


7-1-1960

Ordination in the Ancient Church (I)

Everett Ferguson

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.acu.edu/restorationquarterly>

 Part of the [Biblical Studies Commons](#), [Christian Denominations and Sects Commons](#), [Christianity Commons](#), [Comparative Methodologies and Theories Commons](#), [History of Christianity Commons](#), [Liturgy and Worship Commons](#), [Missions and World Christianity Commons](#), [Practical Theology Commons](#), and the [Religious Thought, Theology and Philosophy of Religion Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Ferguson, Everett (1960) "Ordination in the Ancient Church (I)," *Restoration Quarterly*: Vol. 4 : No. 3 , Article 1.
Available at: <https://digitalcommons.acu.edu/restorationquarterly/vol4/iss3/1>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by Digital Commons @ ACU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Restoration Quarterly by an authorized editor of Digital Commons @ ACU.

RESTORATION QUARTERLY

CONTENTS

Ordination in the Ancient Church (1)—Everett Ferguson	117
Origen's Evaluation of Textual Variants in the Greek Bible—Frank Pack	139
A Note: Martin Luther on Infant Baptism	147
Contrary-to-Fact Conditions—J. W. Roberts	149
Miscellanea	152
Book Reviews—Pat Harrell	158

STUDIES IN CHRISTIAN SCHOLARSHIP
VOL. 4 NO. 3 THIRD QUARTER, 1960

Ordination in the Ancient Church (I)*

Everett Ferguson

In this study attention will be given to the modes of selection and installation to office among the Romans, Greeks, and Jews. Later a detailed examination of the action and significance of ordination in the fourth century will be presented. Information concerning ordination will then be traced backwards so that the lines of evidence from the background and the foreground will be made to converge upon the New Testament. After an elucidation of the New Testament materials bearing on the subject the main themes of the study will be summarized and their relevance for today noted.

The Greco-Roman Background

Roman Magistrates

The features of selection and installation of important magistrates at Rome in the last century of the Republic were determinative for the provincial towns established by Rome.¹

The chief magistrates were elected by the citizens; the voting was by the divisions of the citizenry known as centuries, with a majority in a century determining the vote of that century and a majority of the centuries determining the will of the assembly.² Entrance into office was conditioned on the *designatio*, an appointment to the office made by the presiding consul in the form of a *renuntiatio*, a proclamation of the outcome of the Election. Although bound by the outcome of the Election, he had great powers in accepting or rejecting candidates according to their qualifications. Extraordinary officers and lesser magistrates were appointed by a simple Naming to the function by the magistrate entitled to do so.

The entrance day of the magistrate was January 1, and the office was passed to the person on the stated day. Although he was a private person up to the entrance day, the *designatus* was treated already as an officer, for declining the office had the same legal status as abdication.³ The selection was the decisive thing.

*This article is the first of a series based on the author's Ph.D. thesis at Harvard University. The thesis itself, which contains the original texts, additional documentation, and discussion of fine points, is available at Harvard's Widener Library and on microfilm. A special feature of the study is the adoption of a technical vocabulary, signified by the use of capitalization; hence the reader should consult the glossary at the end of this article in connection with the series.

¹We follow the definitive study of Theodor Mommsen, *Roemisches Staatsrecht* (Dritte Auflage; Leipzig: S. Hirzel, 1887), Vol. I, pp. 578ff. The practices at Rome must be reconstructed from scattered literary references. The situation in the provinces, both confirming and clarifying procedures at Rome, is exemplified by the civil laws of Malaca in Spain at the end of the first century—*Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*, Vol. II (Berolini: G. Reimarum, 1869), Nos. 1963, 1964.

²See the article on "Voting," *Oxford Classical Dictionary* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1949), p. 954.

³Mommsen, *op. cit.*, pp. 590f.

There followed on the gaining of the office a two-fold confirmatory act. A magistrate could legally take office only if the gods were consulted. Hence, the new consul, for example, took the *auspices* on the morning of his first day in office. The purpose was to receive a favorable sign for the assumption of the office, but the very performance of the Auspication was an indication that the person had assumed office. Secondly, the assembly passed the *lex curiata de imperio* by which the community bound itself to obey the authority of the new officer within his competence. The *lex curiata* did not bestow the authority but rather set forth the same.⁴

A great amount of ceremony and formality marked the entrance (*inire*) into office. The office was not by them obtained, but rather was by them for the first time exercised, Usurpation (*usurpatio*) in the legal sense. After the first Auspication of the new consul, he put on the official dress and accompanied by lictors and friends went in solemn procession to the Capitol where he was seated in the curial chair (Solemn Seating). There he vowed to Jupiter that he had defended the state and offered sacrifice (Divine Invocation). The new consul then held a session of the Senate. Praetors, aediles, and quaestors similarly showed their entrance into office when they took their seat and first performed the function of office.⁵ Within five days after assuming office the new magistrate had to present an Oath that he would observe the laws. The prevalence of the oath is seen in the fact that one was taken by the candidate when he announced his candidacy, when the proclamation of his election was made, and when he surrendered the office.⁶

Under the principate the power of the Emperor essentially limited the election-right even where the forms of Election were maintained. By the third century the manner in which emperors were in fact made became virtually a constitutional process. Following an Acclamation by the troops there was a proclamation and an Enthronement.⁷

In imperial times Porrection was known in appointment to office. A sword was given to the prefect to indicate his appointment.⁸

The following features are prominent in the appointment of the important civil officials in the Roman world: Election by the qualified voters with the important role played by the official presiding; the Invocation of the gods on the day of assuming office; the installation by Usurpation; the prevalence of Oath-taking; and the steady movement toward autocracy.

⁴*Ibid.*, pp. 590, 609. Here as elsewhere references to the original sources together with a translation of some of the more important may be found in the thesis.

⁵*Ibid.*, pp. 615ff.

⁶*Ibid.*, p. 619-22. Steinwenter, "Ius iurandum," in Pauly-Wissowa *Real-Encyclopaedie*, X (Stuttgart, 1919), 1256-57.

⁷H. U. Instinsky, *Bischofsstuhl und Kaiserthron* (Muenchen: Koesel, 1955), pp. 32ff.

⁸Dio Cassius lxviii.16.

Roman Priesthoods

In the early Republican period the filling of all priestly colleges and sodalities was by Co-option.⁹ However, certain lesser priests and religious functionaries were designated by the *Pontifex Maximus*. The latter was an elected official, chosen by a special assembly of seventeen of the tribes after a Nomination from their own number by the principal priests (*pontifices*). Later the same elective act by part of the tribes was inserted between Nomination and Co-option of the members of the four great priestly colleges. Nominations to the assembly convened for sacerdotal business were made by the respective colleges, which after the Election went through the form of Co-option. The Emperor's powers finally ended the independence of the priestly colleges although the old forms of Co-option remained.

Whether chosen by the members of a college, elected first by an assembly of the people, or designated by the *pontifex maximus*, the new priest had to be installed in his sacred function. The formal completion of Co-option came when the president of the college or sodality "called to sacred things" (*ad sacra vocabat*) the newly designated member, a constitutive Naming.¹⁰

Certain religious functionaries underwent an *inauguratio* (an Inauguration in the limited sense). The ceremony of Inauguration meant the declaration of the assent of the deity to the accomplished Election or Designation. In significance the *inauguratio* was the same as a magistrate's first taking of the auspices, the only difference being that in the latter case the official performed the function himself and in the former it was done for him by an augur. There is no evidence that *inauguratio*, or any other rite performed on the new priest, involved a change of state.¹¹

The distinctive feature provided by the Roman priesthoods was their practice of Co-option.

