

## LAYING ON HANDS.

ACTS vi. 6.

AS there is much diversity in the Scriptural use of this phrase, we will limit our inquiry to "What is its Scriptural signification as a *religious rite*?"

In Gen. xlviii. 14, the venerable Jacob laid his hands on the heads of his grandsons, Ephraim and Manasseh; blessed them; acknowledged them as constituents of the Abrahamic family; from which the Messiah was to come. There is no account of any such laying on hands in his own case; or in the case of Isaac; or in the case of any one of Jacob's sons.

At Lev. viii. 14, 18, 22, Moses brought a bullock for a sin-offering, and Aaron and his sons laid their hands upon his head; so with a ram for a burnt-offering; so with a ram of consecration. These statements are parts of a detailed account of the official induction of Aaron and his sons into the priestly office; but only the above-mentioned instance of the laying on of hands is to be found in that transaction. Moses, who was not a priest, inducted those men into the priesthood: but the ceremony of laying on hands was performed by the priests-elect, upon the animals offered in sacrifice.

Next comes the case of Joshua, who was to succeed Moses in the leadership of the people. Num. xxvii. 18-23. On him, Moses, by divine command, laid hands, publicly assigning to him a share of his own honor. This laying on hands was not to confer the Holy Ghost; for of that Joshua was already possessed, the Lord himself having pronounced him to be "a man in whom is the Spirit." It was part of a public ceremony, used by specific revelation, upon the very extra-

ordinary occasion of introducing to Israel the only successor Moses was to have, and who did succeed to his high office some months thereafter.

Then we have the narrative of the revival under Hezekiah, II Chron. xix., where it is stated, v. 23: "And they brought forth the goats for the sin-offering, before the king and the congregation; and they laid their hands upon them. 24. And the priests killed them, and they made reconciliation with their blood upon the altar, to make an atonement for all Israel." Here, again, the imposition of hands was upon the victims, and was part of a religious ceremony: as in Lev. xvi. 21, where Aaron laid both his hands upon the scape-goat, confessed the sins of all Israel, and sent him forth into the wilderness: as in the case of the blasphemer, Lev. xxiv. 14: "Bring him forth without the camp; and let all that heard him lay their hands upon his head, and let all the congregation stone him."

From these citations we must form our opinion of the Old Testament meaning of the imposition of hands, as a religious rite. Passing into the New Testament, Matthew viii. 3, in his account of the leper, who came to Jesus, saying, "Lord, if thou wilt, thou canst make me clean," affirms, "And Jesus put forth his hand, and touched him, saying, I will; be thou clean. And immediately his leprosy was cleansed." The ruler (Matt. ix. 18) came to him, saying, "My daughter is even now dead; but come and lay thy hand upon her, and she shall live;" and (v. 25) "He went in and took her by the hand; and the maid arose." So (Matt. xix.) little children were brought unto him, "that he should put his hands on them and pray;" and (v. 15) "He laid *his* hands on them and departed thence." Mark (vi. 5) says of Jesus, "He laid his hands on a few sick folk, and healed them." In vii. 32, he gives the case of the man that was deaf, and had an impediment in his

speech, whom they bring unto him, "and besought him to put his hand upon him." At Bethsaida (viii. 22) they brought a blind man unto him, "and besought him to touch him:" he did put his hands upon him twice, "and he was restored." Omitting similar cases, the four Evangelists mentioning nothing of the imposition of hands, by way of induction to office, we come to The Acts, where, at vi. 6, we have the case of the *seven*, usually styled *deacons*. These men were chosen by the disciples, and "were set before the apostles; and when they had prayed, they laid their hands upon them." *Who* prayed and laid their hands upon them? Suppose it was the disciples, or the apostles, or both these parties: in either case the narrative would be equally intelligible. By common consent, the treasure of the Church, the managing of its finances, had been entrusted to the apostles; and these, perceiving that this interfered with their peculiar mission of testifying to the resurrection of Jesus, the seal of his Messiahship, "called the multitude of the disciples *unto them*, and said, It is not reason that we should leave the Word of God, and serve tables. Wherefore, brethren, look ye out among you seven men of honest report, full of the Holy Ghost and wisdom, whom we may appoint over this business. But we will give ourselves continually to prayer, and to the ministry of the Word." No utterance could be clearer. Between the ministry of the Word and the ministry of tables, the apostles made their choice: for them, ministers, servants of the Word, to turn aside to the ministry; or service, of tables, they declared to be unreasonable; and they advised that seven elect men should be assigned to "this business." What business? Indubitably, the service of tables. They did not ask for help to relieve them from the ministry of the Word; that was not the intolerable, unreasonable burden; but "this business" of serving

