comp. the allusions to their impurity, ver. 13, 19. 24). So Chrysostom and Jerome explain (περικοπτέσθωσιν, *abscindantur*). *SEE CIRCUMCISION*.

Conclave

(Lat. *con, with*, and *clavis, a key*, because from their strict seclusion its inmates as it were *unam habent clavem communens*) is applied

(1.) to the apartments in which the cardinals of the Roman Catholic Church meet to elect a new pope; and

(2.) to the assembly itself convened for this object. The place of assembling was frequently changed until 1455, from which date to 1823 the conclave was held in the Vatican palace; since 1823 the Quirinal palace has been used for this purpose. When necessary, however, another place, even if without the city of Rome, may be designated. Little chambers, technically called cells, are prepared for the separate accommodation of each cardinal and his attendants, which are assigned by lot, and those falling to the occupancy of cardinals created by the late pope are draped with some purple material as a badge of mourning, while green is used for the others. The coat of arms of each cardinal is affixed to his cell. When a pope dies,

ten days are allowed, for the obsequies, for the arrival of absent cardinals, and for the preparations above mentioned for the conclave, together with the selection of persons styled conclavists, who are to enter the conclave as servants of the cardinals (two to each, or, if the cardinal be very old, sickly, or of princely birth, three), masters of ceremonies, confessors, clerks, physicians, carpenters, masons, barbers, and other servants. The prescribed time having elapsed, the cardinals and conclavists attend the mass of the Holy Ghost, formerly in St. Peter's, lately in St. Sylvester's church. The papal ordinances governing the conclaves are read, to the strict observance of which all who are to enter the conclave are sworn. Then the cardinals, with their conclavists, proceed solemnly to the apartments prepared, and repair severally to their cells, where they receive visits until evening from persons not of their number. At the third signal from the bell, about three hours after sunset, all not belonging to the conclave are excluded, and all the entrances except one are walled up, the windows also, except so much as may be necessary for air and light. The excepted entrance is closed by double locks and strictly guarded, admission being allowed to none except the absent cardinals. No egress is allowed except by permission of the conclave itself in case of grave illness. The theory is that all communication between those within and persons without in regard to the pending election must be prevented; but these precautions have not always secured their end. In spite of the law, there is frequent correspondence between the cardinals within and their political friends without. The decree of Gregory X prescribed that, if a choice was not made by the cardinals within three days, for the next five days only one dish at noon and evening should be allowed to each, and after that time only bread, wine, and water; but this rigid regimen was modified somewhat by Clement VI (1351). The execution of these regulations is entrusted externally to the civil authorities of the place where the conclave is held, and internally to the officers appointed by the conclave.'

Prior to the latter half of the 11th century, the choice of the bishop of Rome was the joint prerogative of the clergy and people, exercised, we may suppose, at first directly, though subsequently the popular participation in the election appears to have been through some representative body; while the supreme secular power asserted its authority by requiring that the election should receive its sanction, the origin, doubtless, of the right exercised by certain Catholic governments (France, Spain, and Austria), and claimed by Italy (Naples) and Portugal, of each

excluding from the papal throne some particular cardinal, a right, however, to be exercised before an election, and limited to one veto at each conclave. By a decree of Pope Nicholas II (*In nosmine Domini*), 1059, the election of pontiff was given to the cardinal bishops, the other cardinals, and the clergy, the people merely approving it. By a further decree of Alexander III (1179), the choice was vested exclusively in the college of cardinals, with the proviso that the concurrence of two thirds of the cardinals present should constitute a legal election, the assent of clergy and people being no longer required. The Council of Lyons (1274), under the auspices of Gregory X, promulgated a constitution minutely prescribing the forms to be observed in regard to such elections, which were to be made in conclavi clauso, so as to shut out secular influence. These three instruments furnish the organic laws and regulations, both of franchise and ceremonials, which, without fundamental change, are still in force in papal elections.

It is laid down as a settled principle that no pope can appoint his successor, and that every cardinal, however recently made such, provided he has taken deacon's orders, may participate in a conclave, though under papal censure, suspension, interdict, or excommunication.

According to the bulls of Gregory XV (*AEterni Patris Filius and Decet Romanum Pontiifcem*), confirmed by that of Urban VIII (*ad Romani Pontjicis providenz tiam*), the choice must be made in one of three ways, viz., by inspiration, compromise, or ballot. Election by inspiration is when all the electors spontaneously (*per quasi inspirationem*), without any previous concert, proclaim the same person for the office. Examples of such elections are given by early ecclesiastical writers, as that of Fabianus (Euseb. *Hist. Eccles.* 6:29), but in modern times none such has occurred. Election by compromise is when, in default, of agreement themselves, the cardinals delegate to a select number of their body, with or without conditions, authority to choose a pope, as was the case in the electtion of Clement V. The ordinary way, however, is by ballot. In this method, after the usual morning mass, each cardinal (when the conclave is assembled in the balloting-room or chapel), invoking Christ as witness to the purity of his intentions in the vote, deposits in the chalice on the altar a square paper, folded at opposite corners so as to conceal the voter's name and mot. to (which, once selected, must be adhered to), while the name of the person voted for is written on the open central space. These ballots are then examined in turn by three cardinals, appointed scrutatores, and the

numbers taken, which must agree with that of the cardinals present, all being required to vote, and are filed to await the result. If any one has received just two thirds, the folded ends are opened to see that he has not voted for himself, which is not allowable. If no one has attained the required majority, the conclave proceeds in the afternoon session, after the hymn Veni Creator Spiritus, to try the process called *acceding* (*accessus*), in which each cardinal may give a supplementary vote, in the words *accedo domino cardinali*, to any one who received votes in the first process from others than the accedent; those declining to change the, morning's choice write *nemini*. If the supplementary votes for any, added to the morning's votes for the same, do not make up the two thirds 'majority, the papers are burned, and the same process of balloting is repeated the next day. When the requisite majority is given, the papers are examined to see that no cardinal has voted twice for the same person, and that the mottoes of the evening and morning vote tally; then the recipient of the highest vote equaling or exceeding two thirds is declared duly elected. On his acceptance the work of the conclave strictly ends, for the newly elected is deemed to be legally pope, with all his prerogatives and powers; he is invested with the pontifical robes, receives the homage of the cardinals, adopts his official name, and is proclaimed from, a reopened balcony window to the people by the cardinal dean, in the words *Annuntio vobis gaudium magnum. Papam habemus Eminentissimum ac Reverendissimum — , qui sibi imposuit nomen — ,* and the shouts of the people are recorded as their assent, still, in theory, necessary to an election. The other ceremonies belonging to the inauguration follow in due order. — Ferraris, *Bibliotheca Canonica*, etc., art. Papa; Herzog, *Real-Encyklopadie*, art. Papstwahl; Ranke, *History of the Papacy* (see Index); *North British Review*, Dec. 1866, art. *Conclaves*; Petruccello della Gattina, BISTOIRE DIPLOMATIQUE DES CONCLAVES (Paris, 1865, 2 vols. 8vo); Cartwright, *Papal Conclave* (Lond. 1867). *SEE CARDINALS*; *SEE POPE*.

Concomitant

(1.) A term used by Roman theologians to denote the grace of God *accompanying* an action, as distinguished from *prevenient* grace, which (against the Pelagians) is necessary to excite to good desires and actions (Bergier).

(2.) Concomitance, in the Roman doctrine of the Lord's Supper (q. v), means the "accompanying of the body of Christ by the blood, and of the

blood by the body," in the Eucharist. Aquinas introduced the term (*concomitantia*). The withholding of the cup from the laity is justified by this Romanist doctrine of concomitance on the ground that as Christ is present entirely in each of the elements, he is received fully in either by the communicant. Of course this theory goes along with transubstantiation. — Burnet, *On the Articles*, art. 31; Smith's Hagenbach, *History of Doctrines*, § 195. *SEE LORDS SUPPER*.

Concord, Formula of

(FORMULA CONCORDIAE), the seventh and last symbolical book of the Lutheran Church, first publicly adopted in 1580. It was framed in consequence of the long disputes between the stricter Lutherans and the milder Philippists and the Crypto-Calvinists in Germanyo The principal theologians and evangelists considered it their duty to unite the Church as much as possible by clearly defining its fundamental doctrines in accordance with the principles of the Augsburg Confession of 1530. In 1574, duke Julius of Brunswick and the elector Augustus of Saxony commissioned professor Jacob Andrei (q.v.), of Tubingen, to frame a suitable formula. His work underwent divers alterations in the hands of Chemnitz and Chytraeus, and was finally received as the confession of Swabia and Saxony. Subsequently, by the influence of prince George Ernest of Henneberg, a second formula of concord was framed by Osiander and Bidenbach, theologians of Wurtemberg, and revised and completed by a body of theologians in the convent of Maulbronn in January, 1576 (known as the formula of Maulbronn). Andrei considered this latter as too short, the former as too diffuse, and undertook to base a third on these two. For this purpose the elector, in May, 1576, called a meeting of theologians at Torgau. Among the eighteen who answered to the call were Andrea, Chemnitz, Chytrseus, Selneccer, Cornerus, Musculus, Crell, and Morlin. Between them, and based on the two preceding formulas and the Augsburg Confession, they framed the *Book of Torgau* (published by Semler, Halle, 1760), which was submitted to the elector and his council on the 7th of June, and by him sent to the other evangelical princes and states to be approved or altered according to their suggestions. After many additions had been made to it, the elector required Chemnitz, Andrea, and Selneccer to remodel it. This was done in March, 1577, in the convent of Bergen, near Magdeburg. In order to embody the different additions made to the primitive production (*Solida declaratio*), they made a small supplement (*Epitome*). At a second session in April they adopted a new

redaction; and in a third, in May, where they were assisted by Musculus, Cornerus, and Chytraeus, they perfected the final version, which was then handed to the elector. The latter named it *Formula Concordiae*, and with the elector of Brandenburg called on the theologians of their states to sign it. It was then joined with the other received symbols in a *Corpus doctrinoe*, and this *Book of Concord* was officially recognized at Dresden, June 25th, 1580, as the fundamental symbol of the Lutheran Church.

It is divided into two parts:

1. The *Epitome*, or summary, consisting of eleven articles, each headed by the enunciation of some controverted point of doctrine (*status controversiae*), which is then followed by the orthodox doctrine (*pars affirmativa*), and finally by the condemnation of the opposite view (*pars negativa*).

2. The Solida declaratio, or fundamental exposition, which treats of the same articles in connection with each other.

The eleven articles, taken in the order of the Augsbnrg Confession, are on,

1. Original Sin (human nature by original sin has become utterly depraved [*in universum corrupta*]);

2. Free-will;

3. Justification by Faith;

4. Good Works;

5. The Law and the Gospel;

6. The third Use of the Law;

7. The Lord’s Supper (the body and blood of Christ is really and substantially [*vere et substantialiter*] present: there is a sacramental union between bread and wine and the body and blood of Christ, and consequently and oral [*ore*] reception of the body and blood of Christ, in a supranatural and heavenly manner, so that also the unworthy and the unbelievers receive the real body and blood of Christ, though to their condemnation);

8. The Person of Christ;

9. The Descent of Christ into Hell;

10. The Customs of the Church;

11 Predestination and Election (the foreknowledge of God [*praescientia*] relates to all men, the predestination only to the good).

To these is joined an appendix concerning heresies and sectaries (i.e. all who had not accepted the Augsburg Confession). The appended testimony of the witnesses of the Holy Scriptures, and of the pure doctrines of the original Church, on the person and work of Christ (*Communicatio idiomatum*), by Andrea and Chemnitz, in eight articles, is not considered as part of the creed.

As to Anthropology, the Formula Concordiae carries out the doctrines of the Augsburg Confession with regard to original sin to their logical results, and after distinctly rejecting the view of Flacius, which made original sin to be the substance of the human soul's agency, and not the soul's essence, the Formula Concordiae affirms that "Christians ought not only to acknowledge and define actual faults and transgressions of the commands of God to be sins, but they ought also to regard that hereditary disease (*morbus*), by which the whole nature of man is corrupted, as a specially dreadful sin, and, indeed, as the first principle and source of all other sins, from which all other transgressions spring as from their root." The first position in the statement of the doctrine of original sin, according to the Formula Concordime. is that "this hereditary evil is guilt (culpa) or crime (reatus); whence it results that all men, on account of the disobedience of Adam and Eve, are odious in the sight of God, and are by nature the children of wrath, as the apostle testifies" (Hase, *Libri Symbolici*, p. 639, 640; Shedd, 2:155).

The Formula "is the only Lutheran symbol in which the distinction between the active and passive righteousness of Christ appears." Its statement is as follows: "That righteousness which is imputed to faith, or to the believer, of mere grace, is the *obedience*, suffering, and resurrection of Christ, by which he satisfied the law for us and expiated our sins. For since Christ was not only man, but truly God and man in one undivided person, he was no more subject to the law than he was to suffering and death [i.e. if his Person merely be taken into account, without any reference to his vicarious relations], because he was the divine and eternal Lord of the law. Hence not only that obedience to God his Father which he exhibited in his passion

and death, but *also that obedience which he exhibited in voluntarily subjecting himself to the law, and fulfilling it for our sakes*, is imputed to us for righteousness, so that God, on account of the total obedience which Christ accomplished (*praestitit*) for our sake before his heavenly Father, both in acting and in suffering, in life and in death, may remit our sins to us, regard us as holy and righteous, and give us eternal felicity" (Hase, *Libri Symbolici*, p. 68; Shedd, *Hist. of Doctrines*, 2:342). As to the work of regeneration, it teaches that "before man is illuminated, converted, regenerated, and drawn by the Holy Spirit, he can no more operate, cooperate, or even make a beginning towards his conversion or regeneration, with his own natural powers, than can a stone, a tree, or a piece of clay" (Hase, *Libri Symbolici*, p. 622; Shedd, 2:368). For a full discussion of the Christology of the Formula, see Dorner, *History of the Doctrine of the Person of Christ*, div. 2, vol. 2:209 sq.

The *Formula* was originally framed in German; the Latin translation by Osiander was adopted by Selneccer in his first Latin edition of the Book of Concord; but the latter afterwards made another translation of it, which, after being revised in the convent of Quedlinburg in 1583, was inserted in the new edition of the Book of Concord in 1584. The signatures of the princes who endorsed it were placed after the preface, which was prepared at Juiterbock in 1579; those of 8000 ministers (put in A.D. 1582) follow immediately after the text. The Formula was for a long time rejected by Denmark and Sweden; in the former country its publication was, until 1580, forbidden under penalty of death. It was received in Hungary(1593-1596), Holstein (1647), Pomerania (1685), and Livonia. It was rejected in Hesse, Anhalt, a part of Mecklenburg, and the free cities of Frankfort on the Main, Spires,Worms, Strasburg, Nuremberg, Magdeburg, Bremen, Dantzic, etc.; the electors of the Palatinate (in 1583), and Brandenburg (1614), and the Duke Julius of Brunswick, who had previously accepted it, retracted afterwards. Thus, of the three Protestant electors of the German empire, Palatinate, Brandenburg, and Saxony, only one (Saxony) remained a champion of the Formula of Concord, and he subsequently joined the Church of Rome. The Formula of Concord, united with the Augsburg Confession of 1590, the Apology, the Articles of Smalcald, and the two catechisms of Luther, forms the "Concordienbuch," or the Book of Concord, of which there are many editions in German and Latin. "But the Lutheran Church is still divided upon this symbol. The so-called High Lutherans insist that the Formula Concordiae is the scientific completion of

the preceding Lutheran symbolism, while the moderate party are content to stand by the Augsburg Confession, the Apology, and the Smalcald Articles" (Shedd, *Hist. of Doctrines*, 2:458). *SEE CONFESSIONS OF FAITH*; *SEE SYMBOLICAL BOOKS*; *SEE LUTHERANS*.