Roman Associations

The officers of the Roman clubs were elected in an ordinary meeting by the vote of the members. The terms of office, as for civil officials, was customarily for one year, and re-election was permitted. The only ceremony attested for the induction into office is Oath-taking.¹²

⁹For the Roman priesthoods see Gordon J. Laing, "Priest, Priesthood (Roman)," *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics*, X (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1922), pp. 325-335. Cited *ERE*. The references on each class of the priestly personnel may be found in Georg Wissowa, *Religion und Kultus der Roemer* ("Handbuch der Klassischen Altertumswissenschaft"; Zweite Auflage; Muenchen: Ch. H. Beck, 1912), p. 487.

¹⁰J. Toutain, "Sacerdos—Rome," *Dictionnaire des antiquites Grecques et Romaines*, ed. Daremberg et Saglio (Paris: Hachette, n.d.), IV, 945. Cited Daremberg-Saglio.

¹¹Wissowa, *op. cit.*, p. 490. Cf. A. D. Nock, "Intrare sub Iugum," *Classical Quarterly*, Vol. XX, No. 2, p. 108.

¹²Wilhelm Liebenam, *Zur Geschichte und Organisation des Roemischen Vereinswesens* (Leipzig: Teubner, 1890), pp. 199, 202.

Greek Magistrates

The Athenian constitution of the fourth century B.C., for which the most evidence is available, may be taken as representative of Greek democracy.¹³

All important magistrates were selected either by Lot-taking (*klerosis*) or by Election (*cheirotomia*). The Lot was used for those positions the management of which every citizen possessed the ability, and the Lot-taking emphasized that aspect of democracy which provides every one with the right to be chosen. *Cheirotomia* was voting by a show of hands, and the Election emphasized the right of every citizen to decide who was qualified to serve in certain specialized tasks.

The Election of officials occurred in an ordinary meeting of the Assembly. The meeting would open with prayer and sacrifice. The preliminary decision of the Council to place the Election on the agenda of the meeting of the Assembly would be presented. The supervision of the Election was in the hands of the nine chairmen (*proedroi*) for the day. The list of candidates was supplied either by the Nomination of friends or by announcement. There might be a preliminary vote to decide to proceed with the Election. At the appropriate time the Herald called for a show of hands for the respective candidates. The votes were counted and the report of the results was given and these results were ratified as a legal vote. Both were the assignment of the nine *proedroi*.

A distinctive feature of entrance into office in Athens was the Formal Scrutiny (*dokimasia*) which every official had to undergo at the first of the civil year. The Scrutiny according to the law covered only the formal qualifications for the office, but in practice must have often covered the whole private and public life of the candidate. The Scrutiny was conducted by the presiding officer of the Assembly or of the law-court.

Next came the Oath-taking (*horkos*) by which the newly selected magistrate bound himself to rule according to the laws and to the best of his ability.¹⁴

Upon entrance into office Entrance-sacrifices were brought.¹⁵ The details of the performance are obscure, but the idea seems to have

¹³Aristotle's *Constitution of Athens* in the edition of J. E. Sandys (London: MacMillan and Co., 1912) is the principal original source. Important studies include Georg Busolt, *Griechische Staatskunde* ("Handbuch der Klassischen Altertumswissenschaft"; Muenchen: C. H. Beck, 1920) and for this article, Markos A. Siotis, "Die Klassische und die Christliche Cheirotomie in ihrem Verhaeltnis," *Theologia* (Greek), XX-XXII (1949-50).

¹⁴The Scrutiny and the Oath are described by Aristotle, *Ath. Pol.* 55.

¹⁵Busolt, *op. cit.*, pp. 517, 518. The clearest statement comes from Demosthenes, XIX. 190.

been that one did not begin an important task without recourse to the gods, Divine Invocation.¹⁶

Greece differed from Rome in the extensive use of the Lot in filling magistracies. When Election was performed in Greece, the basic voting unit was the individual, and not a group. The Formal Scrutiny had a distinctive role in the Greek appointive process. Although Greece too had its sacrificial Invocation of the gods and Oath-taking, the ceremonies lack the elaboration and legal precision characteristic of Rome.

Greek Priesthoods

In reference to the method of their selection Greek priesthoods may be placed in three categories: those following the civil analogy and filled by Election or Lot-taking, those closely connected with a given family and acquired by Inheritance, and those purchased.¹⁷

The ordinary civic priests were chosen by Election or by Lot-taking and served for one year. The use of lots was more common and could be interpreted as permitting the deity to choose his own minister.¹⁸ The methods of voting and taking lots could be combined—the field being narrowed by one means and the actual choice made by the other.¹⁹

Any number of circumstances may have brought a given family into especially close relationship with a given deity so that the service of that deity was reserved to members of the family; this was true even of civic cults. The rule of succession varied from family to family.

During the Hellenistic period in Asia Minor and the Islands there was a strong development of the practice of the purchase of priesthoods.²⁰ Purchase was sometimes combined with other methods of selection. The vendor was always the State.

The entrance into the functions of office by a newly chosen priest would be marked in some way with a certain ceremony, but "in classical antiquity most priesthoods did not, it seems, involve any solemn

¹⁶J. A. Hild, *Daremberg-Saglio*, II, 504.

¹⁷W. J. Woodhouse, "Priest, Priesthood (Greek)," *ERE*, X, 305; Ph.-E. Legrand, "Sacerdos—Grece," *Daremberg-Saglio*, IV, 938; Paul Stengel, *Die Griechischen Kultusaltertüemer* ("Handbuch der Klassischen Altertumswissenschaft"; Muenchen: C. H. Beck, 1920), pp. 44-46.

¹⁸"As to the priests, we shall entrust it to the god himself to ensure his own good pleasure, by committing their appointment to the divine chance of the lot." Plato, *Laws* 759 C.

¹⁹A good example is supplied by Cicero, *Against Verres* ii.162. The comparison to Acts 1 is striking. The people narrowed the field by passing on the qualifications and then the divine choice was expressed through the Lot.

²⁰Martin P. Nilsson, *Geschichte der Griechischen Religion* ("Handbuch der Klassischen Altertumswissenschaft"; Muenchen: C. H. Beck, 1950), Zweiter Band, 74, 77ff. F. Sokolowski, "Partnership in the Lease of Cults in Greek Antiquity," *Harvard Theological Review*, Vol. 50 (April, 1957), pp. 133ff.

ordination or investiture."²¹ Some Attic inscriptions mention Entrance-sacrifices. Priests of certain cults were also admitted by a form of initiation. At such a time the priest may have assumed any insignia of his office. The very paucity of the evidence is perhaps an indication that nothing unusual attached to the assumption of a priestly position in Greek religion.