tables. To "this business," therefore, the *seven* were assigned: *diakonein trapezais*, to serve tables. Here were seven men of honest report, full of the Holy Ghost (therefore disposed to act justly and kindly), and wisdom (so capable of discernment and good management), with the formal acknowledgment and blessing of the apostles and the whole multitude of the disciples upon them. So, henceforth let *these* have the management of the commissariat, the receiving of the contributions, and the distribution of supplies. No trace of any other office, authority or function is to be found in this short, clear, comprehensive record. If it be asked, Why, then, did the seven preach? It may be replied, if they preached, they had no authority from this transaction. Stephen disputed, wrought miracles, defended himself before a council. Philip, one of the seven, preached, after having been driven out of Jerusalem. So did those who were scattered abroad at the same time, in the same persecution (Acts viii. 4). Apollos preached, and that when he knew only the doctrines of John the Baptist, and assuredly could have had no official appointment to such an office.

We, of this time, are slow to admit that, in the Apostolic days, any Christian preached that experienced an impulse thereto. On the memorable Pentecost, the Holy Ghost descended upon the whole assembly, the entire infant Church; "And they were ALL FILLED with the Holy Ghost, and began to SPEAK with other tongues, as the Spirit gave them UTTERANCE." Acts ii, 4. So, when a multitude had run together, and some, mocking, pronounced them to be full of new wine; Peter, standing up with the eleven, affirmed: "These are not drunken —, but this is that which was spoken by the prophet Joel: I will pour out of my Spirit upon all flesh; and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy." Acts ii. 14-18. And therefore

Paul, I Cor. xiv., "If the whole church be come together into one place, and all speak with tongues, etc. But if all prophesy, and there come in one that believeth not, or one unlearned, he is convinced of (by) all, he is judged of (by) all; and thus are the secrets of his heart made manifest; and so falling down on his face, he will worship God, and REPORT that God is with you of a truth."

In the Primitive Church, preaching and other matters were in much more simplicity than with us.

When Philip had preached the Gospel with great success in Samaria, the apostles, who had managed to remain in Jerusalem, sent thither Peter and John, "who, when they were come down, prayed for them, that they might receive the Holy Ghost; then laid they their hands on them, and they received the Holy Ghost."

Paul, in a vision (ix. 12), saw "a man named Ananias coming in and putting his hand on him, that he might receive his sight." And so it occurred. Ananias, putting his hands on him, said, "Brother Saul, the Lord, *even* Jesus, that appeared to thee in the way as thou camest, hath sent me, that thou mightest receive thy sight, and be filled with the Holy Ghost." This Ananias was "a certain disciple at Damascus" (ix. 10). Did he *ordain* Paul?

Next, in xiii. 1-3, we have, "Now there were in the Church that was at Antioch certain prophets and teachers, as Barnabas, and Simeon (that was called Niger), and Lucius of Cyrene, and Manaen (which had been brought up with Herod the tetrarch), and Saul." Here Paul ranks with the "prophets and teachers;" Barnabas first, Paul last, on the list of the five. Simeon, Lucius and Manaen, are described definitely; Barnabas and Saul are not described. Their history is assumed to be sufficiently known. Who was Barnabas? "Joses, who by the apostles was surnamed Barnabas (which is,

being interpreted, the son of consolation), a Levite, *and* of the country of Cyprus" (iv. 36). In Christ, Paul's senior, friend, companion; ranking with him in the Church at Antioch, as prophet and teacher. Paul's history up to this time is given us at length.