See Hospinian, *Concordia discors* (Zurich, 1607; Genesis 1678); Leonhard Hutter, *Concordia concors* (Wittenb. 1614, 1621; Lpz. 1690); J. Musaeus, *Proelectiones in opitomen Formulae conc*. (Jena, 1701); Balthasar, *Hist. d. Torgischen Buches* (Greifsw. 1741-56, 8 vols.); J. N. Anton, *Gesch. d. form. Conc*. (Lpz. 1779,2 vols.); Francke, *Lib. Symbol*. pt. 3; Mosheinm, *Ch. Hist.* 153165; Herzog, *Real-Encyklopadie*, 3, 87 sq.; Franck, *Theologie der Concordienformel* (Erlang. 1865, 4 vols.).

Concordance

(Lat. *concordantioe*), a book containing the words in the Holy Scriptures, in alphabetical order, with their context more or less fully given, and a designation by chapter and verse of the places in which they are to be found. (See Glauchius, *De usu Concorcantiarum Biblicarum*, Lips. 1668.) While the Scriptures remained in manuscript, or were not divided into sections and paragraphs, indexes of their words and phrases could neither be formed nor used. As soon as any regular divisions began to be made, the importance of concordances, or alphabetical indexes, was felt, and learned men devoted their labors to form them. The first concordances were prepared for the Latin Vulgate. (See below.) See Orme's *Bibliotheca Biblica*, p. 112; Watts's *Bibliotheca Britannica*; Winer's *Handbuch*; Walch, *Biblioth. Theol.* 4:307; Rohr's *Kritische Prediger-Bibliothe*k, 1841.; *Meth. Quar. Review*, 1847, p. 451; *Princeton Review*, 1828, p. 471. The following are the most important works of this description.

I. Hebrew. —

1. The first Hebrew *Concordance* was by Rabbi Isaac (or Mordecai) Nathan (q.v.), in 1445. It cost seven years' hard labor by himself and some assistants. It was first printed at Venice in 1524, fol., by Daniel Bomberg, then by Franzoni (*ib.* 1564, fol.), again by Pesaro (Basle, 1581, fol.), and afterwards at Rome in 1622. It is entirely Hebrew, and entitled *Meir Nathib* (byti; ryaim), "'*The Light of the Way*." It was translated into Latin by A. Reuchlin (Basil. 1556, fol., 1569, 4to), but both the Hebrew and the Latin editions are full of errors.

2. These errors were for the most part corrected and other deficiencies supplied by Mario di Calasio (q.v.), a Franciscan friar, who published *Concordantiae Sacr. Bibl. Hebr. et Latin*. (Romae, 1621, 4 vols. fol.), republished in London under the direction of W. Romaine (1747-9, 4 vols. fol.), under the patronage of all the monarchs in Europe, not excepting the pope himself.

3. *Concordantiae Bibl. Ebraioe, nova et artificiosa methodo dispositoe* (Basil. 1632, fol.), by John Buxtorf, the father, but published by his son. It takes for its basis the work of Rabbi Nathan, though it is much better arranged, more correctly printed, the roots more distinctly ascertained, and the meanings more accurately given; but as the references are made by Hebrew letters, and relate to the rabbinical divisions of the Old Testament, it, is of little service, unless the student is familiar with the Masoretic system. This work was abridged under the title of *Fons Leonis*, etc. (Berolini. 1677, 8vo). A new edition of Buxtorf's *Heb. Concordance*, by Bar, has lately been published (Stettini. 1861 sq., 4to).

4. Before the republication of Calasio there appeared Chr. Nolde's (q.v.) *Concor. particularum Ebraeo-Chaldaicarum* (Hafn. 1679, 4to: an edition seems to have been begun in 1675, fol., but this never saw the light). This concordance contains the particles, or indeclinable words, omitted in former (as well as later) concordances. The best edition of Nolde is that by Tympe (Jena, 1734, 4to). It contains, as an appendix, a *Lexicon of the Hebrew Particles*, by John Henry Michaelis and Christ. Koerber.

5. But the best, or at least to the English reader most important work up to the present century on this subject is *The Hebrew Concordance, adapted to the English Bible, disposed after the manner of Buxtorf*, by John Taylor, D.D. (London, 1754, 2 vols. fol.). It was the fruit of many years' labor, and still has its value.

6. An edition of Buxtorf's *Heb. Concordance*, which has received so much care and attention on the part of the editor as nearly to deserve the name of a new work — *Hebraische and Chaldaische Concordanz zu den heiligen Schriften des alten Testaments*, by Dr. Julius First (Leipzig, 1840, fol.), offers one of the most useful aids to the study of the Bible that has ever appeared. In addition to those of a more mechanical kind, such as a good type and clear arrangement, there are, 1. A corrected text, founded on Hahn's *Vaznderhooght*; 2. *The Rabbinical significations*; 3. *Explanations in Latin*, giving the etymology of the Rabbinical; *Illustration*s from the

three Greek versions, the *Aramaic Paraphrase*, the Vulgate, etc.; the Greek words employed by the Seventy as renderings of the Hebrew; together with philological and archaeological notices, so as to make the Concordance contain a brief Hebrew lexicon.

7. *The Englishman's Hebrew and Chaldee Concordance*, edited by G. V. Wigram (Lond. 1843, 2 vols. 8vo), is an original and exceedingly useful work, and remarkably accurate. It gives the Hebrew words in their order, but quotes the passages in which they occur from the common English Bible. It contains the first complete list of the Hebrews proper names ever made. It deserves to be more extensively known and used. Its high price is a serious check to its circulation.

8. Aaron Pick, *The Bible Student's Concordance* (Lond. 1845, 8vo), a work of little account to scholars.

9. W. Wilson, *The Bible Student's Hebrew Guide* (Lond. 1850, 4to), equally brief and insufficient.

Other and earlier Hebrews Concordances are: Rabbi Anschel, hnvMhi tbKrmi (a vocabulary, with references to passages, Cracow, 1534, 4to, and later); Crinesius, *Concordantioe Ebraicoe* (Vitemb. 1627, 4to); Layman, *Concordantioe Ebraeo-sacrae*, etc. (1681, fol.); Trostius, *Concordantiae Chaldaicae* (Vitemb. 1617, 4to).

II. Greek *Concordance*s.

(a) To the Septuagint. —

1. Conrad Kircher, *Concordantioe Veteris Testamenti Graecae Ebraeis vocibus respondentes* (Francof. 1607, 2 vols. 4to). This work follows the order of the Hebrew words, placing the corresponding Greek word after it; in consequence of which, it is more useful in consulting the Hebrew than the Greek Scriptures.

2. The best Greek *Concordance* to the Septuagint is that which bears the title *A. Trommii Concordantioe Graecae Vers. vulgo dic. LXX Interpre*. (Amst. et Traj. ad Rh. 1718, 2 vols. fol.). *SEE TROMME*. It follows the order of the Greek words, of which it first gives a Latin translation, and then the Hebrew word or words for which the Greek term is used in the Seventy. Then the different places in which the words occur follow in the order of the several books and chapters. When the word occurs in any of

the Greek translators, Aquila, Symmachus, or Theodotion, the places where it is found are referred to at the end of the quotations from the Sept. The words of the Apocrypha are placed at the end of each enumeration. There are two indices at the end of the work: one Hebrew and Chaldaic, by examining which the Greek term used in the Septuagint for any Hebrew or Chaldee word is seen at once, with the Latin version and the place where it is found in: the *Concordance*, so that Tromme serves in a measure for a Hebrew *Concordance*; the other index contains a lexicon to the Hexapla of Origen, and comprehends the Greek words in the fragments of the old Greek translators published by Montfaucon.

(b) *To the New Testament.* —

1. The first Greek concordance to the New Testament, now exceedingly rare, is entitled *Xysti Betuleii Concordantioe Graecoe Novi Testamenti* (Basil. 1546, fol.). The author's real name was Birck.

2. A concordance to the Greek New Testament, projected and partly executed by Robert Stephens, and completed and published by his son Henry (Genev. 1594, and with a supplement, 1600, fol.), is too inaccurate to merit more than a passing notice.

3. Of much value is *Erasmi Schmidii Novi Testamenti J. C. Graeci; hoc est, originalis linguae* ταμιεῖον (Vitemb. 1638, fol.; revised ed. Gotha, 1717, fol.; also Glasg. 1819, 2 vols. 8vo; recently by the Messrs. Bagster of London, in a thin, flat pocket volume, and in another form, 32mo, being one of their "Polymicrian series").

4. J. Williams, concordance to the Greek Testament (Lond. 1767, 4to), a work especially useful to the mere English reader.

5. A new and very superior edition of Schmid's ταμιεῖον has been put forth by C. H. Bruder, *Concordantioe* (Leipz. 1842, 4to). Among the advantages of this edition, let it suffice to specify, 1. Fulness, accuracy, and correspondence with Griesbach's edition; 2. Regard has been paid to the editions of Lachmann and Scholz; all the readings of the Elzevirs, Mill, Bengel, Knapp, Tittmann, Scholz, and also of Erasmus, Robert Stephens's. third edition, and of Schmid himself, are either given or pointed out. The student is presented also with a selection of readings from the most ancient MSS., from the interpreters of Scripture who lived in the earlier ages of the

Church, and the works of the ecclesiastical fathers: no various reading possessing critical value is omitted.

6. One of the most valuable aids for the general study of the New Testament which modern times have produced is *The Englishman's Greek Concordance of the New Testament*, being an attempt at a *Verbal Connection between the Greek and the English Texts* (Lond. 1839, 8vo). The work, which is carefully compiled, takes Schmid as its basis. The plan is the same as that of the "*Englishman's Hebrew Concordance*" above, and it is by the same editor. It has been republished in this country (N. Y. 1848, 8vo).

III. *Latin Concordance*s. —

1. Antony of Padua (born A.D. 1195, died 1231) is said to have produced the first work of the kind, entitled *Concordantiae Morales*, which was formed from the Vulgate translation.

2. Hugo de Santo Caro, better known as Cardinal Hugo, a Dominican monk, who died about 1262, followed Antony in 1244, by compiling for the Vulgate a concordance of the Scriptures. Having given himself sedulously to the study of Holy Writ, with a view of writing a commentary thereon, he was, in order to facilitate his labor, led to project and undertake to form a concordance, calling to his aid his brother monks to the number of no fewer than five hundred. Their labors have been a rich storehouse for subsequent compilers. The concordance thus made was improved by Conrad of Halberstadt, who flourished about 1290, and by John of Segovia in the ensuing century.

3. R. Stephens, *Concordantic Bibliorum utriusque Testamenti* (1555, fol.).

4. After the revision of the Vulgate by Sixtus V, a concordance to it appeared, entitled *Concordantiae Sacr. Bibl. Vulgat. edit. F. Lucae Brugensis* (Antw. 1617; Paris, 1683). Most of the Latin concordances are reprints of this, e.g. by Luca and Phalesti (Vien. 1825, fol.).

5. A new Latin concordance to the Vulgate, edited by Ducrisson, appeared in Paris in 1838 (4to).

IV. *German Concordance*s. —

1. The first German concordance was that of Conrad Agricola (Nurnb. 1609, fol.), repeatedly reprinted and revised.

2. The most useful is that of F. Lankisch, *Concordant. Bibl. Germanico-Hebraico-Graecoe* (Lips. 1677, fol., often reprinted; best edition that of Reineccius, Lips. 1718). There are several modern German concordances, the most noteworthy of which is

3. J. G. Hanff, *Biblische Real-und Verbal-Concordenz* (2 vols. in 4 pts. 8vo, Stuttg. 1828-34).

4. We may also mention a valuable concordance for the German Bible — *Biblische Hand-Concordanzfur Relegionslehrer und alle Freunde der Heiligen Schrift* (pub. by H. Schott, Leipzig, 1827, 8vo). The work is more comprehensive than similar writings in the English language. It is divided into three parts:

(1.) A full and complete register of all the words found in the Bible;

(2.) An index of the most important things, subjects, and ideas found in the Bible, with references to the places where they lie in the sacred volume; as, for instance, under the head "Lord's Supper, a meal commemorative of the death of Jesus, it brings us into intimate fellowship with Christ; the worthy participation of the same; spiritual enjoyment of the flesh and blood of Christ," etc.

(3.) The leading doctrines of Christianity systematically arranged, drawn up according to Luther's Catechism, and accompanied by scriptural proofs.

Other concordances in German are those of G. Buchner (Jena, 1750, 1757, 1776; Halle, 1837; Lpz. 1806), Wichmann (Lpz. 1782), F. J. Bernhard (Lpz. 1850-2), J. M. Otto (Sulzb. 1842), K. A. Toller (Stuttg. 1838), S. Lueg (Passau, 1841).

IV. The first complete French concordance was that of Mark Wilks, *Concordance des Saintes Ecritures* (Paris, 1840, 8vo).

V. *English Concordance*s. —

1. The first concordance to the English version of the New Testament was published without date, but certainly before 1540, by "Mr. Thomas Gybson," being chiefly, as appears probable from the prefatory epistle to

the reader, the work of the famous printer John Day. It is entitled *The Concordance of the New Testament*, most necessary to be had in the hands of all soche as desire the communication of any place contained in the New Testament.

2. The first English concordance to the entire Bible was that of John Marbeck - *A Concordance, that is to saie, a Worke wherein by the order of the letters of the A, B, C, ye maie redely find any worde conteigned in the whole Bible, so often as it is there expressed or mentioned*, Lond. 1550, fol. Till the' year 1555, when Robert Stephens published his concordance, it was not customary to mark the verses in books of this sort. At first it was thought sufficient to specify the chapter with the letters a, b, c, d, as 'marks to point out the beginning, middle, and end of each chapter. But in 1545 Robert Stephens divided the Bible into verses, thus preparing the way for a more exact reference in concordances, etc.; but Marbeck does not appear to have made use of this improvement, as his work refers merely to the chapters. — *SEE MARBECK*.

3. The following work, which appeared in the same year as the last, is a translation from the German — *A Briefe and a Compendious Table, in maner of a concordance, openyng the waye to the principall Histories of the whole Bible, and the most comon articles grounded and comprehended in the Newe Testament and Olde, in maner as amply as doeth the great concordance of the Bible. Gathered and set forth by Henry Bullinger, Leo Jude, Conrade Pellicane, and by the other ministers of the Church of Ligurie. Translated from the Hygh Almayne into Englysh by Walter Lynne. To which is added, a Translation of the Third Boke of Machabees* (8vo, 1550). Lynne, the translator, was an English printer, who flourished about the middle of the 16th century, a scholar, author, and translator of several books. *SEE BULLINGER*. An improved edition of the tabular concordance, adapted to the translation of 1611, was published by John Downame (London, 1646, 8vo).

4. All earlier English concordances were superseded by the more correct and valuable work of Alexander Cruden (q.v.), entitled *A Complete Concordance to the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testament, etc., to which is added a concordance to the books called Apocrypha* (1737, 4to). Three editions were published by the author during his life, and many have appeared since his death. The London edition of 1810 is the best standard edition. Several useful editions of Cruden have been put forth by

the Messrs. Bagster, who have also *issued An Alphabetical Index of the Holy Scriptures, comprising the Names, Characters, and Subjects, both of the Old and New Testament*, in two sizes, which the Biblical student will find very serviceable.

Cruden's concordance has been for a century the basis of every other work of the kind, such as Brown's, Butterworth's, Coles's, Eadie's, etc. With all its excellences, however, it has more serious defects than is generally apprehended. The Rev. Thomas Scott was so well aware of this that he contemplated a revision of the work. Its chief fault is its great want of completeness, but a moiety of the words being really given at all, and only a part of the occurrences of these, the proper names being especially defective. These and other defects are in a good measure remedied in the edition issued by the "*Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge*" (Lond. 1859, 8vo), but this still is far from perfect. A really *complete* and accurate English concordance is yet a desideratum. The want is now met by Strong's *Exhaustive Concordance to the Auth. Engl. Version of the Holy Scriptures* (N. Y., 1849, 4to).