Greek Associations

A special mode of appointment met with in the private associations of the Greeks is the Designation of an official by another, but this usually occurred only in the appointment of a lesser functionary by a higher officer. More common were appointments by Lot or by Election.²² The statutes of Greek guilds in Egypt during the imperial period open with an account of the Election of a president whose term was to run for a single year.²³ (Apparently Roman imperialism had not submerged local democratic traditions.) About the manner of Election by the members little information occurs, but the indications are that it was commonly by a show of hands.²⁴

The installation of officers is spoken of in wholly general phrases in the overwhelming majority of cases. An Oath was taken in Attic colleges at the entrance into the association or into one of its offices. Sacrifices accompanied the entrance into office in some cases, as they did the laying down of office and all other important occasions.²⁵ The Oath-taking and Entrance-sacrifices are features that other phases of Greek life would lead us to expect, but the evidence is not sufficient to permit a generalization.

The Jewish Background

Priests

The account of the installation of Aaron and his sons to the priesthood in Exodus 29 and Leviticus 8 gives the fullest description of installation to the priestly office. The seven-day ceremony, in the presence of the people, included the following elements: ceremonial washing, Investiture with the garments of the priesthood, Chrismation, and the performance of certain sacrifices which were accompanied by the placing of blood on the right ear, thumb, and the

²¹A. D. Nock, *loc. cit.*

²²Franz Poland, *Geschichte des Griechischen Vereinswesens, Preisschriften von der Fuerstlich Jablonowskischen Gesellschaft zu Leipzig*, Vol. XXXVIII (Leipzig: B. H. Teubner, 1909), pp. 416, 417. A good introduction to the Greek associations in English is found in chapter 3 of Marcus Tod, *Sidelights on Greek History* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1932).

²³A. E. R. Boak, "The Organization of Gilds in Greco-Roman Egypt," *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association*, Vol. LXVIII (1937), p. 213.

²⁴Poland, *loc. cit.*

²⁵*Ibid.*, pp. 418, 499, 253.

great toe and by the sprinkling of blood and oil on the person and garments of the new priest. There are several indications that the Investiture and the Chrismation were the basic elements in the ceremony (Ex. 29:9c, 29; 40:14f; Num. 20:26-28).

One set of passages suggests that all priests were anointed, whereas another set implies that Chrismation was limited to the high priest. That all priests received the oil is indicated by Exodus 28: 40f; 30:30; 40:14f (but, do the latter two passages refer to the sons of Aaron as successors in the high priesthood?); Lev. 7:36; 10:7; and Num. 3:3. Nevertheless, the term the "anointed priest" seems to be a special term for the high priest (but this interpretation is not necessarily demanded in Lev. 4), and anointing is given as the mark of Aaron's successor in Lev. 6:22.²⁶ Apparently all priests could be spoken of as "anointed," but the "anointed priest" *par excellence* was the high priest. The account of the consecration of Aaron and his sons in Exodus 29 and Leviticus 8 does in fact make a distinction in the manner of the application of the oil. It is only sprinkled on Aaron's sons (and also on Aaron himself), whereas it is poured on Aaron's head (cf. Lev. 21:10; Ps. 133:2).

Several Pentateuchal statements indicate that Chrismation was to be used in the appointment of each new priest (Ex. 29:29f; 40:14f). The virtual silence of sources outside the Old Testament leaves the question of what ceremony if any was in use in later times uncertain. Furthermore, it would appear that in the latter days of the Temple the high priest was no longer (or not always) anointed, for the Mishnah knows of high priests introduced to their office through the ceremony of Investiture.²⁷ The continuation of Chrismation into Hellenistic times is indicated by Daniel 9:26 and 2 Maccabees 1:10. The Hasmonaean priest-kings, precisely because of the question of their legitimacy, would hardly have omitted the rite. Rather any abolition of Chrismation would have come in Herodian-Roman times.²⁸

²⁶For an analysis of the problem see Wolf Baudissin, "Priests and Levites," *Dictionary of the Bible* (Ed. James Hastings; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1900), Vol. IV, p. 83.

²⁷Such is the understanding of *Horajoth* iii.4 by Emil Schuerer, *Geschichte des Juedischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi* (Vierte Auflage; Leipzig: J. C. Hinrich, 1907), II, 284. For the Mishnah the English translation of Herbert Danby (London: Oxford University Press, 1933) has been used.

Only Investiture and Inaugural Usurpation in the installation of a new high priest are discussed in *bYoma* 12a, b. [Unless otherwise stated, references to the Babylonian Talmud are based on the edition of I. Epstein (London: Soncino Press, 1935-52.) Josephus, *Ant.* XX.i, would indicate that Investiture was constitutive in making the high priest.

²⁸So Schuerer, *loc. cit.*

Christianity's break with the priestly traditions of the Old Testament is well symbolized by the absence of Chrismation in ordination until well into the Middle ages.²⁹

The accounts of Exodus 29 and Leviticus 8 use words from the root *male'* ("to fill" or "to appoint") in reference to the installation of Aaron and his sons. The full form of the expression, "to fill the hand," (Judg. 17:5, 12) seems to have been the literal terminology for the installation of a priest. What was the hand filled with? The most attractive explanation, based on the "fill offering" of the Exodus and Leviticus texts, is that there was a handing over of sacrificial portions (Porrection) to the new priest. Consecration was meant thus to express that the priest was empowered to lay these pieces upon the altar, or, as the case may be, to take them for himself from the sacrifice as perquisites.³⁰ Leviticus 8:27 would lend support to this view. In most Old Testament passages, however, the word has lost any specific sense and means only "appoint."

Kings

Some data on the installation of kings is preserved in the stories of Saul and David in the books of Samuel. First, Saul was appointed privately by Samuel as an expression of the divine choice (1 Sam. 10:1). The public selection took place by Lot in an assembly of the people (1 Sam. 10:20f). David, also, was designated to the kingship by Chrismation, and in this case the act was connected with the coming of the Spirit upon him (1 Sam. 16:13f). Chrismation is mentioned in later cases of disputed succession.

Coronation is mentioned (2 Kings 11:12), but Chrismation seems to have been the rite with comparable significance to the coronations of pagan kings.

Prophets

By the nature of the prophetic office a regular mode of appointment would not be expected. As endowed with the Spirit of God, prophets could be spoken of as "anointed," but there is some question whether this was ever literally done.³¹ In the Elijah-Elisha stories the mantle of the master was passed on to his successor (1 Kings 19:19; 2 Kings 2:6-15).³²

²⁹Gerald Ellard, *Ordination Anointings in the Western Church before 1000 A.D.* (Cambridge: Medieval Academy of America, 1933), pp. 7-13, 104, finds the first evidence in the 8th century. At baptism there was a Chrismation at an early period, and Tertullian connects this ceremony with admission to the priesthood (*de Bapt.* 7).

³⁰Baudissin, *loc. cit.*, p. 70.

³¹In 1 Kings 19:16 Elijah is told to anoint Elisha but no record is preserved of his doing so. Ps. 105:15 has reference to the Patriarchs but may imply an anointing of prophets (but with the Holy Spirit?). Isa. 61:1 is metaphorical.

³²In *The Ascension of Isaiah*, according to the text adopted in the edition of R. H. Charles (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1900), p. 43, there is a reference to imposition of hands on prophets: "And they [forty prophets] had come to salute him and to hear his words."