These five ministered to the Lord, and fasted; and through them it was revealed to the Church, by the Holy Ghost, saying, "Separate me Barnabas — and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them." Not *ordain*; not *consecrate*; but, *separate*. "And when they had fasted and prayed, and laid *their* hands on them, they sent *them* away." *Who* laid hands on them? If only Simeon, Lucius and Manaen, these were but prophets and teachers. What did they mean by the religious rite of the imposition of hands? What they had been ordered to do, was to separate from their number Barnabas and Saul: to dismiss them for the mission to which they had been called. This they did, laying on hands, as Jacob on his grandsons; as Jesus on the little children; an affectionate and tender commendation to the divine love and care; but not at all in the sense of a modern *ordination*. Omitting two instances of laying on hands for the receiving of the Holy Ghost, xix. 6, and in the healing of the sick, xxviii. 8, as being similar to cases already noted, we leave The Acts, and take up I Tim. iv. 14: "Neglect not the gift (*charisma*) that is in thee, which was given thee by prophecy, with the laying on of the hands of the presbytery." And II Tim. i. 6: "I put thee in remembrance that thou stir up the gift of God (*charisma tou Theou*) which is in thee by the putting on of my hands." This *charisma* that was in him, by the putting on of hands, was scarcely any Church office; but much more likely a spiritual gift, such as Paul desired to impart to the brethren at Rome: "For I long to see you, that I may impart unto you some spiritual gift (*charisma*), to the end ye may be established." Rom. i. 11.

Our next instance is Heb. vi. 2. The apostle chiding the disciples for their continuing in an infantile condition exhorts them to "go on to perfection ; not laying again the foundation of repentance from dead works, and of faith toward God, of the doctrine of baptisms, and of laying on of hands," etc. Why this collating of baptism and laying on of hands? Is it explained by Acts xix. 5, 6? "When they heard this, they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus. And when Paul had laid his hands upon them, the Holy Ghost came on them ; and they spake with tongues and prophesied." This looks much more plausible than to suppose the writer to the Hebrews to have alluded to any imposition of hands in such a ceremony as we call ordination.

The result of our investigation is that the laying on of hands is of frequent mention in the Scriptures, as used in solemn religious ceremonial ; but there is no clear case of doctrine or example, in which it has the significance of investing any one with ecclesiastical office.

---

---

## ORDINATION.

ACTS vi. 6.

THIS word is not in the Accepted English Version. The corresponding verb, *ordain*, occurs with some frequency ; and we propose an inquiry into its Scriptural sense. The ensuing selections will afford opportunity for a correct decision : "It is a continual burnt-offering, which was ordained in Mount Sinai for a sweet

savor, a sacrifice made by fire unto the Lord." Num. xxviii. 6. Here *ordained* renders an inflection of the Hebrew *gnasa*; in LXX. *ginomai*; Vulg. *offero*; Fr. *faire*. "And Jeroboam ordained a feast," etc. I Kings xii. 32. The Hebrew is the same, *gnasa*; LXX. *poieo*; Vulg. *constituo*; Fr. *ordonner*. "And he put down the idolatrous priests, whom the kings of Judah had ordained to burn incense," etc. II Kings xxiii. 5. Heb. *nathan*; LXX. *didomi*; Vulg. *pono*; Fr. *etablir*. "And he ordained him priests for the high places," etc. II Chron. xi. 15. Heb. *gnamad*; LXX. *kathisteemi*; Vulg. *constituo*; Fr. *etablir*. "Also Jehoida appointed the offices of the house of the Lord —, as it was ordained by David." II Chron. xxiii. 18. The word *ordained* being interpolated, in this case, there is no corresponding word in the Hebrew, nor in LXX.; but we have, Vulg. *dispositio*; Fr. *disposition*. "And with the instruments *ordained* by David, King of Israel." II Chron. xxix. 27. A case of interpolation again. Heb. —; LXX. —; Vulg. *præparo*; Fr. *ordonner*. "The Jews ordained, and took upon them, and upon their seed, and upon all such as joined themselves unto them, so as it should not fail, that they would keep these two days according to their writing, and according to their appointed time every year." Esther ix. 27. Heb. *quoom*; LXX. *isteemi*; Vulg. *sustineo*; Fr. *etablir*. "And before thou camest forth out of the womb I sanctified thee, and I ordained thee a prophet unto the nations." Jer. i. 5. Heb. *nathan*; LXX. *titheemi*; Vulg. *sustineo*; Fr. *etablir*.