Concordat

I. A treaty, but usually restricted to a convention between the pope of Rome and any secular Roman Catholic government for the settling of ecclesiastical relations. Treaties which the pope, as a secular sovereign, concludes with other princes, are not called concordats. Conventions between the pope and a Protestant government for the settlement of the ecclesiastical relations of the Roman Catholic subjects of the latter are properly only called conventions, though it is common to apply the term concordat to any convention. The name concordat was for the first time applied to the convention made in 1418 between Pope Martin V and the representatives of the German nation, which was called *Nonnulla capitula concordata et ab utraqueparte suscepta*. The name is now, however, generally applied to earlier conventions also. One of the most important of the earlier concordats is that of Worms, called also the *Calixtine Concordat*, made in 1122 between Calixtus II and Henry V, in order to put an end to the long contest on the subject of investiture, and which has since been considered a fundamental ordinance in Germany. Most of the concordats have been extorted from the popes by the different civil powers. This was done as early as the fifteenth century; for when the Council of Constance urged a reformation of the papal court, Martin V

saw himself obliged, in 1418, to conclude the concordats of Constance with the German, the French, and the English nations. Chap. 1 restricts the number of cardinals, and makes provisions as to their character and mode of appointment. Chap. 2 restricts the papal reservations. Chap. 3 treats of papal annates and taxes, which for France were reduced for the space of five years to one half of their former amount; while in the English concordat these were abolished altogether. Chap. 4 defines what trials are to be lodged at Rome. Chap. 5 reduces the number of commendams. Chap. 6 enjoins a strict proceeding against simony before the forum conscient*ioe*. Chap. 7 provides that excommunicated persons need not be shunned before the publication of the ban. Chap. 8 reduces the number of papal dispensations. Chap. 9 treats of the revenue of the papal curia. Chap. 10 reduces for Germany the papal indulgences, and repeals those that had been issued since the death of Gregory XI: in the French concordat nothing is said about this point. Chap. 11 provides that the German and French concordats are to be valid only for five years, and that with regard to the French the royal sanction is reserved. The English concordat is definite. The German and English concordats obtained at once legal authority; the French in 1424.

At a meeting of the German electors at Frankfort, in October, 1446, the reformatory demands of the German nations, which for several years had been the subject of negotiations, were finally agreed upon. They chiefly concerned the recognition of the supreme authority of general councils, the convocation of a new general council, and the redress of the grievances of the German nation. Pope Eugene IV, through his ambassadors, declared his readiness to concede these demands, and on his death-bed, Feb., 1447, signed five bulls by which they were severally granted. The Frankfort demands, and the bulls of Eugene IV, by which they are ratified, are together called the *Frankfort Concordats*, or the *Concordat of Princes*. The chief basis of these concordats was the series of reformatory decrees which had been adopted by the Council of Basle. Nicholas V, on March 28, 1447, ratified the concessions made by his predecessor to the German nation.

On Feb. 17, 1448, the Emperor Frederick III concluded (without the cooperation of the electors) with the cardinal legate Carvajal a concordat at Vienna, which made to the pope far-reaching concessions; in particular, the right of ratifying the election of all the bishops (which right, by the Concordat of Princes, had been restricted to the bishoprics immediately

subject to the pope), of canceling uncanonical elections, and of appointing bishops for the dioceses thus become vacant. This convention was formerly called the *Aschaffenburg Concordat or Recess*, but the more correct name is the *Vienna Concordat*. The Frankfort Concordats and the; Vienna Concordat together are called the *Concordats of the German Nation*. They formed a fundamental law of the German Empire, and part of them continued, even after the destruction of the German Empire, to be a part of the ecclesiastical law of the several German countries.

In *France*, the reformatory decrees of the Council of Basle had been, in 1438, adopted as a law of the kingdom at the Diet of Bourges. But this law — *the Pragmatic Sanction of Bourges* — was never recognized by any of the popes of the 15th century; and in 1516, Pope Leo X prevailed upon king Francis I to conclude a new concordat, which the Lateran Council, then in session, approved and embodied with its decree, while the king made it a law of the country, notwithstanding the protest of the Parliament and the University of Paris. It established the annates, referred the *causoe majores* for adjudication to Rome, and gives to the king the right of nominating the bishops.

In 1451 a concordat was concluded with the duke of *Savoy*, by which the latter received the right of nominating for the most important benefices. In 1486 king John II of *Portugal* concluded a concordat with Pope Innocent VIII, by which he abandoned the *Placet Regium*, which the kings had exercised since the beginning of the century, though, since 1427, the popes had protested against it. The concordat was disapproved by the Cortes. In 1523 Pope Adrian II gave to the kings of Spain the same right as regards the nominating for ecclesiastical benefices which had been conceded to France. No concordat was concluded during the 16th century after the year 1523, and none at all during the 17th century.

II. *The Concordats of the Eighteenth Century*. — The concordats of this period (1717-1774) were occasioned by the revival of the anti-papal tendencies of the Church of Rome, which had prevailed in the 15th century, and still more by the development of the theory of the absolute state. They all belong to the Latin nations of Europe.

1. *Savoy*. — The arrangement of 1451 had been the subject of long controversies, which were partly settled by an agreement in 1727, and fully by a concordat on Jan. 6, 1741, which made provisions on the admission and authority of papal bulls in the country, on the limits of ecclesiastical

jurisdiction, on the exemption of church property, on the right of asylum, etc.

2. For *Milan*, which, since 1706, belonged to Austria, a concordat was concluded Dec. 10, 1757, concerning exclusively the exemption of church property.

3. In *Naples* the so-called *Monarchia Sicula*; or the right claimed by kings to act as papal legates, had long been a hereditary subject of controversy between the secular governments and the popes. It was finally regulated, together with other differences, by a treaty concluded June 2, 1741, which recognized, though in somewhat modified form, the exemption of church property and of the clergy from taxation, the right of asylum, ecclesiastical jurisdiction in marriage affairs, and the right of the Church to superintend the importation of foreign books.

4. *Spain*. — The conflicts between Spain and the pope concerning the extent of the royal right of collation were settled by a preliminary agreement in 1737, anid by a concordat concluded Jan. 11, 1753. An appendix to the concordat concerning the rights of the papal nuncio in Madrid was agreed upon.

5. *Portugal*. — In 1740 Benedict XIV granted to the kings of Portugal, by a concordat, the right of nominating for the episcopal sees and all benefices.

III. *The Concordats of the Nineteenth Century*. — The present century has witnessed the conclusion of a very large number of concordats. Most of them were called forth by a desire of the secular government to rearrange ecclesiastical affairs, which had been thrown into utter disorder by the French Revolution and the territorial changes in Europe following it.

1. *France*. — Bonaparte, when first consul, concluded a concordat with Pius VII, July 15, 1801, which went into operation in April, 1802. It re-established the Roman Catholic Church, which is declared to be the religion of the majority of Frenchmen, and has become the basis of the present ecclesiastical constitution of that country. It guaranteed to the Roman Catholic Church freedom and publicity of worship, which was, however, placed under the general laws of police; promised a new circumscription of dioceses, and provided for the resignation of all the bishops at that time in office; it gave to the first consul the right of

nominating the bishops, and prescribed the oath of fidelity toward the secular government which the bishops and other priests have to take. The bishops received the right to appoint the parish priests, but the latter must be agreeable to the secular government, Of the churches not yet sold, as many as were necessary for divine worship were to be restored to the bishops. The Church renounced all claims to the property that had been sold during the Revolution, and the state promised to, pay the bishops and priests a sufficient salary. The former rights and prerogatives of the French crown were recognized as having been transferred to the first consul, but in case a person not a member of the Church of Rome should be invested with the latter office, new provisions were reserved. The concordat was published as a law of France in 1802, together with some introductory "organic articles." Against the latter, however, the popes always protested. The concordat and the new circumscription of dioceses were also valid for Belgium, and those parts of Germany (the left bank of the Rhine), Switzerland, and Savoy which, by the treaties of peace at Luneville and Amiens, had been united with France.

In 1803 a special concordat was concluded between Pius VII and Napoleon for the Italian republic. It substantially agrees with the French concordat, though some provisions are more favorable to the pope. This concordat remained valid for the kingdom of Italy, which was established in 1805.

In 1813 Napoleon negotiated with the pope a second concordat (the Concordat of Fontainebleau), which was published against the consent of the pope, who had regarded it only as a preliminary agreement, and at once took back his consent. As the reign of Napoleon ceased soon after, the concordat never became effective.

Louis XVIII concluded at Rome with Pius VII (July 11, 1817) a new concordat, by which that of 1516, so injurious to the liberties of the Gallican Church, was again revived; the concordat of 1801 and the *articles organiques* of 1802 were abolished; the nation was subjected to an enormous tax by the demand of endowments for forty-two new metropolitan and episcopal sees, with their chapters and seminaries; and free scope was afforded to the intolerance of the Roman court by the indefinite language of art. 10, which speaks of measures against the prevailing obstacles to religion and the laws of the Church. This revival of old abuses, this provision for the luxury of numerous clerical dignitaries at

the expense of the nation, could please only the ultra-royalist nobility, who saw in it the means of providing their sons with benefices. The nation received the concordat with almost universal disapprobation; voices of the greatest weight were raised against it; the Chambers rejected it, and it was never carried through. After the Revolution of 1830 the government fell back on the concordat of 1801, and the organic articles became a new subject of controversy between Church and State.

2. *Germany, Prussia, and Austria*. — The relations of the German Roman Catholics to the pope were greatly disturbed by the dissolution of the German empire. For some time everything was in confusion; at the time of the Congress of Vienna only five German bishops were still alive. When the political reorganization was begun, the pope at first demanded the restoration of the entire former state of things. But when it was found out that this demand would never be granted, negotiations with particular states concerning the conclusion of concordats began.

(1.) Bavaria was the first state which succeeded (July 5, 1817) in arriving at an agreement. By the Bavarian concordat two archbishoprics were established; seminaries were instituted and provided with land; the nominations were left with the king, with the reservation of the papal right of confirmation; the limits of the civil and ecclesiastical jurisdiction were precisely settled, and the erection of new monasteries was promised. This concordat was published in May, 1818, together with the new political constitution, by which all apprehensions for the Protestant Church in Bavaria were allayed.

(2.) The government of Prussia, in 1821, agreed with the pope upon a bull of circumscription (*De Salute Animarum*), which was published by the Prussian government as a law of the state. It divides the state into two archbishoprics and six bishoprics, and contains provisions as to the re-establishment of chapters, the election of bishops by chapters, the dotation of bishops and chapters, and the taxes to be paid by the episcopal chancellories to Rome.

3. *The Ecclesiastical Province of the Upper Rhine*. In 1818 the state governments of Wurtemberg, Baden, and a number of other minor German states sent delegates to a conference at Frankfort to conduct joint negotiations with the pope concerning the reconstruction of episcopal sees. In 1821, a bull of circumscription, beginning Provida sollersque, and providing for the establishment of an archbishopric in Baden, and

bishoprics in Hesse-Darmstadt, Hesse-Cassel, Nassau, and Wurtemberg, and for the dotation of the bishops, was issued and ratified by the governments in 1822. Some further points were agreed upon between these governments and the pope in 1827, and others continued to be the subject of animated controversy, and were in most states not yet settled in 1867.

A concordat with the king of Wirtemberg, consisting of thirteen articles, was concluded in 1857. The government promises in it to execute the dotation of the bishopric as soon as circumstances will permit. The bishop received the right to confer all benefices which have no patron, of appointing his vicar general, the extraordinary members of the chapter, and the rural deans, yet he must appoint persons to whom the government has no objections. To the bishops belong all the regulations concerning divine service, the holding of synods, and the introduction of monastic orders, the latter, however, only in concert with the government. The episcopal court has jurisdiction over all ecclesiastical affairs, in particular also over all marriage affairs. The bishop has the right of inflicting ecclesiastical censures on clergymen and laymen. If clergymen transgress civil laws, the secular court will act in concert with the bishop. The intercourse of the bishop, the clergy, and the people with the papal see is free, and ecclesiastical decrees do not require the *placet regium*. The religious instruction of the youth, both in public and private institutions, is under the control of the bishop. He selects the catechism. He has the right of establishing seminaries and of superintending them. Provisionally, special regulations are made for the continuance of the three seminaries at Ehingen, Rottweil, and Tubingen. The theological faculty of the university of Tubingen is also under the control of the bishop, who authorizes the professors to lecture, and may refuse this authorization; who takes their confession of faith, and examines the manuscript of their lectures. The property of the Church is inviolate, but subject to public taxes. It is administered by the Church. The vacant benefices and the intercalar fund are administered by a joint committee of Church and State. The concordat was published by the government in its official paper in 1858, but did not receive the consent of the Legislature, without which many of its provisions cannot become valid.

4. In 1821 *Hanover* obtained a bull of circumscription similar to the one issued for Prussia, by which two bishoprics were established. For the kingdom of Saxony two bishops in *partibus* were appointed as vicars

apostolic. The other minor states had their Roman Catholic subjects placed under the subjection of Prussian or Hanoverian bishops, or of those of the province of the Upper Rhine, and thereby ratified the agreements concluded between those states and Rome.

5. *Austria*. — The government of Austria began to negotiate with the pope about a new concordat soon after the beginning of the revolutionary movements in 1848. The concordat was concluded in 1855, and was most favorable to the claims of the papacy. The following are the most important points of the Austrian concordat. The Roman Catholic Church in all parts of the empire enjoys the protection of the government. The *Placet Regium* is abolished, and the intercourse of the bishops with the pope is free. The instruction of the Roman Catholic youth must be in accordance with the Roman Catholic religion. The bishops have the power to detain the faithful from reading pernicious books. Cases of the canon law, especially marriage affairs, belong to the ecclesiastical courts, while the civil relations of marriage remain under the jurisdiction of the secular judge. The bishops have the right of exercising the discipline of the Church, and of proceeding against members of the Church with ecclesiastical punishments. The power of the state is promised to the maintenance of the immunity of the Church. The episcopal seminaries are under the jurisdiction of the bishops. The emperor has the right of nominating the bishops, after taking counsel with the other bishops of the ecclesiastical province. The first dignity at every metropolitan and suffragan church is conferred by the pope. The monastic orders are under the jurisdiction of their superiors. The bishops have the right of introducing new orders, after coming previously to an understanding with the government. Church property may be acquired in the legal way, and is secured to the Church. In Feb. 1856, *twenty* "*Separat-Artikel*" (separate articles) to the concordat were published. They provide that the bishops may found one university independent of the state; that only Roman Catholic professors shall be appointed at the University of Pesth; that Church and State will work together for the suppression of books against religion and morals; that the state shall lay no obstacle in the way of erecting such confraternities and associations as the Church has approved; and that the bishops shall not be hindered from regulating in religious institutions everything that concerns religion and the purity of the Christian life. The immense majority of the Austrian people were indignant at this concordat, and in July, 1867, the Austrian Parliament, by an almost unanimous vote, called on the government to abolish it.

6. *The Netherlands and Belgium*. — Between the government of the Netherlands and the pope a concordat was concluded in 1827, which extended to the northern provinces the provisions of the French concordat of 1801, with the exception that the bishops were not to be nominated by the Protestant king, but to be chosen by the chapter from a list of candidates from which the government had the right to strike out any names not agreeable to it. The concordat was officially published by the government, but the bull of circumscription by which the provinces were divided into bishoprics was not recognized, and the concordat was never carried out. Later the papal government itself disregarded the concordat, and made a new division of dioceses without concert with the government.