Elders, Judges, and Rabbis—Old Testament Precedents

Gaster, in speaking of Jewish ordination, has observed that behind this institution lies a chapter of Jewish history which has not yet been elucidated—the appointment of judges.³³ The Old Testament passages speaking of the appointment of “judges and officers” in the land³⁴ give no indication of a mode of installation. The same applies to the elders, whose status appears to go back to the early tribal days of the Hebrews. The selection of seventy out of the elders to assist Moses is related in Num. 11:16ff, a number which apparently was older in usage (Ex. 24:1). The Sanhedrin of New Testament times was regarded as patterned on the institution of the seventy elders around Moses.³⁵

The judges and the elders of Israel contributed to the picture of the rabbis in normative Judaism. The absence of a method of ordination in the texts relating to these people was supplied from the story of the appointment of Joshua in Numbers 27:15ff.³⁶ Deuteronomy 34:9 seems to look back to this incident, but the point immediately leaps to view that in Numbers Moses imposes hands on Joshua because he is a man “in whom is spirit” whereas in Deuteronomy Joshua has the “spirit of wisdom” because Moses has imposed his hands on him. Jewish commentators have seen no incongruity in the passages and have taken the “spirit of wisdom” (*i.e.* wisdom) as an added gift distinct from the “spirit” Joshua already possessed.³⁷ Co-

³³M. Gaster, “Ordination (Jewish),” *ERE* IX, 552.

³⁴Deut. 16:18-20; 17:9; Ex. 18:13ff; 1 Chron. 23:4; 26:29; 2 Chron. 19:5-7.

³⁵*Sanhedrin* i.6. There is no possibility of the two bodies possessing historical continuity (but local elders did have judicial functions—Deut. 21:18-23). The Chronicler notes in the time of Jehoshaphat the appointment of a council of Levites, priests, and heads of families in Jerusalem to decide disputed cases (2 Chron. 19:8ff). It should be noted that the Mishnah passage speaks of the lesser councils of twenty-three elders in other cities, besides the great council in Jerusalem.

³⁶As the appointment of Joshua and of the seventy elders served as precedents in Judaism, so the appointment of Joshua and the consecration of the Levites (Num. 8) are echoed in Acts 6 and 13. David Daube, *New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism* (London: Athlone Press, 1956), pp. 237, 239. A. M. Farrer’s chapter on the “Ministry in the New Testament,” in *The Apostolic Ministry* (K. E. Kirk, ed.; New York: Morehouse-Gorham Co., 1947) develops the analogies, but hardly establishes his theories from them.

³⁷Cf. J. Newman, *Semikhah* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1950), p. 3. The one exception is the *Midrash Rabbah* to Numbers, xv.25 (H. Freedman and Maurice Simon, ed.; London: Soncino Press, 1939), which quotes the two passages side by side and seems to identify the “spirit of wisdom” with the “honor” of Moses and with the “spirit” placed on the elders in Num. 11.

And that he might place his hands upon them, and that they might prophesy and that he might hear their prophecy” (6:4f). Charles ascribes this passage to a first century Christian work. The significance of the act seems to be a benediction—cf. Joseph Coppens, *L'imposition des mains* (Paris, 1925), p. 3.

inciding with this view is the added consideration that the "because" in Deuteronomy 34:9 may be regarded as stating the evidence for and not the means of Joshua's wisdom.

The central feature of the Moses-Joshua episode is the Imposition of hands. The word used for the action of Moses is *samakh*, "to lean (one's hands) upon somebody or something." This word is to be distinguished from *sim* and *shith*, "to place (one's hands)," which are the words used where a benediction is concerned (as notably in Gen. 48:14ff). The Septuagint has translated both *samakh* and *sim* by *epitithenai* (used for all types of Impositions of hands in the New Testament also) and *shith* by *epiballein*.³⁸ The placing of one's hands on another in benediction was accompanied by the spoken word usually in the form of prayer.³⁹ *Samakh* was a different act, meaning to lean so as to exert pressure.⁴⁰

Samakh is used of witnesses laying their hands on the blasphemer who is to be stoned (Lev. 24:14; cf. Susannah 34), of the person who brings an animal for sacrifice leaning upon it (Lev. *passim*), and of the people consecrating the Levites (Num. 8:10).

Although not significant in Jewish ordination, the consecration of the Levites was important as a precedent in early Christianity. Since the Levites replaced the first-born, the narrative speaks of their setting apart in sacrificial terms. All of the Israelites (or the elders as representatives—?) laid hands on the Levites. Since this was the exclusion of a whole tribe, it was a non-repeatable act.

Efforts to find a common significance behind these usages of the act have not been notably successful. Elderenbosch has emphasized the ideas of solidarity and community, the giving of oneself so as to establish an identity, in the imposition of hands in the Old Testament.⁴¹ This approach sounds good, but on application to the specific instances suffers the limitation of not being able to make a contribution to their understanding except in generalities. The interpretation in terms of "transference"⁴² has the same defect. It is easy to set up a general category, but a generalization does not aid in interpreting specific passages from which the generalization is drawn. If such diverse qualities as one's sins and one's gratitude could be transferred to the sin and peace offerings respectively, the act was hardly ambiguous. Moreover, there was no obvious transfer

³⁸Daube, *op. cit.*, pp. 224-229.

³⁹Eduard Lohse, *Die Ordination im Spätjudentum und im Neuen Testament* (Goettingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1951), p. 16.

⁴⁰Cf. Amos 5:19. This meaning lay at the root of a Rabbinic controversy about whether an animal could be brought for sacrifice on a Sabbath or a festival, since work was involved—*bChagigah* 16b. Although the Rabbis preserved the tradition of the action, it is to be noted that in the discussion the exertion of pressure was no longer derived from the meaning of *samakh*.

⁴¹P. A. Elderenbosch, *De Oplegging der Handen* (Gravenhage: Boekencentrum, 1953), chapter III.

⁴²E.g. Johannes Behm, *Die Handauflegung im Urchristentum* (Leipzig: A. Deichert, 1911), p. 139.

in the dedication of the Levites. Daube concludes that by pressing upon a person or animal one poured his personality into him or it, making a substitute.⁴³ But the case of the witnesses does not fit this frame of thinking, nor does the offering of a sacrifice. If the animal was a substitute, it represented the offerer in only one aspect (his sins or his feeling of gratitude); therefore, the distinction with *sim* breaks down, for this word is said by Daube to indicate the transference of something other than or less than the whole personality.

Lohse is probably right in concluding that there is no unified explanation for the Old Testament impositions of hands.⁴⁴ Indeed there is no necessity that there should be. Perhaps originally the act had a common root, but it could very easily acquire various connotations in different contexts. Furthermore, there is no basis for Behm's contention that a gesture must be unambiguous and have a definite meaning in a religion.⁴⁵ The history of religions is replete with actions that continue with a changed interpretation, or indeed with no significance save the sacredness which age imparts.