So much as to the Old Testament sense of the word ordain; and it is quite certain that neither of the four Hebrew words, *gnasa*, to make; *nathan*, to give; *gnamad*, to stand; *quoom*, to rise, conveys the idea of investing with ministerial function or sacerdotal power. The same may be said of the words from the Greek, Latin and French.

Let us turn now to the New Testament: "And he ordained twelve, that they should be with him, and that he might send them forth to preach." Mark iii. 14. Gr. *poieo*; Vulg. *facio*; Fr. *ordonner*. As this is a case of much importance, it may be well to consider this word *POIEO*, rendered here *ordained*. It is used 540 times in the New Testament; and yet this is the only instance in which our Accepted English Version renders it by our English word *ordain*: and though it might seem plausible that our Lord might have used some solemn form of investiture, in the case of the Twelve; and so the Evangelist might have used the word *poieo* in the churchly sense of *ordain*; yet this word is used with reference to him, where it cannot have this meaning. For example, Mark vi. 5: "And he could there *do* (*poiesai*) no mighty work," etc. John iv. 1: "When, therefore, the Lord knew how the Pharisees had heard that Jesus made (*poiei*) and baptized more disciples than John." John v. 18: "Making (*poion*) himself equal with God." John vi. 14: "When they had seen the miracle that Jesus *did* (*epoieese*)." Here we have not only *poieo*, but in the very same inflection, *epoieese*, as in Mark ii. 14. So in John vii: "Because I have made (*epoieesa*) a man every whit whole," etc. In John xiii. we have a narrative of the Lord's washing the disciples' feet, the Evangelist using *poieo* some five times: where, selecting the 15th verse, we have: "For I have given you an example, that ye *should do* (*poiete*) as I have done (*epoieesa*) unto you." A multitude of such selections might be given; but it cannot be necessary. The Greek *poieo* corresponds to the Latin *facio*; and its use in Mark iii. 14 is rendered in the Vulg. by *facio*: the general sense of each of these two words being to *do*, shading into *to make*, *to constitute*, etc. It is quite certain, then, that by *epoieese* Mark did not signify that the Lord *ordained* the Twelve in our ecclesiastical sense

of that word ; but that he *appointed* the Twelve, "that they should be with him, and that he might send them forth to preach." He appointed them to what? To a position near his person ; his attendants ; his suite. Our Accepted English Version renders *poieo* by appoint, Heb. iii. 2, where, referring to the Apostle and High Priest of our profession, Christ Jesus, the Scripture declares, "Who was faithful to him that appointed (*poiesanti*) him, as also Moses *was faithful* in all his house."

The next instance of the occurrence of the word *ordain*, is John xv. 16 — "Ye have not chosen me, but I have chosen you, and ordained (*etheka*) you, that ye should go and bring forth fruit," etc. Gr. *titheemi*, Vulg. *pono*, Fr. *etablir*. *Titheemi* means generally, *to put, to place, to assign, to constitute*, etc. Jesus had selected the twelve—had assigned them a position ; for what purpose? "That they should go (preaching) and bring forth fruit (have success)."

We meet *ordain* next in Acts i. 22 — "Must one be ordained (*genesthai*) to be a witness with us of his resurrection." Gr. *ginomai*, Vulg. *fit*, Fr. *etre*. This is an interesting and lucid instance. We copy Dr. Adam Clarke's note : "This translation misleads every reader who cannot examine the original text. There is no term for *ordained* in the Greek ; *genesthai, to be*, is the only word in the verse to which this interpretation can be applied. The New Testament printed at London, by Robert Barker, the king's printer, in 1615, renders this and the preceding verse more faithfully and more clearly than our common version : 'Wherefore of these men who have companied with us, all the time that the Lord Jesus was conversant among us, beginning from the baptism of John, unto the day he was taken up from us, must one of them BE MADE a witness with us, of his resurrection.' The word *ordained* would nat-

urally lead most readers to suppose that some *ecclesiastical rite* was used on the occasion, such as *imposition of hands*, etc., although nothing of the kind appears to have been employed."—*Clarke's New Testament*. We add merely that the Gr. *ginomai*, the L. *fit*, and the Fr. *etre*, have about the same significance—to be, to become, to exist; and Luke meant that Peter affirmed that "one of these men" must "become a witness, with the remnant of the twelve, of his resurrection."