In Belgium, which at the time of the publication of the French concordat of 1801 was a part of France, that concordat continued in force, while the country was annexed to Holland (1815-1880). In the new Belgian kingdom the Church was separated from the state, and thus the concordat naturally lost its authority.

7. *Switzerland*. — The idea of establishing one national bishopric could not be carried out, as some of the cantons were unable to agree with the papal see. Gradually, by agreement with some of the cantonal governments, the ecclesiastical relations of the Roman Catholics were regulated, and six bishoprics established.

8. *Italy*. — For *Sardinia* a new bull of circumscription was issued July 17, 1817. *Naples* concluded a convention with the pope July 18, 1818, which in the same year was promulgated as a law of the country. The convention consists of thirty-five articles, and yields all the chief demands of the Roman court. The Roman Catholic Church is declared to be the exclusive religion of the state; the right of nominating the bishops is given to the king; the right to nominate the members of the chapters is divided among the pope and the bishops of the diocese. The Church recognizes the sale of Church property which had taken place during the French rule, and the property not yet sold is restored to her; she also receives the right of acquiring new landed property. The jurisdiction of bishops is enlarged; the influence of the Church upon public instruction is guaranteed; the abolition or fusion of ecclesiastical benefices without the consent of the pope is declared invalid; the property of the Church is declared inviolate.

The concordat with *Tuscany* of June 19,1851, consists of fifteen articles. It provides that the ecclesiastical authorities, in the exercise of their offices,

shall find the protection of the state. The intercourse of the bishops with their diocesans and the papal see shall be free. They shall also have the censorship over religious publications, and the right of preventing the faithful from reading pernicious books. If priests offend against civil laws they shall be amenable to the civil courts, but the punishment shall not be inflicted without the consent of the bishops; and if it be the penalty of death, or any penalty involving infamy, the papal see shall take cognizance of the case. The property of the Church shall be administered by the bishops and the parish priests, and, in case of vacancies, by a joint committee of priests and laymen. By this concordat the ecclesiastical legislation of Leopold II, which was nearly the same as that of Joseph I in Austria, was abolished. The concordat was soon followed by some organic interpretations, by which the state, with the consent of the papal see, guarded some of its former rights. The provisional government of Tuscany in 1859 declared this concordat abolished. By the absorption of Naples and Tuscany into the kingdom of Italy their special concordats ceased.

9. *Russian Concordat*. — For the Roman Catholic Church of Russia a concordat was concluded by the emperor Nicholas Aug. 15, 1847. It guarantees to the Roman Catholics of Russia the free exercise of their religion, and permits the establishment of a new bishopric at Cherson for Bessarabia, Tauris, and the Caucasus. The government charged itself with maintaining the bishop, his chapter, and seminary. It also contained provisions on the elections of bishops not yet officially published.

10. A concordat with *Spain*, consisting of forty-five articles, was concluded March 16, 1851. According to it, the Roman Catholic religion is, to the exclusion of every other religious worship, the only religion of the Spanish people. Public instruction in all institutions is to be imparted in accordance with the Roman Catholic doctrine, and placed in this respect under the control of the bishops. The government is bound to assist the bishops in maintaining the purity of doctrine and of morals, and in suppressing pernicious books. The female orders which occupy themselves with education, and the Sisters of Charity, are to be maintained. The confiscated Church property which was not yet sold at the time of the conclusion of the concordat was to be restored to the Church, and to be administered by the clergy. The pope, on the other hand, promised to leave the former buyers of Church property in the undisturbed possession thereof. A new concordat, slightly modifying the preceding, was concluded Nov. 25,1859.

11. *Portugal*. — A concordat with Portugal was concluded in 1857, and ratified by the Portuguese Legislature in 1859 — almost unanimously by the Chamber of Peers, but only by a majority of fifteen (66 votes against 51) in the Chamber of Deputies. This concordat concerns only the present and former Portuguese possessions in India. It places again nearly the whole of British India under the jurisdiction of bishops appointed by the Portuguese government. — Pierer, *Universalt Lexikon*, s.v.; Herzog, *Real-Encykl*. 3, 60-87; Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirch.-Lex.* 2:741-760; the *Manuals of Church Law* (*Kirchenrecht*) by Richter and Walter; Munch, *Vollstandige Sammluig aller altern u. neuern Concordate* (Leipz. 1830, 2 vols.); *Revue des deux Mondes*, May 1,1865; Sept. 15, 1866.

Concubinage

the sexual connection of two persons of different sexes who are not united by the bond of matrimony. Externally, marriage and concubinage were equal according to Roman law, as even for marriage nothing was required but the agreement of the contracting parties. But they were different with regard to the legal effect of the union. In a regular marriage the wife obtained the rank of the husband (*dignitas mariti*), and her children were legitimate and in the power of the father. None of these results took place in case of concubinage. The Church distinguished between temporary and life-long concubinage. The former was always forbidden; the latter, though not approved, was long tolerated. The Council of Toledo (A.D. 400), by its Canon 17, excommunicates a married man keeping a concubine, but permits unmarried men to do so; and allows either a wife or a concubine. In the Latin Church, it was not until the Council of Trent, which made the validity of a marriage dependent upon a declaration of consent before the parish priest and two witnesses, that life-long concubinage was declared to be criminal, and subjected to punishment. The punishment for ministerial concubinarii was withholding of income, suspension, imprisonment, and, ultimately, excommunication. The evangelical churches have never recognised concubinage. — Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 3, 105; Lea, *Sacerdotal Celibacy*, chap. 12 *SEE CONCUBINE*.

Concubine

(vg,l yPi; *pile'gesh*, deriv. uncertain, but apparently connected with the Gr. πάλλαξ [fully in the plur. µyvig]l yPi µyvi; 10516 2 Samuel 15:16; 20:3]; Chald. hnhe]*lechenah'*, 27012 Daniel 5:2, 3, 23), denotes in the Bible not a

paramour (Gr. παλλακή), but only a female conjugally united to a man in a relation inferior to that of the regular wife (hVa). *SEE WIFE*. The positions of these two among the early Jews cannot be referred to the standard of our own age and country; that of concubine being less degraded, as that of wife was, especially owing to the sanction of polygamy, less honorable than among ourselves. The natural desire of offspring was, in the Jew, consecrated into a religious hope, which tended to redeem concubinage from the debasement into which the grosser motives for its adoption might have brought it. The whole question must be viewed from the point which touches the interest of propagation, in virtue of which even a slave concubine who had many children would become a most important person in a family, especially where a wife was barren. Such was the true source of the concubinage of Nahor, Abraham, and Jacob, which indeed, in the two latter cases, lost the nature which it has in our eyes, through the process, analogous to adoption, by which the offspring was regarded as that of the wife herself. From all this it follows that, save in so far as the latter was generally a slave, the difference between wife and concubine was less marked, owing to the absence of moral stigma, than among us. We must therefore beware of regarding as essential to the relation of concubinage what really pertained to that of bondage.

The concubine's condition was a definite one, and quite independent of the fact of there being another woman having the rights of wife towards the same man. The state of concubinage is assumed and provided for by the law of Moses.

A concubine would generally be either

(1) a Hebrew girl bought of her father, i.e. a slave, which alone the rabbins regard as a lawful connection (Maimonides, *Halach-Melakinm*, 4), at least for a private person;
(2), a gentile captive taken in war;
(3), a foreign slave bought, or
(4), a Canaanitish woman, bond or free.

The rights of (1) and (2) were protected by law (Exodus 21:7; Deuteronomy 21:10), but (3) was unrecognized, and (4) prohibited. *Free Hebrew* women also might become concubines. So Gideon's concubine seems to have been of a family of rank and influence in

Shechem, and such was probably the state of the Levite's concubine (<07201>Judges 20). The ravages of war among the male sex, or the impoverishment of families, might often induce this condition. The case (1) was not a hard lot. The passage in <02101>Exodus 21 is somewhat obscure, and seems to mean, in brief, as follows: A man who bought a Hebrew girl as concubine for himself might not treat her as a mere Hebrew slave, to be sent "out" (i.e. in the seventh year, v. 2), but might, if she displeased him, dismiss her to her father on redemption, i.e. repayment probably of a part of what he paid for her. If he had taken her for a concubine for his son, and the son then married another woman, the concubine's position and rights were secured, or, if she were refused these, she became free without redemption. Further, from the provision in the case of such. a concubine given by a man to his son, that she should be dealt with "after the manner of daughters," we see that the servile merged in the connubial relation, and that her children must have been free. Yet some degree of contempt attached to the "handmaid's son" (hmaA ^B), used reproachfully to the son of a concubine merely in <07018>Judges 9:18; see also <19616>Psalm 116:16. The provisions relating to (2) are merciful and considerate to a rare degree, but overlaid by the rabbis with distorting comments.

Concubinage therefore, in a scriptural sense, means the state of cohabiting lawfully with a wife of second rank, who enjoyed no other conjugal right but that of cohabitation (q.v.), and whom the husband could repudiate, and send away with a small present (<01214>Genesis 21:14). In like manner, he could, by means of presents, exclude his children by her from the heritage (<01256>Genesis 25:6). Such concubines had Nahor (<01224>Genesis 22:24), Abraham (<01256>Genesis 25:6), Jacob (<01522>Genesis 35:22), Eliphaz (<01612>Genesis 36:12), Gideon (<07008>Judges 8:3), Saul (<10807>2 Samuel 3:7), David (<09501>1 Samuel 5:13; 15:16; 16:21), Solomon (<11103>1 Kings 11:3), Caleb (<13046>1 Chronicles 2:46), Manasseh (*ib.* 12:14), Rehoboam (<14121>2 Chronicles 11:21), Abijah (<14321>2 Chronicles 13:21), and Belshazzar (<27012>Daniel 5:2). Their issue was reputed legitimate (though the children of the first wife were preferred in the distribution of the inheritance), but in all other respects these concubines were inferior to the primary wife, for they had no authority in the family, nor any share in household government. If they had been servants in the family before they came to be concubines they continued to be so afterwards, and in the same subjection to the mistress as before. If a woman were made captive in war she was allowed a month in which she was at liberty to mourn the loss of her parents and

friends; and neither father nor son was permitted to take her as a concubine until the expiration of that time (<5210>Deuteronomy 20:10, 14). To judge from the conjugal histories of Abraham and Jacob (Genesis 16 and 30), the immediate cause of concubinage in patriarchal times was the barrenness of the lawful wife, who in that case introduced her maid-servant of her own accord to her husband for the sake of having children. Accordingly, we do not read that Isaac, son of Abraham, had any concubine, Rebecca, his wife, not being barren. In process of time, however, concubinage appears to have degenerated into a regular custom among the Jews, and the institutions of Moses were directed to prevent excess and abuse in that respect by wholesome laws and regulations (<2107>Exodus 21:7-9; <5210>Deuteronomy 21:10-14). The unfaithfulness of a concubine was regarded as criminal (<7002>Judges 19:2; <1007>2 Samuel 3:7, 8), but it was not punished as was that of a wife (<3020>Leviticus 19:20). *SEE ADULTERY*. Such a case, however, as that mentioned (Judges 19), where not only is the possessor of the concubine called her "husband" (ver. 3), but her father is called his father-in-law and he his son-in-law (4, 5), shows how nearly the concubine approached to the wife. Hired women, such as "*uxores mercenariae conductae ad tempus ex pacto*," whom Ammianus Marcellinus attributes to the Saracens (14:4), were unknown among the Hebrews. To guard adult male offspring from debauchery before marriage, their parents, it appears, used to give them one of their female slaves as a concubine. She was then considered as one of the children of the house, and she retained her rights as a concubine even after the marriage of the son (<2109>Exodus 21:9, 19). When a son had intercourse with the concubine of his father, a sort of family punishment, we are informed, was inflicted on him (<0352>Genesis 35:22; <1301>1 Chronicles 5:1). Where polygamy was tolerated — as it was among the Hebrews — the permission of concubinage would not seem so much at war with the interests and preservation of society as we know it to be. Christianity restores the sacred institution of marriage to its original character, and concubinage is ranked with fornication and adultery (<4005>Matthew 19:5; <4702>1 Corinthians 7:2). *SEE POLYGAMY*.

In the Talmud (tit. *Cetuboth*), the Rabbins differ as to what constitutes concubinage, some regarding as its distinguishing feature the absence of the betrothing ceremonies (*sponsalia*) and of the dowry (*libellus dotis*), or portion of property allotted to a woman by special engagement, and to which she was entitled on the marriage day, after the decease of the

husband, or in case of repudiation; others, again, the absence of the latter alone. In the books of Samuel and Kings the concubines mentioned belong to the king, and their condition and number cease to be a guide to the general practice. A new king stepped into the rights of his predecessor, and by Solomon's time the custom had approximated to that of a Persian harem (2 Samuel 12:8; 16:21; 1 Kings 2:22). To seize on royal concubines for his use was thus a usurper's first act. Such was probably the intent of Abner's act (2 Samuel 3:7), and similarly the request on behalf of Adonijah was construed (1 Kings 2:21-24). For fuller information, Selden's treatises *De Uxore Hebraea and De Jure Vatur. et Gent*. v. 7, 8, and especially that *De Successionibus*, cap. 3, may, with some caution (since he leans somewhat easily to rabbinical tradition), be consulted; also the treatises Sotah, Kidushim, and Chetuborh in the *Gemara Hierosol*., and that entitled Sanhedrin in the *Gemara Babyl*. The essential portions of all these are collected in Ugolini, vol. 30, *De Uxore Hebroeae*. See also Otho, Lex. Rabbin. p. 151; Selden, *De Successionibus*, 3; Michaelis, Laws of Moses, 1:455-466.

The Roman law calls concubinage an allowed custom (*licita consuetudo*). When this expression occurs in the constitutions of the Christian emperors, it signifies what we now sometimes call a marriage of conscience. The concubinage tolerated among the Romans, in the time of the Republic and of the heathen emperors, was that between persons not capable of contracting legal marriage. Inheritances might descend to children that sprung from such a tolerated cohabitance. Concubinage between such persons they looked on as a kind of marriage, and even allowed it several privileges; but then it was confined to a single person, and was of perpetual obligation, as much as marriage itself (Gaii, *Institut*. *lib*. 1, § 109 sq.; Justin. Institut. *lib*. 1, tit. 10). Hottoman observes that the Romans had allowed concubinage long before Julius Caesar enacted the law by which every one was at liberty to marry as many wives as he pleased. The emperor Valentinian, Socrates tells us, allowed every man two. Concubinage is also used to signify a marriage with a woman of inferior condition, to whom the husband does not convey his rank. Dajos (*Paratilla*) observes that the ancient laws allowed a man to espouse, under the title of concubine, certain persons who were esteemed unequal to him on account of the want of some qualities requisite to sustain the full honor of marriage; and he adds that, though such concubinage was beneath marriage both as to dignity and civil rights, yet was concubine a reputable

title, and very different from that of “mistress” among us. The connection was considered so lawful that the concubine might be accused of adultery in the same manner as a wife (see Smith’s *Dict. of Class. Antiq.* s.v. Concubina).

This kind of concubinage is still in use in some countries, particularly in Germany, under the title of *halb-ehe* (half-marriage), left-hand or morganatic marriage, in allusion to the manner of its being contracted, namely, by the man giving the woman his left hand instead of the right. This is a real marriage, though without the usual solemnity, and the parties are both bound to each other forever, though the female cannot bear the husband’s name and title. *SEE MARRIAGE*; *SEE CONCUBINAGE*.

Concupiscence

(Lat. *concupiscentia*), evil desire (ἐπιθυμία, Romans 7:8; ἐπιθυμία κακή, Colossians 3:5); generally used in the sense of indwelling sin. The term is especially used in Roman Catholic theology. For its import there, and the controversy concerning it, *SEE SIN*.