There is some confusion whether one or both hands were ordinarily employed in the rite. In the case of sacrificial animals where the subject is singular the singular "hand" is always used except in Leviticus 16:21 (where the consonantal text is singular but the context demands the plural). The rabbis, however, always spoke of the action in the plural, "hands." The evidence is more confused where persons are concerned. In Numbers 27 God tells Moses to impose his "hand" on Joshua; Moses is said to have imposed his "hands" on him. In the New Testament the plural is used in the great majority of cases, even of the action of one person. It would seem that no distinction was made, and in later times the practice gravitated toward the use of both hands.⁴⁶

Elders and Rabbis—the Rabbinic Literature

The Babylonian Talmud uses words from the *samakh* root for ordination, whereas the Palestinian Talmud uses *minnuv*, a general word for any kind of installation into an office. We are warranted in taking both terms as having the same meaning.⁴⁷ Lohse suggests

⁴³Daube, *op. cit.*, pp. 226f.

⁴⁴*Op. cit.*, p. 25.

⁴⁵Behm, *op. cit.*, p. 135.

⁴⁶Philo, contrary to Old Testament usage, in speaking of a person's sacrifices says that he lays on "hands" (*Spec. Leg.* i.203). The Septuagint, although generally following the number of Hebrew, sometimes changes the singular to the plural, as it does in Lev. 3:2, 8, 13. The plural is the common form in Greek Christian writers, but the singular is more often utilized by Latin writers (who generally show considerable indebtedness to the literal text of the Old Testament). See the references in P. Galtier, "Imposition des mains," *Dictionnaire de Theologie Catholique*, VII, 135.

⁴⁷H. L. Strack and Paul Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament* (Muenchen: C. H. Beck, 1920), II, 648. (Cited Strack-Billerbeck.)

that because *semikah* can have more than one usage *semikuth* came to be used exclusively for ordination,⁴⁸ but this is not certain. *Semikuth* is brought into conjunction with the *semikah zekenim* in three passages. Although Strack-Billerbeck take the latter to refer to "ordination to be elders,"⁴⁹ it seems better to take the phrase as equivalent to the imposition of the elders' hands in connection with a sacrifice for the sins of the community (Lev. 4:15).⁵⁰

The halakic midrash to Numbers understands the installation of Joshua as an example of Rabbinic ordination:

God said to Moses: Give Joshua an interpreter (*i.e.* make Joshua a lecturing teacher at whose side an interpreter stands), so that he questions, and lectures, and makes decisions as long as you still live; if you depart from the world, the Israelites may not say: During the life of his teacher (Moses) he gave no decisions, and now he does. Moses had Joshua to stand up from the ground (on which he had sat before him up to that time as his student) and he set him before himself on the seat (as enjoying equal privileges)⁵¹

A passage from the Palestinian Talmud describing the changes in the ordaining authority provides a good framework for the history of Jewish ordination during the early centuries of the Christian era:

Originally, every one (*i.e.* every teacher) ordained his own pupils, thus R. Johanan b. Zakkai ordained R. Eliezer and R. Joshua, R. Joshua ordained R. Akiba, R. Akiba ordained R. Meir and R. Simeon. They were anxious to honor this house (the house of the Nasi) and declared that if the Beth Din ordained without the approval of the Nasi the ordination was not valid, but if a Nasi ordained without the knowledge of the Beth Din the *Semikah* was valid; then again they made a regulation that ordination should be performed with the mutual approval of the Beth Din and the Nasi.⁵²

With the mention of R. Johanan b. Zakkai (d. about A.D. 80) this passage gives the first case of ordination in which names are recorded. The Babylonian Talmud preserves a story of a scholar ordaining his students during the war under Hadrian.⁵³

The Palestinian Talmud is probably right in saying that the change from an individual teacher to the Nasi ("Patriarch" or "President") was made to do honor to his house. Most scholars ascribe this change to the time after the Hadrianic war, presumably under R. Gamaliel II, by A.D. 140. This centralization may have been part of the re-organization in those troubled times. The limitation of Nasi's authority so that the approval of the council was required is

⁴⁸*Op. cit.*, pp. 28f.

⁴⁹*Op. cit.*, II, 653.

⁵⁰So Lohse, *op. cit.*, p. 28 and Newman, *op. cit.*, pp. 3f. With the precedent of the Biblical text and the Mishnah (*Sanhedrin* i.3) before them it does not seem possible that the Talmudists reversed the usage.

⁵¹*Sifre Numbers* 27:18, 20 from the quotation in Strack-Billerbeck, II, 647f.

⁵²*Sanhedrin* 1, 19a, 43, following the translation of Newman, *op. cit.*, pp. 13f.

⁵³*Sanhedrin* 13b-14a.

usually ascribed to the third century at the time of R. Judah II.⁵⁴

The essential part of early Rabbinic ordinations appears to have been the Imposition of hands. However, Rabbinic literature preserves no express mention of this rite in ordination earlier than about A.D. 380, and here in a context denying its necessity but apparently indicating that it was formerly so regarded.⁵⁵ The evidences adduced in Strack-Billerbeck seem conclusive that the Imposition of hands was performed and was the center of the rite of ordination: the name itself which is based on the Old Testament word used in the imposition of hands; the explanations of Moses' installation of Joshua which is interpreted according to the views held of a scholar's ordination; and the later denials of the necessity of this act, implying a previous practice.⁵⁶ We may add another argument: the connection made by the rabbis between ordination and the imposition of hands in sacrifice.

Verbal Naming later replaced the practice of Imposition of hands. As Newman argues, the question of why a change was made points to the time when the change was made. The Imposition of hands was dropped in the time of Hadrian when ordination was restricted to the Nasi. Ordination was no longer an individual but a communal affair.⁵⁷ The new circumstances and the new ceremony called for a new name, and thus *minnuv* became the usual term in Palestine.

While ordination was performed by Imposition of hands, the act would have involved leaning upon the ordained so as to exert pressure.⁵⁸ When appointment by Naming came into use, the essential feature was the giving of the title "Rabbi." The sources also suggest an Investiture and Inaugural Usurpation such as giving a public discourse.⁵⁹

There was a requirement that three ordained men be present for conferring ordination on another, but the rule itself puzzled the Talmudic interpreters.⁶⁰ The accounts of ordination make it clear that only one was the principal, so the other two must have been assistants or witnesses.

What was the meaning attached to ordination in Judaism? The leadership and authority of the rabbis were especially associated

⁵⁴Newman, *op. cit.*, pp. 19f.

⁵⁵"R. Aha, the son of Raba, asked R. Ashi: Is ordination effect by the literal laying on of hands?—[No,] he answered; it is by the conferring of the degree: He is designated by the title of Rabbi and granted the authority to adjudicate cases of *kenas*" (fines). *bSanhedrin* 13b.

⁵⁶Strack-Billerbeck, II, 654.

⁵⁷Newman, *op. cit.*, pp. 104-110. Cf. also J. Z. Lauterbach, "Ordination," *The Jewish Encyclopedia* (New York: Funk & Wagnalls Co., 1905), IX, 428-430.

⁵⁸Daube interprets the *Sifre* on Numbers 27:23 as likening the imposition of hands to pressing upon a full vessel (or to make a full vessel), *op. cit.*, p. 231.

⁵⁹Newman, *op. cit.*, pp. 117-123.