Coming on to Acts x. 42: "And to testify that it is he which was ordained (*orismenos*) of God to be the judge of quick and dead." Gr. *orizo*, Vulg. *constituo*, Fr. *destiner*. *Orizo* is defined, to determine, decree, appoint, set, its etymon being *oros*, a bound, a limit; as if the judgship of quick and dead had been divinely limited to "Jesus of Nazareth" and therefore he had been divinely appointed to that office. The L., *constituo*, is defined, to set, put, range, establish, constitute, appoint, etc. For the Fr. *destiner*, we have to *destine*, to fate, etc. There is nothing here of any *rite* of investiture.

Acts xiii. 48: "And as many as were ordained (*tetagmenoi*) to eternal life believed." Gr. *tatto*, Vulg. *præordino*, Fr. *destiner*. There is no question of any rite of investiture here, and we might pass the passage without further notice, but for its relation to another subject. *Tatto*, to appoint, order, a verb used eight times in the New Testament, and in no instance in the sense of election, or predestination, to eternal life. Its ideal force is *arrangement, order, disposition*, and not *destiny*. Dr. Parkhurst, who closely, carefully, patiently studied this passage, translates it: "And as many as were disposed, adapted, or in a right disposition and preparation, for eternal life, believed." The Jews were prejudiced against Jesus as a Saviour from sin unto eternal life, desiring and expecting a temporary

Saviour; but the Gentiles, who were the believers referred to in the passage, had no such prejudice and expectation, and as many of them as were disposed to a salvation from sin unto eternal life, accepted the preaching and believed. Such is the substance of Dr. P.'s discussion in his lexicon, and with it Dr. Clarke fully coincides, in his able note, in his commentary.

We may remark, further, that in Rom. xiii. 1 this same participle is used: "The powers that be are ordained (*tetagmenai*) of God." In the following verse, 2d, the apostle says, "Whosoever, therefore, resisteth (*antitassomenos*) the power, resisteth (*antheستن*) the ordinance (*diatagei*), of God; and they that resist (*oi de antheستكotes*) shall receive to themselves damnation." This *antitassomenos* is a compound of *anti*, *against*, and *tatto*, *to appoint, place, set*, etc., having the same root with *tetagmenai* or—*oi*: the latter rendered *ordained* in verse 1, and the former *resisteth* in verse 2, while *antheستن* and *antheستكotes* are also rendered *resisteth* and *resist* in verse 2 as synonymous, which is the case with *antitassomenos*. But *antheستن* and *antheستكotes* are from *anthisteemi*, a compound of *anti*, *against*, and *isteemi*, *to place, set, appoint*, etc. Does the apostle mean that the man *resisting, setting himself against the powers that be* (existing by divine providence) does so by a divine decree? and "receiveth to himself damnation," for obeying the divine decree?

Besides, in verse 1, "Let every soul be subject (*upotassestho*) unto the powers that be," *upotassestho* is a compound of *upo*, *under*, and this same *tatto*, *to appoint, place, set*, etc., the apostle meaning that every Christian should consider himself to be under the authority of divine providence, and should so live, as a matter of conscience: he being held responsible to the government and to God, for so doing or so not doing. It is no divine decree that fixes him in the right; but

his own enlightened conscience and choice: and as many as are disposed to a reasonable, conscientious course, obey the injunction of this Scripture to this day.