Conder, Josiah

born in London 17th September, 1789, was the son of a bookseller, and very early displayed a taste for literature. In 1814, being at the time a bookseller, he purchased the *Eclectic Review*, of which he continued to be editor until 1837. Under his management the *Eclectic Review* received the assistance of many eminent men among the Nonconformists, such as Robert Hall, John Foster, Dr. Chalmers, Dr. Vaughan, and others. In 1818 he published a treatise *On Protestant Noncoformity* (Lond. 2 vols. 8vo); in 1824 *The Star in the East*, a poem; and in in 1834 a new translation of the Epistle to the Hebrews, with *Notes*. In 1836 he edited *The Congregational Hymn-book*, issued under the sanction of the Congregational Union. Besides these, he issued *An Analytical View of all Religions* (1838, 8vo); *Exposition of the Apocalypse* (8vo); *Literary History of N.T.* (1845, 8vo). His works are chiefly compilations, but are carefully executed, and well adapted to popular use. He died Dec. 27, 1855.

Condescension

a term both earlier and more correct for the modern theory of the ACCOMMODATION *SEE ACCOMMODATION* (q.v.) of Scripture; we

have therefore reserved for this place some remarks supplementary to the article under that head. The general idea expressed by the term Accommodation is that some object is presented, not in its absolute reality as it is in itself, but under some modification, or under some relative aspect, so as the better to secure some end at which the writer or speaker aims. Of this leading conception there are several forms known among Biblical scholars under the titles of formal and material accommodation. The following is a somewhat fuller analysis.

1. *Real*. — This takes place when a person is set forth as being or as acting under some modified character, accommodated to the capacity for conceiving him, or the inclination to receive him, of those to whom the representation is addressed. Thus God is frequently in Scripture described anthropomorphically or anthropopathically, i.e. not as he is in himself, but relatively to human modes of thought and apprehension. *SEE ANTHROPOMORPHISM*. So also the apostle describes himself as becoming all things to all men, that by all means he might save some; i.e. he accommodated himself to men's habits, usages, and modes of thought, and even prejudices, in order that he might disarm their opposition, and secure a favorable reception for the gospel of salvation which he preached. This species of accommodation is what the Christian fathers usually have in view under the terms συγκατάβασις, or condescensio, and οἰκονομία, or dispensatio. They apply these terms also to the incarnation and state of humiliation of Christ, which they regarded as an accommodation to the necessities of man's case for his redemption. (See Suicer, *Thesaurus Eccl.* s.v. συγκατάβασις and οἰκονομία; Chapman's *Miscellaneous Tracts relating to Antiquity*, London, 1742.) To this head may be referred many of the symbolical actions of the prophets.

2. *Verbal*. — This takes place when a passage or expression used by one writer is cited by another, and applied with some modification of the meaning to something different from that to which it was originally applied. Such accommodations are common in all languages. Writers and speakers lay hold of the utterances of others for the sake of giving to their own ideas a more graceful and a more forcible clothing than they feel themselves able to give them, or for the purpose of procuring for them acceptance, by uttering them in words which some great writer has already made familiar and precious to the general mind. Sometimes this is done almost unconsciously. "Wherever," says Michaelis, "a book is the object of our daily reading and study, it cannot be otherwise than that passages of it

should frequently flow into our pen in writing; sometimes accompanied with a conscious recollection of the place where we have read them, at other times without our possessing any such consciousness. Thus the lawyer speaks with the corpus juris and the laws, the scholar with the Latin authors, and the preacher with the Bible" (Einleit. 1:223). Our own literature is full of exemplifications of this, as is too well known to need illustrative proof. In the writings of Paul we find him making use in this way of passages from the classics (<44179>Acts 17:19; <46534>1 Corinthians 15:34; <56012>Titus 1:12), all of which are of course applied by him to Christian subjects only by accommodation. We need not be surprised, then, to find the later Biblical writers quoting in this way from the earlier, especially the N.T. writers, from the great classic of their nation, the ἱερὰ γράμματα of the former dispensation. As instances may be adduced, <45018>Romans 10:18 from <19904>Psalm 19:4, and <45220>Romans 12:20 from <21252>Proverbs 25:21, 22. See also <40215>Matthew 2:15, 18, with Calvin's notes thereon. "They have done this," says Michaelis, "in many places where it is not perceived by the generality of readers of the N.T., because such are too little acquainted with the Septuagint."

3. *Rhetorical*. — This takes place when truth is presented, not in a direct and literal form, but through the medium of symbol, figure, or apologue. Thus, in the prophetical writings of Scripture, we have language used which cannot be interpreted literally, but which, taken symbolically, conveys a just statement of important truth, e.g. <23405>Isaiah 4:5; 27:1; 34:4; <29228>Joel 2:28-31; <38402>Zechariah 4:2, 10, etc. Many instances occur in Scripture where truth is presented in the form of parable, and where the truth taught is to be obtained only by extracting from the story the spiritual, or moral, or practical lesson it is designed to enforce. In all the sacred books there are instances constantly occurring of words and statements which are designed to convey, under the vehicle of figure, a truth analogous to, but not really what they literally express. (See Knobel, *Prophetismus der Hebraer*, § 30-33; Smith, *Summary View and Explanation of the Writings of the Prophets*, Prel. Obss. p. 1-22; Glassius, *Phil. Sac*. 1. v, p. 669 sq., ed. 1711; Lowth. *De Sac. Poesi Heb*., pl. loc.; Davidson, *Sacred Hermeneutics* ch. 9.)

4. *Logical*. — In arguing with an opponent it is sometimes advantageous to, take him on his own ground, or to argue from principles which he admits, for the purpose of shutting him up to a conclusion which he cannot refuse, if he would retain the premises. It does not follow from this that his

ground is admitted to be the right one, or that assent is given to his principles; the argument is simply one *ad hominemn*, and may or may not be also *ad veritatem*. When it is not, that is, when its purpose is merely to shut the mouth of an opponent by a logical inference from his own principles, there is a case of logical accommodation.

5. *Doctrinal*. — This takes place when opinions are advanced or statements made merely to gratify the prejudices or gain the favor of those to whom they are addressed, without regard to their inherent soundness or truthfulness. If, for instance, the N.T. writers were found introducing some passage of the O.T. as a prediction which had found its fulfillment in some fact in the history of Jesus Christ or his Church, merely for the purpose of overcoming Jewish prejudices, and leading those who venerated the O.T. to receive more readily the message of Christianity; or if they were found not only clothing their ideas in language borrowed from the Mosaic ceremonial, but asserting a correspondence of meaning between that ceremonial and the fact or doctrines they announced when no such really existed, thereby warping truth for the sake of subduing prejudice, they would furnish specimens of this species of accommodation.

In both respects, a charge to this effect has been brought against them. It has been alleged that when they say of any event they record that in it was fulfilled such and such a statement of the O.T., or that the event occurred that such and such a statement might be fulfilled, they did so merely in accommodation to Jewish feeling and prejudices. A fitter place will be found elsewhere for considering the import of the formulae ἵνα πληρωθῇ, τότε ἐπληρώθη, and the like. *SEE QUOTATION*. At present it will suffice to observe that it may be admitted that these formulae are occasionally used where there can have been no intention on the part of the writer to intimate that in the event to which they relate there was the fulfillment of a prediction; as, for instance, where some gnome or moral maxim contained in the O.T. is said to be fulfilled by something recorded in the N.T., or some general statement is justified by a particular instance (comp. <4012535>Matthew 12:35; <4815525>John 15:25; <4501717>Romans 1:17; <5902323>James 2:23; <6012222>2 Peter 2:22, etc.). It may be admitted, also, that there are cases where a passage in the O.T. is said to be fulfilled in some event recorded in the N., when all that is intended is that a *similarity* or *parallelism* exists between the two, as is the case, according to the opinion of most, at least, in <4012717>Matthew 2:17, 18. But, whilst these admissions throw the *onus probandi* on those who, in any special instance, maintain that there is in it

an actual fulfillment of an ancient prediction, it would be preposterous from them to foreclose the question, and maintain that in *no case* is the N.T. passage to be understood as affirming the fulfillment in fact of an ancient prediction recorded in the Old. Because some accommodations of the kind specified are admitted, it would be folly to conclude that nothing but accommodation characterizes such quotations. If this position were laid down, it would not be easy to defend the N.T. writers, nay, our Lord himself, from the charge of insincerity and duplicity.

Still more emphatically does this last observation apply with respect to the notion that our Lord and his apostles accommodated their teaching to the current notions and prejudices of the Jews of their own times. It might seem almost incredible that any one should venture to impute to them so unworthy and so improbable a course, were it not that we find the imputation broadly made, and the making of it defended by some very eminent men of the anti-supernaturalist school, especially in Germany. By them it has been asserted that our Lord and his disciples publicly taught many things which privately they repudiated, and an attempt has been made to save them from the charge of downright dishonesty which this would involve by an appeal to the usage of many ancient teachers who had an exoteric doctrine for the multitude, and an esoteric for their disciples. (Semler, *Programm. Acad. Sel. Hal*. 1779; Corrodi, *Beytrdge zur beforderung des verninftigen Denkens in d. Religion*, 15th part, p. 1-25; ‘P. Van Hemert, *Ueber Accom. in N.T.* Leipz. 1797, etc.). The prompt and thorough repudiation of such views even by such men as Wegscheider (*Instt. Theologicoe*, p. 105, 6th ed.) and Bretschneider (*Handb. der Dogmat*. 1:260, 265, 2d ed.) renders it unnecessary to enlarge on the formal refutation of them. These writers, however, contend that, though our Lord and his apostles did not make use of a positive accommodation of their doctrine to the prejudices or ignorance of the Jews, they did not refrain from a negative accommodation, by which they intend the use of reserve in the communication of truth or refutation of error, and the allowing of “men to retain opinions not authorized by truth without express or formal correction of them. They adduce as instances, <43162>John 16:12; 6:15; <42422>Luke 24:21; <44106>Acts 1:6; <46301>1 Corinthians 3:1, 2; 8:9, etc. By these passages, however, nothing more is proved than that in teaching men truth our Lord and his apostles did not tell them everything at once, but led them on from truth to truth as they were able to receive it or bear it. In this there is no accommodation of the material of doctrine; it is simply an

accommodation of method to the capacity of the learner. In the same way Paul's assertion, which they have also cited, that he became all things to all men, that he might by all means save some (1 Corinthians 9:22), is to be regarded as relating merely to the mode and order of his presenting Christian truth to man, not to his modifying in any respect the substance of what he taught. Wlien he spoke to Jews, he opened and alleged out of their own Scriptures that Jesus was the Christ (Acts 17:2, 3). When he spoke to the Athenians on Mars' Hill, he started from the ground of natural religion, and addressed the reason and common sense of his audience; but in either case it was the same Jesus that he preached, and the same Gospel that he published. Had he done otherwise, he would have been found a false witness for God.

This accommodation theory is often spoken of as identical with the historical principle of interpreting Scripture. It is so, however, only as the historical principle of interpretation means the treating of the statements of our Lord and his apostles as merely expressing the private opinions of the individual, or as historically traceable to the prevailing opinions of their day. This is not to be confounded with that true and sound principle of historical interpretation which allows due weight to historical evidence in determining the meaning of words, and to the circumstances in which statements were made as determining their primary application and significancy. (Storr, *Opusc. Acad.* vol. 1*; Abhandlung u. d. Zweck des Todes Jesu*, § 10; *Lehrb. d. Chr. Dogmatik*, § 13 [Eng. tr. by Schmucker, p. 67, Lond. 1836]; Planck, *Introd. to Sac. Interpretation*, tr. with notes by Turner [N. Y. 1834], p. 138, 276; Unselt, *De accommodatione orthodoxa* [Lips. 1766]; Smith, *First Lines of Christian Theoloqy*, p. 518; Alexander, *Connection and Harmony of the Old and New Testaments*, p. 45-48; 148-157, 416, 2d edit.). *SEE HERMENEUTICS*.

Condict Ira, D.D.,

a clergyman of the Reformed Dutch Church at New Brunswick, N. J., from 1793 to 1811, and vice-president of Queen's (now Rutgers) College, and professor of moral philosophy. He was an eminent, usefull, and honored minister and collegiate officer. He died suddenly in 1811. See Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, IX, 2:79; Corwin, *Manual of the Ref. Ch. in America*, 3d ed. p. 219.

Condignity and Congruity

(*meritum de condigno* and *de congruo*), “terms used by the schoolmen to express their peculiar opinions relative to human merit and deserving. The Scotists maintain that it is possible for man in his natural state so to live as to deserve the grace of God, by which he may be enabled to obtain salvation; this natural *fitness* (*congruitas*) for grace being such as to oblige the Deity to grant it. Such is the *merit of congruity*. The Thomists, on the other hand, contend that man, by the divine assistance, is capable of so living as to merit eternal life, to be *worthy* (*condignus*) of it in the sight of God. In this hypothesis, the question of previous preparation for the grace which enables him to be worthy is not introduced. This is the *merit of condignity*.” The 13th article of the Church of England is directed against these opinions, and ‘maintains that the grace of Christ and the inspiration of his Spirit can alone produce the fitness required in Christians; and that so far are any works not springing of faith in Christ from being pleasing to God, that they have the nature of sin.

Conditional

Strict Calvinists maintain that the decrees of God with regard to the salvation or damnation of individual men are absolute; Arminians, that they are conditional. The Pelagian doctrine is that God’s will to grant grace to men is always conditioned on their so using their natural power as to merit that grace. To say that God decrees to save all men if they will, i.e. if they, without grace, are willing to obey God, is Pelagian; to say that God wills to save all men if they will use the prevenient grace given to them, which they are left at liberty to resist, is Arminian. *SEE ARMINIANISM*; *SEE GRACE*.

Condillac Etienne Bonnot de Mably,

one of the chief French philosophers of the 18th century, brother of the abb: Mably, was born at Grenoble in 1715. At the age of thirty he published his first important work, *Essai sur l’origine des connaissances humaines* (Amsterdam, 1746, 2 vols.; Eng. transl. by Th. Nugent, 1756), by which he largely contributed to the spreading of the views of Locke in France, and to their farther development. This book is a natural history of human cogniition, the foundation of which is found by Condillac in the sensuous impressions and their transformations. To refute the metaphysical systems which do not proceed from experience, he wrote his *Traite des Systemes* (Amsterdam, 1749, 2 vols.). His views on the origin of human

cognition were more fully developed in his *Traite des Sensations* (Amsterdam, 1754, 2 vols.). As he was charged with having plagiarized from Diderot and Buffon, he wrote for his defense *Traite des Animaux* (Amsterdam, 1775). By all these writings Condillac became one of the chief representatives of Sensualism, although he steered clear of the Materialism of his age. His knowledge had procured for him at an early age the position of tutor of the infante of Parma, a nephew of Louis XV. He wrote for him a *Cours d' etude* (Parma, 1775, 13 vols.), which contains a grammar, an *Art d'ecrire*, an *Art de raisonner*, an *Art depenser*, and a universal history. In 1768 he was made a member of the French Academy. During the latter part of his life he lived very retired, and died August 3, 1780. His complete works have appeared in several editions (*OEuvres Complates*, Paris, 1798, 23 vols.; 1803, 32 vols.; 1824, 16 vols.). — (Brockhaus) *Conversat. Lex. s.v.; Wetzer u. Welte, Kirchen-Lex.* 2:764.

Conduit

(hl;[;T] *tealah'* [from hl;[; *alah*, to *ascend*, Gesenius, *Thes. Heb.* p. 1022], a *channel*, "watercourse," <183825>Job 38:25, stream, <263104>Ezekiel 31:4, or "trench," <111832>1 Kings 18:32-38), spoken of the *aqueduct* made by Hezekiah for conveying the waters from the upper pool in the valley of Gihon into the western part of Jerusalem (<121817>2 Kings 18:17; 20:20; <230703>Isaiah 7:3; 36:2); apparently the same with that which now supplies the mosque enclosure with water from the pools at Bethlehem. It seems at first to have been an open trench, but was closed by Hezekiah with masonry on the approach of the Assyrians (Sirach 48:12). *SEE JERUSALEM*.