⁶⁰*bSanhedrin* 13a, b.

with judicial questions arising from the Law. This association points to the origin of rabbinic ordinations in the judges and in the greater and lesser Sanhedrins of pre-Christian times. Newman devotes a whole chapter to the "exclusive jurisdiction of the ordained."⁶¹ An examination of this list of prerogatives of the ordained scholar in Judaism is instructive: They settled financial disputes, inflicted fines, established the calendar, released the first-born animal for profane use by reason of disqualifying blemishes, annulled vows, and originally inflicted corporal and capital punishment.

The impression of the ordained rabbi as a religious judge is strengthened by two further considerations. First, there is the principle, "There is no ordination outside Palestine," meaning that ordination could not be conferred outside the holy land.⁶² The very existence of such a regulation indicates that ordination was rooted in the juridical life of the Jewish people in their homeland and was not a spiritual principle necessary to the religious life of the Diaspora. That the Babylonian exilarch (*resh galutha*) granted authorizations, sometimes called "ordinations," does not change the principle, rather it speaks of the legal status attained by Jewry in that region. The terminology for ordination was never changed in Babylonia because ordination never had its full meaning there. The second consideration is the granting of part and conditional ordinations.⁶³ Ordinarily, ordination conferred an equal status, and when a teacher ordained his student, this would have been the case.⁶⁴ But authorizations to decide ritual questions or act as a judge can be limited to certain cases or certain times. In cases of full ordination the ordination was apparently considered irrevocable.⁶⁵

Other concepts besides the juridical one were associated with the rabbinate, but we have dwelt on the legal aspect because it indicates clearly the difference between Christian and Jewish ordination. Christian ordination had no comparable legal or juridical purpose. Ehrhardt calls attention to two subsidiary differences between Rabbinic and Christian ordination. The former required the presence of three, and this is a later feature of Christian ordination for which there is no early evidence. Moreover, Rabbinic ordination conferred an equal status, something not true of all Christian ordinations. A related problem to the latter would be the renewed laying on of hands in episcopal consecration of one already a presbyter—this would have been contrary to a Jewish rule against repeating the act.⁶⁶

Ehrhardt claims that in early Judaism the transference of the

⁶¹*Op. cit.*, pp. 24-64.

⁶²*bSanhedrin* 14a; *pBikkurim* 3, 65d (quoted in Newman, *op. cit.*, p. 103).

⁶³Bases for these are discussed in *bSanhedrin* 5a and *pChagigah* 1, 76a.

⁶⁴See Strack-Billerbeck, II, 647, on *Sifre* Numbers 27:18.

⁶⁵*bSanhedrin* 30b. Cf. Newman, *op. cit.*, p. 98.

⁶⁶Arnold Ehrhardt, "Jewish and Christian Ordination," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, V (1954), pp. 132, 134f.

Spirit was admitted and was connected with the Imposition of hands.⁶⁷ This is far from a general opinion among scholars. Davies states as follows: "It is precarious also to assume that Rabbinic ordination by the laying on of hands in the first century was meant to signify the transmission of the Holy Spirit."⁶⁸ Daube also declares that the imparting of the Spirit was not Rabbinic ordination.⁶⁹ The Rabbinic comments on Numbers 27:18 and Deuteronomy 34:9 would appear to be conclusive evidence for the negative. The only passage this writer has found which would connect the Imposition of hands with the giving of the Spirit is a quite late homiletic midrash on Num. 27.⁷⁰ Otherwise, Jewish writers stress that in Numbers 11 God made the transfer.⁷¹ Numbers 27 has no transfer of the Spirit, and in the interpretations the emphasis is on the "honor" Joshua received in being designated Moses' successor.⁷² Significantly, little is made of the Deuteronomy passage which does make a connection between spirit and the Imposition of hands. What little is said stresses that Joshua had, not Spirit, but wisdom from Moses. The "spirit of wisdom" passed down among Jewish scholars was that which a student learned from his teacher.

It has been noted above that at ordination the title of "rabbi" was given. There is evidence to suggest that originally "elder" (*zagen*) was the status conferred in ordination. Lauterbach asserts that persons ordained to the Sanhedrin bore the title of *zagen*, and he gives as evidence a passage in *bSanhedrin* 14a where this word is referred to the ordained.⁷³ Furthermore, the Talmudic statements which link the laying on of the hands of the elders in a communal sacrifice with ordination imply that "elders" are involved in both cases. The comments on Numbers 11 make the transition from the "elders" of the text to ordained teachers directly.⁷⁴ One of the texts denying ordination "outside the Land" speaks of it as ordination of

⁶⁷*Ibid.*, p. 137.

⁶⁸W. D. Davies, *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism* (Second ed.; London: S.P.C.K., 1955), p. 213.

⁶⁹*Op. cit.*, p. 241.

⁷⁰*Midrash Rabbah*, Numbers xv. 25.

⁷¹Not even Philo, *de Gigantibus* 24f, is an exception to this, although it is the main passage to which Ehrhardt appeals, in spite of his skepticism about Philo's value for views held by Palestinian Jews (*op. cit.*, p. 131). Justin, *Dial.* 49 confuses Num. 11:17 with Num. 27:18 and Deut. 34:9 in a way not found in Jewish sources. Nevertheless, even if Justin is reproducing some rabbi's exegesis, the transfer of Moses' spirit to Joshua is not ascribed to the Imposition of hands but to a separate act by God.

⁷²"Authority" is the happy rendering of the RSV. Both the Old Testament text and the Rabbinic interpretations show that the transfer involves Moses' authority or prestige (the Latin *auctoritas* would seem exactly to represent the Hebrew "honor" or "majesty" in this instance).

⁷³Lauterbach, *loc. cit.*, p. 428.

⁷⁴*Sifre* Numbers 11:16 (quoted in Lohse, *op. cit.*, p. 42).

elders.⁷⁵ Two passages referring to the later ordination by Naming speak of this as "appointment to be elders."⁷⁶ The term "elder" (indicating dignity more than age) forges another link between ordination and the judicial aspects of Jewish life, for the term was the designation for the members of the councils in each community. It would appear to have been an early title for the ordained that enjoyed a revival in later times. The term, "rabbi," on the other hand, is first used as a *title* in reference to the disciples of Johanan ben Zakkai.⁷⁷ The Gospels show "rabbi" as a respectful form of address to a teacher, but are an evidence against its usage at that time for ordained teachers. "Rabbi" apparently acquired official connotations only at the time we also hear of the first ordinations performed by individual teachers.

Can Rabbinic ordination be traced to the time before A.D. 70? There is point in Newman's observation that the Talmud would not have tolerated any innovations such as R. Ashi's decision that laying on of hands by the qualifier was not necessary, or the introduction of part-ordination, if the Old Testament story of Moses and Joshua had been considered binding in all its details.⁷⁸ His doubts raise the more important question whether ordination by a scholar through the Imposition of hands would, or could, have been abandoned if it was an institution of long standing.⁷⁹ Moreover, there seems no reason why *individual* ordination could not have spread outside Palestine, and, if it was an old institution, the probability is that it would have done so.

In the face of these presumptions an effort has been made to break through the wall in our evidence raised at the time of the Jewish revolt, A.D. 66-70. Lohse has made the most persistent effort of recent times,⁸⁰ but his evidence has been answered by Ehrhardt.⁸¹ We are left with no clear evidence for Rabbinic ordination before 70 and a presumption against it.