Acts xiv. 23: "And when they had ordained them (*cheirotoneesantes de autois*) elders in every church, and had prayed with fasting, they commended them to the Lord, on whom they believed." Gr. *cheirotoneo*, Vulg. *constituo*, Fr. *etablir*. *Cheirotoneo*, from *cheir*, the hand, and *teino*, to extend, stretch out, or lift up, the hand. To choose by vote or suffrage, etc. From the history of the case, and the meaning of the word, the most probable meaning of the passage is, that Paul and Barnabas superintended an election of such brethren as had the confidence of each church referred to, to serve as elders; then they prayed with fasting, and took leave of them. The phraseology of John iv. 1, 2, is in point: "The Pharisees had heard that Jesus made and baptized more disciples than John (though Jesus himself baptized not, but his disciples)." According to common parlance, the Pharisees spoke of the act of the agent, as being the act of their *principal*, and properly.

The only other case of the use of *cheirotoneo* is II Cor. viii. 19: "Who was also chosen (*cheirotoneethis*) of the churches to travel with us," etc. A brother was nominated to accompany Paul, and the churches voted in affirmation. A plain statement of a plain case. Acts x. 41, *prokecheirotonemenois*, is rendered in A. E. V. *chosen before*. This word is a participle of *procheirotoneo*. *Cheirotoneo*, in the New Testament, does not mean to invest with office, but to elect.

Acts. xvi. 4: "They delivered them the decrees — that were ordained of the apostles and elders which were at Jerusalem." Gr. *krino*, Vulg. *decerno*, Fr. *decreter*. No delay is needed here. We pass to the last instance in Acts.

Acts xvii. 31: "Because he hath appointed a day, in the which he will judge the world in righteousness by

*that* man whom he hath ordained (*orise*).” As this word, *orizo*, has already been examined, at Acts x. 42, it is only proper to hint that this is a strictly parallel case.

We have now arrived at the Epistle to the Romans.

Rom. vii. 10: “And the commandment, which *was ordained to life*,” etc. Was ordained is interpolated. If it were not it could not signify a rite of investing with office.

Rom. xiii. 1: “The powers that be are ordained (*tetagmenai*) of God.” Gr. *tatto*, Vulg. *ordino*, Fr. *ordonner*. No question here of any official investiture.

I Cor. ii. 7: “Which God ordained (*proorise*) before the world,” etc. God pre-ordained the hidden wisdom, the calling of the Gentiles, before the Mosaic dispensation. Nothing of any investiture.

I Cor. vii. 17: “As the Lord hath called every one, so let him walk. And so ordain I (*diatasomai*) in all the churches.” The apostle was recommending, that, in the case of a married couple, if one only should believe, the believer should not separate from the unbeliever; but “if the unbelieving depart, let him depart.” He says that in this *he* speaks, “not the Lord.” He only advises, then; and this is what he means by *diatasomai*. If it is not, he certainly means no investiture.

I Cor. ix. 14: “Even so hath the Lord ordained (*diataxe*) that they which preach the Gospel should live of the Gospel.” Same Greek word as in the last instance.

Gal. iii. 19: “Wherefore, then, *serveth* the law? It was added because of transgressions, till the seed should come to whom the promise was made, *and it was ordained* (*diatageis*) by angels in the hand of a mediator.” The law was ordained by the instrumentality of angels. Same Greek word.

Eph. ii. 10: "For we are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God hath before ordained (*proetoimase*) that we should walk in them." Gr. *proetoimazo*; Vulg. *præparo*; Fr. *preparer*. This word *proetoimazo* occurs twice in the New Testament; in this Eph. ii. 10, where it is rendered *before ordained*; and Rom. ix. 23, rendered *afore prepared*. The Latin *præparo* gives the true sense of the Greek: as in Cicero's phrase, *ad vitam degendam præparare res necessarias*: to prepare the things necessary to livelihood. The calling of the Gentiles, to live in the purity of, actuated by faith in, the Gospel of Christ, was an item in the original arrangement of the divine plan of salvation.

I Tim. ii. 7: "Whereunto I am ordained (*etethen*) a preacher and an apostle, —, a teacher of the Gentiles in faith and verity." Gr. *titheemi*; Vulg. *pono*; Fr. *etabli*. We have already studied this word *titheemi*, at John xv. 16, and seen that it means *to put, to place, to assign, to constitute*, etc. There is no Scriptural account of the ordination of Paul, or of any other apostle, in the ecclesiastical sense of that word.