1. Although no notice is given either by Scripture or by Josephus of any connection between the pools of Solomon beyond Bethlehem and a supply of water for Jerusalem, it seems unlikely that so large a work as the pools should be constructed merely for irrigating his gardens (*Eccl.* 2:6); and tradition, both oral and as represented by Talmudical writers, ascribes to Solomon the formation of the original aqueduct by which water was brought to Jerusalem (Maundrell, *Early Trav*. p. 458; Hasselquist, *Trav.* 146; Lightfoot, *Descr. Templ.* c. 23, vol. 1:612; Robinson, 1:390). Pontius Pilate applied the sacred treasure of the Corban to the work of bringing water by an aqueduct from a distance, Josephus says of 300 or 400 stadia (*War*, 2:9, 4), but elsewhere 200 stadia, a distance which would fairly correspond with the length of the existing aqueduct with all its turns and windings (*Ant.* 18:3, 2; Williams, *Holy City*, 2:501). His application of the

money in this manner gave rise to a serious disturbance. Whether his work was a new one, or a reparation of Solomon's original aqueduct cannot be determined, but it seems more than probable that the ancient work would have been destroyed in some of the. various sieges since Solomon's time. The aqueduct, though much injured, and not serviceable for water beyond Bethlehem, still exists; the water is conveyed from the fountains which supply the pools about two miles S. of Bethlehem. The watercourse then passes from the pools in a N.E. direction, and, winding round the hill of Bethlehem on the S. side, is carried sometimes above and sometimes below the surface of the ground, partly in earthen pipes and partly in a channel about one foot square of rough stones laid in cement, till it approaches Jerusalem. There it crosses the valley of Hinnom at the S.W. side of the city on a bridge of nine arches at a point above the pool called Birket es-Sultan, then returns S.E. and E. along the side of the valley and under the wall, and, continuing its course along the east side, is finally conducted to the Haram. It was repaired by Sultan Mohammed Ibn-Kalaun of Egypt about A.D. 1300 (Williams, *Holy City*, 2:498; Raumer, *Pal*. p. 280; Robinson, 1:514; 2:166; new ed. 3, 247). *SEE POOL*.

2. Among the works of Hezekiah he is said to have stopped the "upper watercourse of Gihon," and brought it down straight to the W. side of the city of David (2 Chronicles 32:30). The direction of this watercourse of course depends on the site of Gihon. Dr. Robinson identifies this with the large pool called Birket es-Mamilla at the head of the valley of Hinnom, on the S.W. side of Jerusalem, and considers the lately-discovered subterranean conduit within the city to be a branch from Hezekiah's watercourse (*Researches, new ed*. 3, 243-4; 1:327; Gesenius, *Thes. Heb.* p. 616, 1395). Mr. Williams, on the other hand, places Gihon on the N. side, not far from the tombs of the kings, and supposes the watercourse to have brought water in a S. direction to the temple, whence it flowed ultimately into the Pool of Siloam, or Lower Pool. One argument which recommends this view is found in the account of the interview between the emissaries of Sennacherib and the officers of Hezekiah, which took place '" by the conduit of the upper pool, in the highway of the fuller's field" (2 Kings 18:17), whose site seems to be indicated by the "fuller's monument" mentioned by Josephus as at the N.E. side of the city, and by the once well-known site called the Camp of the Assyrians (Josephus, *War*, 5:4, 2; 7, 3; 12, 2).; (See Maundrell, p. 456 sq., Bohn's ed.; Richardson, *Travels*,

2:379; Bertheau, *D. Bich. d. Konige*, p. 409; Schultz, *Jerusalem*, p. 40.) *SEE GIHON*.

Cone Spencer Houghton, D.D.,

an eminent Baptist minister, was born in Princeton, N. J., April 30, 1785. His early education was carefully conducted, and at twelve years of age he entered Princeton College. Two years after, through his father's failure in business, he was compelled to leave college, and devoted himself to teaching, first in Princeton, then in Burlington, and finally (under Dr. Abercrombie) in Philadelphia. Here he began to study law; but his fine powers of elocution led him in 1805 to become an actor. He "trod the boards" with distinction for eight years, and then was suddenly converted, and was baptized by immersion Feb. 4, 1814. Obtaining a government clerkship in Washington, he removed thither, and began to preach within a year after his baptism. In 1815-16 he was chaplain to Congress, and immediately became pastor of a Baptist church at Alexandria, D. C. In 1823 he accepted a call from the Oliver Street Baptist Church, New York, where he remained until 1841, when he became pastor of the First Baptist Church, which built a new edifice in Broome Street. In this charge he remained until his death, Aug. 28, 1855. Dr. Cone's career as a preacher was very brilliant. He spoke with great ease, with a rich, sonorous voice, and very appropriate and expressive gestures. In doctrine he was a Calvinist, and a strenuous advocate of Baptist views, but yet courteous and charitable to all Christians. His preaching and pastoral labor exhausted but a small part of his activities. He took a deep interest in missions, was a member of the Baptist Board, and was president of the Convention from 1832 to 1841. He did his utmost to avert the disruption of the Convention in 1845 through the slavery disputes. He was also an officer of the Baptist Home Missionary Society from its beginning in 1832 to 1855. For many years he was active in the service of the American Bible Society, but on the formation of the Baptist (American and Foreign) Bible Society in 1836, which he aided greatly in organizing, he was made its president. On the refusal of this society to embark in the enterprise of "Bible Revision," so called, he seceded from it in order to form the American Bible Union, one of the chief objects of which was to substitute "immerse" for "baptize" in the versions of Scripture. — Sprague, *Annals*, 6:656.

Coney

Picture for Coney

(ˆp,v; *shaphan'*; Sept. χοιρογρύλλιος), an animal joined in <3B11C5>Leviticus 11:5, and <5147>Deuteronomy 14:7, with the hare, and described as chewing the cud; in <19A418>Psalm 104:18, it is spoken of as an inhabitant of the mountains and rocks, and in <201626>Proverbs 30:26, it is represented as a feeble, but gregarious and cunning animal. These descriptions some think agree best with the different species of the *jerboa*, the *Mus jaculus* of Linnaeus. It is on the authority of Rabbinical writers that the word has by our translators been rendered "coney," or *rabbit*, which cannot be sustained, as the rabbit is not an Asiatic animal, and does not seek a rocky habitation, which is the leading characteristic by which the *shaphan* is distinguished. "The animal is, in truth, as Bruce justly indicated, the same as the *Ashkoko* of Abyssinia, or *Daman* of Syria, the *Wabber* of the Arabs, and in scientific zoology is one of the small genus Hyrax, distinguished by the specific name of Syrian (*Syriacus*). This animal has been described by travelers as a ruminant, but this is an error. The number, shape, and structure of the teeth are totally different (as is true also of the hare); nor is the jawbone articulated so as to admit freely of a similar action; finally, the internal structure, as well as the whole osteology, represents that of a rhinoceros in miniature, and has no appearance of the complicated fourfold stomachs of ruminants; therefore the hyrax is neither a rodent like hares and rabbits, nor a ruminant, but is anomalous, and most nearly allied to the great pachyderms of systematic zoology. It may be that the peculiar structure of their anterior teeth is convenient for stripping off the seeds of grasses and tritica, and that these, in part retained in the mouth, cause a practice of working the jaws, which, to common observers, may appear to be chewing the cud. In hares and rats a similar appearance is produced by a particular friction of the incisors or nippers, which, growing with great rapidity, would soon extend beyond a serviceable length if they were not kept to their proper size by constant gnawing, and by working the cutting edges against each other. This action, observed in the motion of the lips of most rodents when in a state of rest, caused the belief of rumination in the hare, though, like the hyrax, all rodentia are equally unprovided with the several stomachs, and want the muscular apparatus necessary to force the food back into the mouth for remastication at pleasure, which constitute the leading peculiarities of the anatomical structure of the ruminantia. But

they may possess, in common with pachydermata, like the horse and hog, the peculiar articulation and form of jaws which give them the power of grinding their food, and laminated teeth fitted for the purpose. Externally the hyrax is somewhat of the size, form, and brownish color of a rabbit, and it has short, round cars, sufficiently like for inexact observers to mistake the one for the other. The hyrax is of clumsier structure than the rabbit, without tail, having long bristly hairs scattered through the general fur; the feet are naked below, and all the nails are flat and rounded, save those on each inner toe of the hind feet, which are long and awl-shaped; therefore the species cannot dig, and is by nature intended to reside, not, like rabbits, in burrows, but in the clefts of rocks. This character is correctly applied to the shaphan by David." The total length of the animal as it sits is about one foot. It presents at first sight the idea of a rat rather than any other creature. The color is gray, mixed with reddish-brown, and the belly white. They do not appear to have any cry, nor do they stand upright in walking, but seem to steal along as if in fear, advancing a few steps at a time, and then pausing. "Their timid, gregarious habits, and the tenderness of their paws, make them truly 'the wise and feeble folk' of Solomon, for the genus lives in colonies in the crevices of stony places in Syria, Palestine, Arabia, Eastern Egypt, Abyssinia, and even at the Cape of Good Hope, where one or two additional species exist. In every locality they are quiet, gentle creatures, loving to bask in the sun, never stirring far from; their retreats, moving with caution, and shrinking from the shadow of a passing bird, for they are often the prey of eagles and hawks; their habits are strictly diurnal, and they feed on vegetables and seeds." The flesh of the shaphan was forbidden the Hebrews, and it appears that the Mohammedans and Christians of the East at the present day abstain from the flesh of the daman. (See further particulars in the *Penny Cyclopedia*, s.v. Hyrax; also Bochart, Hieroz. 2:421 sq.; Rosenmüller, *Alterth.* IV, 2:213 sq.; Shaw, *Trav*. p. 301; Sonnini. 1:98; Bruce, 7:241; Hasselquist, p. 277 sq. Wilson, *Bible Lands*, 2:28; Laborde, *Voyages*, p. 47; Robinson, *Researches*, new edit. 3, 387; Thomson, *Land and Book*, 1:460; Oedmann, *Sarml*. 4:48; Lucas, *Allerneuste* R. p. 300; Oken, *NaturGesch.* VII, 2:889; Ehrenberg, *Symbol*. phys. i, fig. 2; Ludolf, *Lex. Anmhar*. p. 58; *Hist. Ethiop*. *lib.* i, c. 10, § 75; Peyron, *Lex*. p. 314; Gesenius, *Thes. Heb.* p. 1467; *Vloten*. Spec. p. 46; Schubert, Reis. 3, 110; Gesen. ad Burckhardt, p. 1076; Forskal, *Descript. anim*. p. v; Fresnel, in the *Asiatic Journal*, June, 1838, p. 514; Isenberg, *Lex. Amhar*. p. 122; Kitto, *Phys. History of Palest*. p. 376; Laborde, *Syria*, p. 114.) *SEE ZOOLOGY*.

Confalon

a fraternity of seculars in the Church of Rome called penitents, established originally by some Roman citizens. Henry III commenced a similar fraternity in Paris in 1583, and, dressed in the habit of a penitent, assisted at a procession wherein the cardinal of Guise carried the cross, and his brother, the duke of Mayence, was master of the ceremonies. Hook, *Church Dictionary*, s.v.

Confection

(j qir o, *ro'kach*, [023035]Exodus 30:35), CONFECTIONARY (h j Q;r i, *rakkachah'*, [090813]1 Samuel 8:13), both derived from the root t qir ;(*rakach'*), to spice, denote respectively perfume and a female perfumer, as the passages cited and the kindred terms derived from the same root (and translated "apothecary," "perfume," "ointment") indicate. *SEE APOTHECARY*.

Conference

the bringing together of individual opinions upon any subject of debate: hence applied, peculiarly, to religious discussions of any kind ([480206]Galatians 2:6).

Conference, Free-Will Baptist.

The ecclesiastical bodies among Free-Will Baptists, higher than the congregation, are the Quarterly Meeting, the Yearly Meeting, and the General *Conference*. The latter meets every three years. *SEE BAPTISTS, FREEWILL*.

Conference, Hampton-Court.

A conference held at Hampton Court in the year 1604, between nine bishops and as many other dignitaries of the Church on the one side, and four Puritan divines on the other. It was held in the presence of James I, and lasted for three days. Some of the demands of the Puritans were acceded to, but others were rejected. One lasting advantage, however, resulted from this conference, namely, our present authorized version of the Bible. Some alterations also were made in the Liturgy; all the thanksgivings now in use were inserted except the "general" one, which was subsequently introduced; and there was annexed to the Catechism the

portion explaining the sacraments. — Eden, *Churchman's Dictionary*, s.v.; Neal, *History of the Puritans*, 2:30; Mosheim, *Ch. Hist.* 3, 408.

Conference, Methodist.

There are three synods or judicatories styled *Conferences* in the Methodist Episcopal Church.

I. The *Quarterly Conference* of each circuit or station consists of the "travelling and local preachers, exhorters, stewards, and class-leaders of the circuit or station. The presiding elder, and, in his absence, the preacher in charge, is president. The regular business of the Quarterly Conference is to hear complaints, and to receive and try appeals; to superintend the interests of Sunday-schools, to license local preachers, 'to appoint stewards," etc. (*Discipline*, pt. 2, ch. 1, § 3).

II. The *Annual Conference* is composed of all the ministers in a certain territory included in the "Conference." There are now (1867) fifty-nine Conferences of the Methodist Episcopal Church, including Mission Conferences, besides those of the Methodist Episcopal Church South. The functions of the Annual Conference are purely administrative. At each session the preachers are "appointed" to their several stations for the ensuing year by the bishop (Discipline, pt. 2, ch. 1, § 2).

III. The *General Conference* is "composed of one member for every twenty-seven members of each Annual Conference, appointed either by seniority or choice, at the discretion of such Annual Conference." It meets once in four years, and is presided over by the bishops. It has full power to "make rules and regulations for the Church," subject to certain limitations known as "constitutional restrictions" (*Discipline*, pt. 2, ch. 1, § 1). *SEE METHODISM*.

In the Wesleyan Church, in England, all the ministers meet in one Conference. "The first Conference of the Wesleyan Methodists was held in London in the year 1744. It was attended only by six persons, five of whom were clergymen. By them the characters of the preachers were examined, differences of theological opinions repressed, the stations of the preachers determined, and their hearts warmed and cheered by mutual consultation and prayer. As Mr. Wesley declined into the vale of years, the perpetuity of that system of doctrine and discipline, which had been so signally owned of God in the conversion and salvation of men, became a

matter of anxious concern both to himself and his people. The appointment of the preachers to the various chapels, and to the consequent pastoral charge of the societies, presented the greatest difficulty. The preachers felt the importance of the case, and requested Mr. Wesley to consider what could be done in this emergency, so that, in the event of his death, the connection might not be dissolved. He took legal advice, and drew up the 'deed of declaration,' constituting one hundred preachers by name 'the Conference of the people called Methodists;' at the same time defining their powers, and making provision for the filling up of all vacancies occasioned by death, superannuation, or expulsion. This deed he caused to be enrolled in the High Court of Chancery in the year 1784. Thus the power of government which Mr. Wesley possessed during his life, by his appointment devolved upon the Conference after his decease, he having nominated its members, provided for its perpetuity, and defined its powers by the 'deed of declaration.' To prevent any abuse of this instrument on the part of the 'legal hundred,' Mr. Wesley left a letter, to be read by the Conference at its first assembling after his death, of which we subjoin an extract: 'I beseech you, by the mercies of God, that you never avail yourselves of the "deed of declaration" to assume any superiority over your brethren, but let all things go on, among those itinerants who choose to remain together, exactly in the same manner as when I was with you, so far as circumstances will permit. Have no respect of persons in stationing the preachers, in choosing children for Kingswood school, in disposing of the yearly contribution and the preachers' fund, or any other public money, but do all things with a single eye, as I have done from the beginning.' When this letter was read after Mr. Wesley's decease, the Conference unanimously resolved that all the preachers who are in full connection with them shall enjoy every privilege that the members of the Conference enjoy, agreeably to the above-written letter of our venerable deceased father in the Gospel. The Conference of the preachers of the Methodist societies is held annually in some one of the principal cities and towns in the kingdom. Representatives from the Irish Conference, whose sittings precede the English Conference by a few weeks, regularly attend." See Jackson, *Centenary of Wesleyan Methodism*, 1839; Stevens, *History of Methodism.*

Conference, Pastoral,

a meeting of ministers for the discussion of questions relating to their pastoral duties. Many meetings of this name are regularly held in many countries, both within the Protestant and the Roman Catholic churches.