Elders and the Sanhedrin

The term "elder" offers the one solid indication of ordination in earlier times. Ehrhardt has advanced a thesis which we would like to elaborate further. The main points of this thesis are as follows: ordination before 70 was the solemn ritual of admission to the Jerusalem Sanhedrin; in the time of Jesus the main rite in Jewish ordi-

⁷⁵*pBikkurim* 3.

⁷⁶*pMegilloth* 1, 72b and *pChagigah*, 76c in Strack-Billerbeck, II, 655.

⁷⁷G. F. Moore, *Judaism* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1954), III, 15.

⁷⁸*Op. cit.*, p. 5. Newman notes the differences between the Moses-Joshua episode and Rabbinic ordination.

⁷⁹*Ibid.*, pp. 104-110. Newman points out that the proscription of ordination by Hadrian mentioned in Rabbinic sources would not account for a failure to resume Imposition of hands.

⁸⁰*Op. cit.*, especially p. 43.

⁸¹*Op. cit.*, pp. 130ff.

nation was not the Imposition of hands but a Solemn Seating; the Imposition of hands rose to prominence in the troubled times, 70-135, when the precedent of Numbers 27 had to be stressed against Numbers 11 in the need for private ordination.⁸² Although evidence is lacking for ordination of rabbis by Imposition of hands before 70, the same is not true for ordination to the Sanhedrin by Solemn Seating.

It is surprising that earlier investigators have not been impressed that all of the earliest descriptions of ordination make the key feature of the Seating of the ordinand on the teaching chair. The *Sifre* to Numbers 27,⁸³ which was quoted earlier, says nothing about the Imposition of hands except as it appears in the citation of the Biblical text. The central feature of the description is Moses raising Joshua up and Seating him on a chair. The same description holds true for the passage cited by Lohse⁸⁴ for support of Jewish ordination going back to pre-Christian times, Assumption of Moses xii.2. Discussing the appointment of Joshua, the text says, "And Moses took his hands and raised him into the seat before him."⁸⁵ Ehrhardt also finds support for Solemn Seating being the central concept of Jewish ordination in the words of Jesus about the scribes and Pharisees in Matthew 23:2, they "sit in Moses' seat."⁸⁶ Lohse also cites texts from the *Sifre* on Deuteronomy where *yashabh* (in the form "cause to be seated") is used of ordination.⁸⁷

Probably the most significant passage on Jewish ordination is a statement from the Mishnah which should serve to certify the rest of the evidence.⁸⁸

The Sanhedrin was arranged like the half of a round threshing-floor so that they all might see one another. Before them stood the two scribes of the judges. . . .

Before them sat three rows of disciples of the Sages, and each knew his proper place. If they needed to appoint another as judge, they appointed him from the first row, and one from the second row came into the first row, and one from the third

⁸²*Ibid.*, pp. 125-138.

⁸³This work is part of the Halakic Midrash by the Tannaim to which Moore gives the first importance for determining second century Jewish thought, especially as that thought preserved older traditions. *Op. cit.*, I, 133.

⁸⁴*Op. cit.*, p. 30.

⁸⁵From R. H. Charles, ed., *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913). Charles dates the work in the early part of the first century.

⁸⁶The background of the teaching and judging chairs of the Sanhedrin favors a non-eschatological interpretation of Matt. 19:28.

⁸⁷Lohse, *op. cit.*, p. 33. Cf. *pBikkurim* 3, 65d.

⁸⁸Again we have a second century source which collects earlier traditional material. Lohse (*op. cit.*, pp. 30f) says this passage must refer to the time of centralization in the second century. The extent to which contemporary material is included in the Mishnah is debatable. It is more reasonable to take this passage for what it purports to be; a description of the Sanhedrin that was prior to the destruction of 70.

row came into the second; and they chose yet another from the congregation and set him in the third row. He did not sit in the place of the former, but he sat in the place that was proper for him.⁸⁹

Samakh is the verb translated "appoint," and it is distinguished in the passage from "chose." The technical meaning "ordain" would seem to be definite. This word may further suggest a laying on of hands; what is significant is that taking the appropriate seat on the Sanhedrin represented one's admission to that body.

Apparently the same procedure was employed for the lesser Sanhedrins, or councils of judges. In the Babylonian Talmud (*Sanhedrin* 17b) the number one hundred twenty is given as the minimum population of a city in order that it may qualify for a Sanhedrin. In arriving at this number the commentator first counts the twenty-three members of a minor Sanhedrin, and then lists three rows of twenty-three who must sit before the council. There is no need to carry the arithmetic further; this much shows that the major Sanhedrin was the pattern for the lesser ones and presumably vacancies would be filled by both bodies in the same way as outlined in the Mishnah.

It may well be that Imposition of hands was part of the ceremony of ordination to a Sanhedrin. It may even have been that rabbis used the rite in the private "graduation exercises" of their pupils before A.O. 70. The evidence, however, is lacking. Ehrhardt's statement that "private ordination was, at any rate, not officially recognized before A.D. 70, but was a transient phase in the troubled times between A.D. 70 and 135, and not the true origin of rabbinical ordination," is correct. The juridical nature of Rabbinic ordination is explained by its intention to continue the Sanhedrin. The Jewish background gives prominence to an act often overlooked in discussions of ordination—Solemn Seating.

Community and Synagogue Officers in the Diaspora

The liturgical functions of the Jewish synagogue, at home and abroad, were in the hands of a "chief of the synagogue" (*rosh hakeneseth, archisynagogos*) and a "servant" of the synagogue (*chazan, hyperetes*). No information exists in regard to their selection and installation.⁹⁰

Distinct from these cult officials were the community rulers. At the legal head of Palestinian communities were local sanhedrins whose members were ordained and wore the title *zaqen*. Although a certain variety appears, non-Palestinian Jewish communities also had a collegiate body in charge of their administrative affairs. Inscriptions from the diaspora show a multiplicity of functionaries patterned after the officials of the Greek associations but keeping within the framework of Palestinian models. Jewry in Rome may be taken as

⁸⁹*Sanhedrin* iv. 3, 4.

⁹⁰Samuel Krauss, *Synagogale Altertuemer* (Berlin: Benjamin Harz, 1922), pp. 114-130.

representative inasmuch as there is more evidence from Rome and we have the benefit of the studies of J. B. Frey for the city.⁹¹

Each Jewish community at Rome was governed by a council of elders,⁹² the *gerousia*, presided over by the *gerousiarch*. *Presbyteroi* do not appear to be mentioned in Rome,⁹³ so the idea has been presented that each member of the *gerousia* was called *archon*.⁹⁴ Frey, however, argues that *archons* were the executive committee of the *gerousia*.⁹⁵

No installation ceremony is known for any officials of the Jewish communities. The only means of selection which is attested is that of Election by the community. The Jewish *archons* were elected for a year by all the community in the month of September at the Feast of Tabernacles.⁹⁶

The later patriarchs sought to maintain some control over Jewish communities through their apostles (*sheluchim*). Their introduction into discussions about the ministry of the church necessitate a word here.⁹⁷ There is no evidence for Jewish apostles of the patriarchs before the second century; neither is there evidence that they were ordained nor any reason to suppose they would be.⁹⁸ There was no place for a laying on of hands in the sending out of the *shaliach*.⁹⁹

Functionaries in the Qumran Community

Although study is producing a fair clear picture of the organiza-

⁹¹"Les Communautés Juives à Rome," *Recherches de Science Religieuse*, XXI (1931), pp. 136ff. We will follow this article in the references, but the same material is included in Frey's introduction to the *Corpus Inscriptionum Judaicarum*, I, lxxviii-cxi.