Titus i. 5: "For this cause left I thee in Crete, that thou shouldst set in order the things that are wanting, and ordain (*katasteeses*) elders in every city, as I had appointed thee." Gr. *kathisteemi*; Vulg. *constituo*; Fr. *etabli*. The Greek word is well rendered by the Latin *constituo* and the French *etabli*. Titus was to attend to the election of elders in every city, and to their being constituted in their official position: as Paul and Barnabas had done, Acts xiv. 23. It is not probable that Titus had greater authority than Paul and Barnabas.

Heb. v. 1: "For every high priest taken from among men is ordained (*kathistatai*) for men (*huper anthropoon*) in things *pertaining to God*, that he may

offer both gifts and sacrifices for sins." Gr. *kathisteemi*; Vulg. *constituo*; Fr. *etablir*. It is remarkable that, in our citations, our Accepted English Version has rendered *kathisteemi* by *ordain*, in three instances—II Chron. xi. 15; Titus i. 5; and in this Heb. v. 1; while in each case the Vulg. renders by *constituo*, and the Fr. by *etablir*. The high priest was put in the stead of men (*hyper anthropoon*), to offer, as their lieutenant, or substitute, the gifts, and sacrifices for sins, due from men to God. As their substitute, when the high priest offered the gifts and sacrifices, it was as though the men themselves had offered them; while the high priest was thus the type of the Great High Priest, Jesus, who offered the great sacrifice of himself for us (instead of us) all. Which is the apostle's argument in the case.

Heb. ix. 6, "Now when these things were thus ordained (*kataskewasmenon*)," etc. Gr. *kataskewazo*; Vulg. *compono*; Fr. *disposer*. *Kataskewazo* signifies *to prepare, make ready, adjust*; and, evidently, it has that signification here; as the reference is to the arrangements in the tabernacle, for the fulfilment of the high priest's office.

Jude 4, "For there are certain men crept in unawares, who were before of old ordained (*progegrammenoi*) to this condemnation, ungodly men, turning the grace of our God into lasciviousness," etc. Gr. *prographo*; Vulg. *præscribo*; Fr. *ecrire*. There is certainly no allusion to official investiture here.

We have examined fifteen Greek words in the Old and New Testaments, all rendered *ordain* or *foreordain*, in our Accepted English Version: *ginomai*, *poieo*, *didoomi*, *kathisteemi*, *isteemi*, *titheemi*, *orizo*, *proorizo*, *tatto*, *diatatto*, *keirotoneo*, *krino*, *proetoimazo*, *kataskewazo*, *prographo*: not one of which signifies such a rite or ceremony, as the existing ceremony of ecclesiastical ordination: their proper scriptural sense being to

*place, put, appoint, assign*: and we conclude that our modern idea of ordination was unknown to the beautiful simplicity of the Church in the apostolic times. Where are we to look, then, for its origin? In the gradual innovation that occurred in the after ages: and, therefore, while we cannot discover it in Scripture, there is no difficulty in finding it in the literature of those after ages. Let us now turn to Worcester's large and excellent Dictionary, at the word *ordain*:

ORDAIN (*L. ordino, ordo, order*; *It. ordinare, Sp. ordenar, Fr. ordonner*).

1. To appoint; to decree; to set apart. Acts xiii. 48; "And as many as were ordained to eternal life," etc.

2. To establish; to settle; to institute; to enact; to order; to prescribe; to enjoin.—*Milton*.

3. To invest or institute with ministerial function or sacerdotal power.—*Stillingfleet, Hook*.

Syn. appoint.

Dr. Johnson, the pioneer in modern English lexicography, and who was of High Church principles, gives four definitions of *ordain*:

1. To appoint; to decree.—*Shakspeare, I Kings, Acts, Waller, Dryden, Prior*.

2. To establish; to settle; to institute.—*Shakspeare, I Chronicles, Milton, Dryden*.

3. To set in office.—*Esther*.

4. To invest with ministerial function or sacerdotal power.—*Stillingfleet*.

His first, second, third definitions are sustained by citations from Holy Scripture, his fourth from ecclesiastical lore. Why did he not also sustain his fourth definition by a citation from Holy Scripture? It was impossible.