Among the best known of the class in Europe belong the annual meetings of the ministers of the Protestant churches of France at Paris. *SEE FRANCE*.

Conference, Roman Catholic,

a meeting of priests for the discussion of religious and ecclesiastical topics. They are either convoked by the bishop of the diocese, or are held by priests of their own accord. Conferences are not mentioned before the 11th century. They seem to have had their origin in the large extent of the dioceses, which made the regular meetings of all the clergy of a diocese difficult. They consequently met in deaneries and archipresbyteries, under the presidence of the dean and archpriest. They were called *Calendae* because they were held on the first day of the month, or Chapters, Consistories, Synods, Sessions. They were common until the middle of the 13th century, when they fell into disuse. In the 16th century cardinal Charles Borromeo gave special regulations on these conferences, and:ordered them to be held regularly. The same order was given by a number of French provincial synods. In 1720 they were declared by the congregation of the Council of Trent to be a proper substitute for diocesan synods. They have, however, never been in general use. Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* 2:766.

Conference, Savoy,

a series of meetings held by royal commission at the residence of the bishop of London, in the Savoy, in the year 1661, between the bishops and the Nonconformist ministers, in order so to review, alter, and reform the Liturgy as to meet the feelings of those who had serious scruples against its use, and thereby promote the peace of the Church. The individuals chosen comprehended the archbishop of York, with twelve bishops, on the one side, and eleven Nonconformist ministers on the other. Had the episcopal ministers entered into a fair and open discussion on the points at issue, reconciliation, to a certain extent, might have taken place; but as they were from the beginning averse from conceding a single iota to the Dissenters, the negotiation turned out a complete failure. At a convocation of the bishops, held almost immediately after, instead of removing anything that was at all likely to stumble tender consciences, they rendered the Liturgy still more objectionable by adding the story of Bel and the Dragon to the

lessons taken from the Apocrypha. See Procter, *On Common Prayer*, ch. 5; Neal, *History of the Puritans*, pt. 4, ch. 6.

Confessio Augustana

SEE AUGSBURG, CONFESSION OF.

Confessio Belgica

SEE BELGIC CONFESSION.

Confession

In the Church of Rome and in the Eastern churches the confession of sins is considered to be one of the seven sacraments. *SEE AURICULAR CONFESSION*. The law prescribing how often the member of the Church should go to confession was not uniform in all parts of the Church, some synods enjoining one, others two, others three confessions a year. Since the Council of Trent, the Church inflicts ecclesiastical censures only upon those who omit going to confession once a year. For nuns the Council of Trent prescribes a confession once a month. Priests are exhorted to go often to confession; some synods, like that of Ghent, enjoined upon them a weekly confession.

In the Middle Ages it was customary to pay a tax to the priests (*nummus confessionarius*) for hearing confession; but the demand for the abolition of this custom was so urgent that after the 16th century the payment of the tax was generally optional, and in this form it still exists in some Roman Catholic countries. Offerings of this kind remained also in use in many Lutheran churches until the present century, while the Reformed churches entirely abolished them.

The priest to whom a confession is made has the duty of observing with regard to it an absolute silence. No exception *whatever* is allowed to this rule. If a person makes communication to a priest of a crime which is still to be committed, the priest must try to change the mind of such a person, and induce him to do all that is possible to prevent its being committed by others, but he is not allowed to notify the secular government of it. In several countries (as Prussia) the civil law demanded in the latter case a notification, but the Church of Rome has always refused compliance with such a law. Luther, and the Church regulations in the Lutheran countries, also enjoined the strictest observance of the secret of confession.

Confession Auricular.

SEE AURICULAR.

Confession Of Faith,

a collection of the articles of belief of any Church. *SEE CREED*.

I. *Their Use in the Church*. —

(1.) The Protestant Confessions were the result of efforts, at the dawn of reviving toleration, to separate the Christian doctrines from the mass of corruption which ignorance, negligence, or artifice had conduced to accumulate around them, under an implicit obedience to the authority and domination of the Church of Rome.

(2.) Many persons altogether object to Creeds and Confessions of Faith on the ground that they infringe Christian liberty, supersede the Scriptures, exclude topics which ought not to be excluded, and ‘admit such as ought not to be admitted; are often too particular and long; are liable to be abused; tempt men to hypocrisy; preclude improvement; and have been employed as means of persecution. It is said further “that confessional formularies, if they do not supersede the Word of God, are placed on a parity with it, and, to a wide extent, are of greater practical authority. Two consequences follow: the first is, that spiritual life is either altogether extinguished, or, where it exists, is so dwarfed and imprisoned that it has neither scope nor power of manifestation; and the second, that fellow-Christians who occupy a domain on the outside of the confessional pale are condemned as schismatics, and at the same time feared as if they were foes.”

(3.) On the other hand, the arguments in favor of them are such as the following. All arts and sciences have been reduced to system, and why should not the truths of religion, which are of greater importance? A compendious view of the principal points of the Christian religion must be useful to inform the mind, as well as to hold forth to the world. which are the sentiments of particular churches. They tend to discover the common friends of the same faith to each other, and to unite them together. The Scriptures countenance them. We have the moral law, the Lord’s prayer, “the form of doctrine,” mentioned by St. Paul (Romans 6:17), and “the form of sound words” (2 Timothy 1:13). Their becoming the occasion

of hypocrisy is not the fault of the Confessions, but of those who subscribe them. If all Creeds and Confessions were expressed in the words of Scripture, this would set aside all exposition and interpretation, and would destroy all means of distinguishing the sentiments of one man from those of another (Farrar, s.v.). And to say that each individual is to interpret the Creeds by the Bible, and to hold and publish his own interpretation, without reference to that of the Church to which he may belong, "is not to exalt the Scriptures, but only to confound the uses of the Word of God and the word of the Church. The one is at all times the ultimate appeal of every believer's conscience; the other is the interpretation of that appeal by the collective body of the Church. The Church does not first make a minister, and then tie him down to her articles; but the minister, professing to have been moved by the Holy Ghost, and demanding to exercise his office and to be intrusted with the cure of souls in the community to which he applies, is asked by the Church whether his individual interpretation of the Scripture accords with that of the collective mind of his brethren. If he cannot answer in the affirmative, it is evident that he must exercise his ministry elsewhere. A particular Church may be in the wrong, and an individual may be in the right; in which case there will arise controversy, and the Church, by the secession and opposition of individuals, may be led to modify and improve its theology. But this must be done by a collective act, and not by the insubordination of private clergymen filling the Church with various doctrines, and giving to its proclamation of the Gospel an uncertain sound. For, if it were otherwise, what heresy could be excluded?"

(4.) In the interpretation of Confessions there are some distinctions perpetually overlooked, some most important principles of interpretation but little attended to. For instance, sometimes the *private opinions* of the framers of formularies confessedly go beyond them; now these private opinions are sometimes appealed to as a proof that the formularies ought to be understood in that extended sense, whereas they prove the direct contrary. (See Archbishop Whately's *Kingdom of Christ*, sec. 24.) If, indeed, the writings of these framers contain indications of the design with which they were framed, this ought to be considered. For instance, articles, etc., framed manifestly on purpose to exclude certain Romish doctrines, as being so utterly unscriptural as to justify and enforce that separation from Rome which the Reformers deliberately resolved on, ought not to be interpreted so as to be consistent with these doctrines; not, however,

because this would have been at variance with the private opinions of each Reformer separately, but because it would be at variance with their deliberate public declaration as a body. Again, there is a distinction to be observed between the interpretation (i) of anything put forth by an individual for the purpose of instructing others or explaining his own views, and (ii) of anything emanating from an assembly, the members of which could not be expected exactly to agree, not only in every shade of opinion, and the relative importance also of every point, but also in the degree of concession to be made to those before whom their declarations were to be put; e.g. an individual (unless a blunderer) will never make one part of his statement so far neutralize the other, that the whole effects no object which might not have been equally well obtained by omitting the whole, yet some public declarations drawn up by assemblies of sensible men may be expected to be such; the XVIIth 'Article' of the Church of England, for instance, is by many considered to contain nothing which might not have been attained by omitting it. In any such case, it may have been that a strong majority think it will be requisite to say something on the point; many may think that so and so ought to be said; and many others may object to this, unless some qualification be added, such as nearly to neutralize it. These principles of interpretation are incalculably important, and should be constantly remembered" (Eden, s.v.). *SEE CREEDS*.

II. *Confessions of different Churches*. —

1. That of the Greek Church, entitled "The Confessions of the True and Genuine Faith," which was presented to Mohammed II in 1453, but which gave place to the "Orthodox Confession of the Catholic and Apostolic Greek Church," composed by Mogila, metropolitan of Kiev, in Russia, and approved in 1643 by the patriarchs of Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem. It contains the standard of the principles of the Russian-Greek Church. For the originals, see *Libri `Symbolici ecclesioe Orientalis*, ed. Eo J. Kimmel (Jena, 1843, 8vo); Neale, *Hist. of the Eastern Church* (Lond. 1850, 2 vols.). *SEE GREEK CHURCH*.

2. The *Church of Rome*, though she has always received the Apostles', Nicene, and Athanasian creeds, had no fixed, public, and authoritative symbol till the Council of Trent. A summary of the doctrines contained in the canons of that council is given in the creed published by Pius IV (1564) in the form of a bull. It is introduced by the Nicene Creed, to which it adds twelve articles, comprising those doctrines which the Church of Rome

finally adopted after her controversies with the Reformers. *SEE CREED OF PIUS IV*. Besides this creed, and the "*Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent*," the Church of Rome acknowledges no symbolical books as authoritative. *SEE TRENT, COUNCIL OF*. The best editions are *Canon. et Decret. Concil. Trid*. (Lips. 1853, 8vo); Buckley, *Canons and Decrees of Trent* (Lond. 1851, 12mo); Donovan, *Catechism of the Council of Trent* (Balt. 8vo). See also Streitwolf, *Lib. Symb. Eccl. Cath*. (Gott. 1844), and the article TRENT *SEE TRENT* .

3. The Lutheran books of faith and discipline are called *Libri Symbolici Ecclesiae Evangelicae*. They contain the three creeds — Apostles', Nicene, and Athanasian, *SEE CREEDS*, the Augsburg Confession, *SEE AUGSBURG*, the "Apology" for that Confession by Melancthon, the Articles of Smalcald (q.v.) drawn up by Luther, the Catechisms of Luther, and in many churches the Form of Concord, or Book of Berg. *SEE CONCORD*. The Saxon, Wirtemburg, Suabian, Pomeranian, Mansfeldtian, and Copenhagen Confessions agree in general with the symbolical books of the Lutherans, but are authoritative only in the countries after which they are respectively called. There are many editions of the *Libri Symbolici*; the best-and most convenient are those of Hase (3d edit. Leip. 1846, 12mo) and of Francke (*edit. stereot*. Leips. 1846, 12mo). *SEE LUTHERAN CHURCH*.

4. Of the *Calvinistic* Confessions the following are the principal:

(1.) The four Helvetic Confessions that of Basle, 1530; the Summary and Confession of the Helvetic churches, 1536; the *Expositio Simplex*, etc., 1566, ascribed to Bullinger; and the *Formula Consensus Helvetici*. 1675. *SEE HELVETIC*.

(2.) The Tetrapolitan Confession, 1531, which derives its name from four cities, Strasburg, Constance, Memmingen, and Lindau, by the deputies of which it was signed: it is attributed to Bucer.

(3.) The Palatine or Heidelberg Catechism, framed by Ursinus and Olevianus, first published in 1563. *SEE HEIDELBERG*.

(4.) The Confession of the Gallic churches, accepted at the first synod of the Reformed, held at Paris, 1559. *SEE GALLICAN CONFESSION*.

(5.) The Confession of the Reformed churches in Belgium, drawn up in 1559, and approved in 1561. *SEE BELGIC*.

(6.) The Confession of Faith of Scotland, allowed by the Estates in 1560, and subscribed by king James in 1561.

(7.) The Westminster Confession. *SEE WESTMINSTER*.

(8.) The Canons of the Synod of Dort. *SEE DORT*. See *Corpus Librorum Symbolicorum*, ed. J. C. G. Augusti (Elberfeld, 1827, 8vo); *Collectio Confessionum in Eccles. reformatis*, edit. H. A. Niemeyer (Lipsiae, 1840, 8vo, the most complete and convenient manual); Bockel, *Die Bekenntnissschriften der evangelisch-reformirten, Kirche* (Leipz. 1847). The last-named work contains, besides all the Reformed Confessions of Faith (of Germany, Switzerland, France, Great Britain, Bohemia, Hungary, Poland, and the Netherlands), brief introductions and notes to each of them.

5. The *Anglican* Confession, or "Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England," agreed on in the Convocation held in London, 1552. They were drawn up: in Latin, but in 1571 they were revised, and subscribed both in Latin and English. *SEE ARTICLES, 39*; *SEE ENGLAND, CHURCH OF*. They were adopted by the Protestant Episcopal Church in 1801, with some alterations, and the rejection of the Athanasian Creed. A selection from these forms the "Articles of the Methodist Episcopal Church." *SEE ARTICLES, 25*; *SEE METHODIST EPISCOPAL*.

The subject of "Confessions of Faith" is treated in Systematic Theology under the head of Symbolism, or Symbolics. The best special collections and textbooks, besides those already named, are: Marheineke, *Institutiones symbolicae doct. Cath., Prot., Socin., ecclesiae Greece Minorumque Societ. Christian*. (Berlin, 1830, 3d ed. 8vo); Guericke, *Allgemeine chr. Symbolik* (Leips. 1846, 8vo); Winer, *Comparative Darstellung des Lehrbegrifs der verschiedenen christlichen Kirchenpartheien* (Lips. 1837, 4to); Mohler, . A. (*Romanist*), *Symbolism, or Exposition of the Doctrinal Differences betw. Cath. and Prot.* (New York, 1844, 8vo); *Corpus et Syntagma Confessionum fidei* (Genev. 1654, 4to); Hall, *Harmony of Protestant Confessions* (London, 1844,. 8vo); *Sylloge Confessionum, edit. auct*. (Oxon. 1827, 8vo). Very convenient manuals are Hahn, *Das Bekenntniss der evangelischen Kirche, in seinemn Verhaltniss zu d. romischen u. griechischen* (Lips. 1853, 12mo); Hofmann, *Symbolik* (1856, 8vo); Heurtley, *Harmonia Symbolica* (Oxford, 1858, 8vo). — Winer, *Theol. Lit.* 11; Hend. Buck, s.v.; Pelt, *Theol. Encyclopedie*, § 67; Hagenbach, *Theol. Encyclop*. § 76; Hill, *Divinity, Am. ed*., p. 751.