⁹²Frey, *loc. cit.*, p. 136. There is no mention of a supreme *gerousia* at Rome. Frey, pp. 161ff, answers the arguments which have been advanced for a central organization of Jewry at Rome such as Alexandria had.

⁹³However, Frey gives *presbyteros* in one restored reading—*loc. cit.*, p. 138.

⁹⁴B. S. Easton, "Jewish and Early Christian Ordination," *Anglican Theological Review*, V (March, 1923), p. 317.

⁹⁵*Loc. cit.*, p. 139.

⁹⁶Krauss, *op. cit.*, p. 152.

⁹⁷The information about the *shaliach* is well summarized by T. W. Manson, *The Church's Ministry* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1948), p. 47.

⁹⁸Easton, *loc. cit.*, p. 319; Lohse, *op. cit.*, pp. 62f.

⁹⁹The mischief that may come from the blind following of scholarly authority may be seen in the influence of Rengstorff's article on "Apostle" in *Theologisches Woerterbuch zum neuen Testament* (ed. Gerhard Kittel; Stuttgart: W. Kahlhammer, 1933), I, 417. Rengstorff states that Jewish apostles received an Imposition of hands on the basis of Justin, *Dial.*, 108:2, which speaks of them as "chosen and appointed (*cheirotoneantes*) men." There is no instance in the early centuries for *cheirotonein* meaning an imposition of hands—Siotis, *op. cit.*, XXI, 251, 254 (although Siotis too is awed by the authority of an article in Kittel). Rengstorff has been guilty of reading a medieval meaning into Justin's text.

tion of the Qumran community,¹⁰⁰ only hints exist in regard to the subject under consideration. The emphasis on an orderly structure of the community may be seen in the following passages from the Manual of Discipline:

This is the regulation for the session of the Many: each member (shall sit) in his definite seat. The priests shall sit in the first seats, the elders in the next seats, and the rest of all the people shall sit, each in his definite seat. (vi. 8ff)

They shall examine their spiritual qualities and their actions year after year, promoting one according to his insight and his perfect ways, and setting back another according to his perverseness. (v. 23f)¹⁰¹

These texts reflect in a new situation the same cycle of ideas about seating as the Mishnah *Sanhedrin* iv.4.

The idea of divine choice is strong in reference to the priests¹⁰² and may have had a basis in the fact that the priests were the descendants of Aaron and thus divinely appointed. At any rate, the priests held a special position at Qumran simply by virtue of heredity. It is assumed that each priest was anointed.¹⁰³

Despite the hierarchical structure there was a strong "democratic" element in the role played by the assembly in making decisions. The voice of the "Many" was especially heard in the selection of leaders. When judges (ten) were chosen for a special occasion, the whole congregation appears to have made the choice.¹⁰⁴ A common phrase, "the lot shall go out" (*ys' hgurl*), was used figuratively for all decisions in which the whole body had a part.¹⁰⁵ In one passage it has definite reference to the selection of the leaders of the community, perhaps by an Election of the members.¹⁰⁶

¹⁰⁰Frank M. Cross, *The Ancient Library of Qumran* (London: Gerald Duckworth and Co., 1958), pp. 173-176.

¹⁰¹Translation by P. Wernberg-Moller, *The Manual of Discipline* ("Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah"; E. J. Brill, 1957).

¹⁰²"God has chosen you," 1QSb v. 22 in D. Barthelemy and J. T. Milik, ed., *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1955), I, 126.

¹⁰³See the note on 1QM ix.8f by J. Van der Ploeg, "La Regle de la Guerre: Traduction et Notes," *Vetus Testamentum*, V (1955), p. 409.

¹⁰⁴CD x. 4-6. Chaim Rabin, *The Zadokite Documents* (Second Edition; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1958), p. 49.

¹⁰⁵1QS v. 2ff. Cf. Wernberg-Moller, *op. cit.*, p. 92.

¹⁰⁶1QSa i.13-17. Barthelemy and Milik, *op. cit.*, p. 112.

GLOSSARY

Capitalization indicates words given a special technical meaning in the paper. The use of the small case in the text indicates either a non-technical meaning or the action in a non-ordinal context. The capitalization is not extended to verb forms and derivative words, but as much as possible these other forms of the word are used only when referring to the technical action.

Acclamation—A spontaneous, unanimous Election or Ratification; in the cry, "*Axios*" (= *Dignus*), an Acclamation became part of the liturgy.

appointment—A general word covering selection and/or installation without reference to the manner in which accomplished.

Auspication—The divination or augury performed by the new Roman office-holder in order to determine the divine attitude toward his magistracy.

Benediction—The pronouncing of a personal blessing at an ordination with a view toward dedicating the person receiving the Benediction to the service of God.

Chrismation—Anointing with oil.

Co-option—Election by members of a collegiate body to replace vacancies in their numbers, thus providing for a self-perpetuating membership.

Designation—A selection for an office made or announced by a person in authority (preserving the meaning of *designatio*).

Divine Invocation—An appeal to the gods or God for favor in an enterprise, particularly an official undertaking.

Election—A selection made by voting, particularly by the whole assembly.

Enthronement—A special form of Solemn Seating, with the chair on a raised platform and containing the ornate trappings of royalty.

Episcopal Election—A choice made by one bishop, especially of a successor.

Formal Scrutiny—Examination of the qualifications of a candidate in public and according to a set form.

Imperial Nomination—Presentation of a candidate by the emperor for Election.

Imposition of hands—Laying of hands, or a hand, on the head of the ordinand, either with or without the exertion of pressure.

Inaugural Usurpation—Assuming an office by performing its duties for the first time.

Inauguration—An auspication performed by an auger in inducting a person into office (Latin *inauguratio*).

Inheritance—Qualifying for an office through birth.

Inspired Designation—Selection of a person for religious work by a spokesman of the divine will, especially a prophet.

installation—Induction into office, however performed.

Investiture—Putting on the garments pertaining to an office and worn in its exercise.

Lot-taking—Selection by chance.

Naming—Bestowing an office by giving the name of the office, or the title carried by its holder, in a verbal proclamation.

Nomination—Proposing a name for Election.

Oath-taking—A solemn promise, supported by an appeal to the divine, marking one's entrance into office.

ordination—A general word for selection and installation, but particularly the latter, ceremonially accomplished.

Ordination—The developed sacrament of orders in Catholic Churches.

Parochial Election—An Election by all the people of a Christian community.

Porrection—Bestowal of the instruments signifying an office and/or used in its performance.

Prayer—The ordination prayer.

Presbyteral Election—Election by the presbyters of a church.

Ratification—Approval by one party to the constitutive selection performed by another.

selection—A general word for choice without reference to the manner of choosing.

Solemn Seating—The taking a seat in the chair of office.

Synodal Election—An Election by a specially assembled synod of bishops.