The general *harmony* of the Protestant Confessions has been shown in various publications. Bossuet's *Histoire des Variations des Eglises Protestantes* (1688) was written to show that the Protestant churches were wide asunder in points of faith; and Basnage's *Histoire de la Religion des Eglises Reformees* (Rott. 1725, 2 vols. 4to) affords a thorough refutation of Bossuet. The Assembly of Frankfort, 1577, entertained the question of a new Confession, which should be adopted by all, or nearly all, the Protestant bodies. A number of divines (among whom Beza, Salvart, and Dalean are named) accordingly drew up a *Harmonia Confessionum Fidei Orthodoxarum et Rebormatarum Ecclesiarum, etc*. (Geneva, 1581, 4to). It embodies, under heads of doctrine, the following eleven Confessions: Augsburg, the Tetrapolitana, Basle, Helvetian, Saxony, Wartemberg, France, England, Helvetica posterior, Belgium, and Bohemia (see Niemeyer, *Prof. ad Coll. Confess*. 5-9). An English translation was immediately made, and published under the title, *An Harmony of the Confessions of Faith of Christian and Reformed Churches*, etc. (Camb. 1586, 12mo; London, 1643, 4to). A new edition of this very valuable work was published in 1842 by the Rev. P. Hall, with important prolegomena and additions (Lond. 1842; again 1844, 8vo). This edition gives also in an appendix, in English, the 39 Articles; the Westminster Confession of 1647; Usher's *Articles adopted by the Convocation of the Episcopal Church in Ireland*, 1615; and the *Articles of the Synod of Dort*.

Among minor works of this class we name Stuart, *The Scriptural Unity of Protestant Churches, exhibited in their published Confessions* (Dublin, 1835, 12mo); contains the 39 Articles, the Irish Articles, the Confession of the Church of Scotland, and a Declaration of Faith of the Congregational dissenters. Also Cumming, *Unity of Protestantism, being Articles of Religion from the Creeds of the Reformed Churches* (Lond. 1837, 8vo), which contains extracts from nine Confessions, arranged under heads. See Hall, *Harmony of Protestant Confessions* (Lond. 1842, 8vo). For the three ecumenical Confessions, *SEE CREED, APOSTLES*; *SEE CREED, ATHANASIAN*; *SEE CREED, NICENE*.

Confessional

the cell in which the Romish confessor sits to hear confessions. It is erected within the church, with a boarded back against the wall, or against a pillar or pier, and is divided into three niches. The center, which is intended for the priest, is closed half-way up by a dwarf door, and has a seat within it.

There is a small grated aperture in each of the partitions between the priest and the side-cells, which are for those who come to confess. The earliest laws which give a prescription concerning the place where confession (q.v.) is to be made, provide that such places shall be open so that they may be seen by all. Nuns according to a decree of the Synod of Paris of 829, must confess before the altar in the presence of witnesses not standing off very far. The first traces of confessionals as they are now in use in the Church of Rome are found in the second half of the 16th century, when several synods (Cosenza, 1579; Malfi. 1591) enjoined that every church should have as many confessionals and confessors (priests hearing confessions) as were necessary, which, however, should be so conspicuous that both the priest and the confessing person could be seen without difficulty by every one in the Church. —Herzog, *Real-Encykl*. 2:786. *SEE SHRIVING-PEW*.

Confessor

(1.) In early ecclesiastical history the Word is frequently used for martyr (q.v.), but its proper application was to those who, after having been tormented, were permitted to live and die in peace. At length it indicated those who, after having lived a good life, died under the reputation of sanctity. According to Cyprian, he who presented himself to torture, or even to martyrdom, without being called to it, was not designated a *confessor*, but a *professor*; and if any through want of courage abandoned his country, and became' a voluntary exile for the sake of the faith, he was called *ex terris*. Later the title Confessor was applied to persons of eminently pious life as "witnessing a good confession." Edward of England was made "Confessor" by a bull of Alexander III.

(2.) In the Romish Church, a confessor is an ordained priest who has power to hear sinners in the so-called sacrament of penance, and to give them "absolution." He is generally designated *confessarius*, to distinguish him from *confessor*. The confessors of the kings of France, from the time of Henry IV, were constantly Jesuits; before them, the Dominicans and Cordeliers shared the office between them. The confessors of the house of Austria have also ordinarily been Dominicans and Cordeliers, but the later emperors have taken Jesuits. — Mosheim, *Church History*, 1:54. *SEE AURICOULAR*.

Confirmation

a rite by which, in some Christian churches, baptized persons are fully admitted into the Church by the imposition of hands and prayer. The Churches which practice this ceremony profess to do it in imitation of apostolic example recorded in the New Testament.

(1.) It appears from the Acts that the apostles laid hands only on baptized persons, as in the case of the converted Samaritans, <44082>Acts 8:12-17, and the disciples at Ephesus, <44195>Acts 19:5, 6. It is, however, evident that in those passages, allusion is made to the miraculous gifts imparted by the apostles. It is said that "when Simon saw that through laying on of the apostles' hands the Holy Ghost was given, he offered them money, saying, Give me also this power, that on whomsoever I lay hands he may receive the Holy Ghost." Nothing is said of the laying on of hands in the baptism of the three thousand on the day of Pentecost (<44238>Acts 2:38-42). Nor does the ceremony appear to have taken place at the baptism of Lydia and her household, <44165>Acts 16:15; or the Philippian jailer and his family, <44164>Acts 16:31-33. In <58602>Hebrews 6:2, mention is made of "the doctrine of the laying on of hands" immediately after that of "the doctrine of baptisms," but there is no intimation that the two transactions were connected. The journey of St. Paul through Syria and Cilicia to confirm the churches does not necessarily imply the rite of confirmation as practiced by the Church of England. These churches had been probably planted by himself at an earlier period. and he now gives them such regulations as are necessary for their welfare, ordaining elders, imparting miraculous gifts, so important to the instruction of converts, and to the furnishing convincing evidences of the truth and power of the Gospel. The unction, or chrism, referred to in <62027>1 John 2:27, and <47021>2 Corinthians 1:21, has been supposed by some to refer to the ceremony of confirmation; it seems rather to relate to a spiritual anointing, to the royal and priestly dignity of Christians, or to the communication of extraordinary and miraculous gifts.

(2.) As the practice cannot be traced to New-Testament authority, so neither do the earliest records of ecclesiastical antiquity contain any clear and certain testimony concerning it. Passages supposed to refer to this rite have been pointed out in the writings of Dionysius, in the Apostolical Constitutions, in Clement, and in Eusebius; but they rather relate to the sacrament of baptism. Confirmaition in connection with baptism may be traced to the time of Tertullian, who informs us that the ceremonies of

unction and the imposition of hands followed immediately after baptism. Cyprian refers to the subject of confirmation, and applies to it the word sacranentum; but it is evident, from the use of the term at the time in which he wrote, and from the scope of the passages in which it occurs, that sacramentum was not used in its strictly theological meaning, but simply in the sense of ceremony. Numerous references to later writers might be made to show the connection of baptism and confirmation. The baptism of adults being regarded as a solemn compact or covenant, confirmation followed as the seal by which the contract was ratified; and hence confirmation was administered, not by the person officiating, but by the bishop. At the stated baptismal seasons, the bishop was chiefly occupied with the rite of confirmation; but he sometimes commenced the whole solemnity by the baptism of a few individuals with his own hands. When baptism was administered in the absence of the bishop, confirmation was solemnized at some convenient season afterwards, either by the bishop or by his representative. Hence it followed that confirmation was often deferred until several years after baptism, especially in those dioceses which were seldom visited, either on account of their great extent, or the negligence or ignorance of the bishop. Even after the general introduction of infant baptism, confirmation immediately succeeded. In the Oriental churches, baptism, confirmation, and the Lord's Supper are administered in immediate succession; a probable evidence that such was the ancient custom.

(3.) The permanent separation of confirmation from baptism is generally traced to the 13th century. The bishop was, for the most part, the ordinary minister. Several canons deny to the other orders of the clergy the right of confirming; but presbyters appear to have conferred imposition of hands, (*a*) in the absence of the bishop; or, (*b*) in the presence of the bishop, only by his express orders; or, (*c*) on the conversion of a reputed heretic, if such a one, desirous of being received into the church, was at the point of death while the bishop was absent. Deacons were on an equality with presbyters in this respect, until they were absolutely forbidden to administer this rite by the Council of Toledo, A.D. 400.

In the Latin Church, after the separation of confirmation from baptism, a series of preliminary religious exercises was requisite for this rite, similar to those which had been previously required for baptism. Names given in baptism were sometimes changed in confirmation. Sponsors were also required; and a separate edifice in some instances provided, called

consignatorium, albatorium, and *chrismarium.* After the disuse of baptisteries, both baptism and confirmation were administered in the church (Farrar; Bingham, *Orig. Eccles.* bk. 12, ch. 1, 2; Neander, *Ch. Hist.* 1:316).

Confirmation is a *sacrament* in the Romish and Greek churches. In the Greek Church confirmation is administered at the same time with, or as soon as possible after, baptism, even in the case of infants, it being considered perilous to die without it; and in the Latin Church also it is often administered to young children — the Church of Rome not considering a person a "complete Christian" till he has partaken of this "sacrament." To reconcile this opinion with the salvation of children who die after baptism but before confirmation, or "committing actual sin," the Church of Rome has decided that they are confirmed by death, as they cannot sin afterwards. In England. five centuries ago, children were usually confirmed at the age of five years. The Council of Trent appointed from the age of seven to twelve; and a synod of Milan, in 1565, prohibited confirmation under seven years of age. The canon law fixes no time, but says "of perfect age," which may be interpreted strictly or laxly. The earlier German Reformers rejected it even as a ceremony; but it was restored through the influence of Spener in the 17th century, and is now in use, as a renewal of the baptismal covenant, in the Reformed and Lutheran Churches. In the Church of England, and in the Protestant Episcopal Church, it is a formal rite, administered by the bishop. These churches direct that the child shall be confirmed "so soon as he can say the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the Ten Commandments in the vulgar tongue, and is further instructed in the Church Catechism set forth for that purpose." Bishop Gibson, to elucidate the words "years of discretion," in the Act 13, 14, Car. II, refers to Lyndwood's *Gloss upon Archbishop Walter's Constitutions,* which makes the proper age to be above seven and under fourteen. The ritualists and canonists of the English Church generally incline to a tender age. Thus, in reply to Bucer, who "finds fault with our Church for administering confirmation too soon," and says that none ought to be confirmed "who have not had opportunity of giving sufficient testimonies of their faith and desire of living to God by their life and conversation," Wheatly argues that confirmation is administered "to assist them in manifesting their faith and practice, and is not to be deferred till these are already manifested." The rite, he says, is to guard them against sin, before they are exposed to temptation, "that so the Holy Spirit may

take early possession of their youthful hearts, and prevent those sins to which, without his assistance, the very tenderness of their age would be apt to expose them." All that the Church demands, he adds, is "that they should understand the nature and advantages of the rite, and the obligations it lays upon them." The High and Low Church differ as to the essence of confirmation, the latter regarding it as being essentially a personal renewal of the promises made in the name of the subject by others at baptism, while the High-Churchmen look upon it as a kind of sacramental rite for conveying the strengthening power of the Holy Ghost. Some High-Churchmen have therefore maintained that the Roman doctrine of the sacramental character of confirmation (as well as of all the other sacraments of the Church of Rome) may, in some sense, be accepted by the Anglican Church. It is connected with this difference of views as to the sacramental character of confirmation that the High-Churchmen generally urge an earlier (about five or six years) and the LowChurchmen a later age (from fourteen to sixteen), for the performance of the rite. Their difference of opinion became the subject of an animated conference when, a few years ago, bishop Baring, of Durham, refused to confirm any children less than fourteen years of age. See Coleman, *Ancient Christianity*, ch. 20; Bangs, *Original Church*, p. 319 (N. Y. 12mo); Burnet, *Hist. of Engl. Reformation*, 1:466, 583; Wilson, *Bampton Lecture*, p. 260; Whately, *Infant Baptism*, p. 36; Schaff, *Apostolic Church*; Palmer, *On the Church*; Procter, *On Common Prayer*; Elliott, *Delineation of Romanism*. See a list of treatises on catechumens and confirmation in Volbeding's *Index Dissertationum*, p. 144,145.

Conflagration, General

The opinion that the end of the world is to be effected by the agency of fire is very ancient, and was common among heathen philosophers (Ovid, *Metamorph.* 1:256). Other testimonies are quoted by Grotius (*De Veritate Rel. Chr. lib.* 1, § 22). It is not easy to discover the origin of this opinion; it can scarcely be traced to tradition derived from revelation, since there is no distinct reference to such a catastrophe in the Old Testament. It is, moreover, remarkable, considering how universal and definite is the ordinary belief on the subject, that there is only one passage in the New Testament, viz., 2 Peter 3:7-10, which can be adduced as speaking distinctly of this event. This passage is, indeed, very explicit, but some learned and able expositors have referred it altogether to the destruction of Jerusalem and of the Jewish polity. Among these are Dr. Lightfoot (*Horae*

Hebr. in Job. 21, 22) and Dr. John Owen (Θεολογούμενα, edit. Bremen, 1684, p. 147, quoted by Dr. Pye Smith, *Scripture and Geology*, sect. 6, p. 233, 1st ed.). If, however, with the majority of interpreters, we refer the prediction to the end of the world, to which it seems most naturally to apply, we could not have a more distinct statement of the fact that the present order of things is to be terminated by the world we inhabit and all the works of man it contains being "burnt up." There is no reason for assuming that the whole material universe is to be involved in this catastrophe; the mention of the heavens leads our thoughts no farther than the atmosphere and vapors surrounding this planet. Nor should we regard this conflagration as involving the absolute destruction or annihilation of the world; it is more consistent with the narrative itself, as well as with physical science, to consider it as introductory to a new and better state of things-"new heavens and a new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness" (ver. 11). By what means the conflagration is to be effected we are not informed, and all attempts to explain how this is to be accomplished must be mere speculation. We have only at present to remark that such an event is not inconsistent with physical facts. We know that the temperature of the earth increases gradually and with considerable regularity as we descend below the surface (Phillips, *Geology*, 2:232), and we have every reason to believe that the central mass is intensely hot. We know, moreover, that there are subterranean fires of great extent, if not forming part of this heated central mass. The means, therefore, of combustion are near at hand. But even if there were no such central heat, chemistry points out very easy means by which the conflagration may be effected through the agency of various elementary substances (Phillips, *Geology*, 2:211). We find evidence also in the pyrogenous rocks which form so large a part of the crust of the earth, that the world has already been subjected, if not to conflagration, yet to a more intense and general action of heat than any which is now observed on the surface of the earth; and it is clearly not impossible that the action may be yet more intense and more general. The example of the conflagration of a star in the constellation of the Northern Crown in May, 1866, by the sudden evolution of hydrogen gas, shows one way in which such a catastrophe might be produced (*Bibliotheca Sacra*, July, 1867, p. 473). In speculating on this subject, however, the caution of Calvin should not be disregarded, that the apostle is not speaking to gratify the speculations of the curious, but to add impressiveness to his pious exhortations (*Comm.* in 2 Peter 3:10).

Conformity

strictly means,

(1) the being reduced to the *same shape* with anything else; hence it has acquired the figurative sense of

(2) agreement with any existing set of principles, or any institution; and has, in a more limited and technical sense, been used for

(3) *compliance with the discipline of the Church of England*.

“Conformists” are therefore generally contrasted with “Nonconformists,” a name which now includes generally all those who, either in doctrine or government, or both, dissent from the Church of England. A declaration is required of all persons who are to be licensed or instituted to an ecclesiastical charge in the Church of England in the following words: “I, A. B., do declare that I will conform to the Liturgy of the Church of England as it is now by law established.” This declaration is to be made and subscribed before the bishop or his commissary, and the making and subscription thereof is to be testified under the episcopal seal of the bishop, and under the hand of the bishop or his commissary. — Eden, *Churchman’s Theol. Dict*.; Hook, *Church Dict*.

Conformists

SEE CONFORMITY.